THE ROLE OF THE LUKAN PARABLES IN TERMS OF THE PURPOSE OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

PERSPECTIVES ON CHRISTIAN LIFE

BY
JEA YEOL JEONG

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTER OF THEOLOGY IN THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE

31 MAY 2011

SUPERVISOR: PROF. H. C. VAN ZYL

Declaration

I declare that the dissertation hereby submitted by me for the D. Th degree at the University of Free State is my own independent work and has not previously been submitted by me at another university/faculty. I further more cede copyright of the dissertation in favour of the University of the Free State.

Signature: JEA YEOL JEONG

Date: 31 MAY 2011

Acknowledgements

Even though writing a dissertation may often feel like a solitary endeavor, many have made this journey possible. I am deeply indebted to many of my family, friends and churches for support, encouragement, and insight during the composition of this thesis over the last three and a half years. I can only mention some of the most important of those here.

My thanks must go to my supervisor, Prof. H.C. van Zyl, whose encouragement has sustained me throughout my time of research at the University of Free State, and whose advice and counsel made me pursue academic study of the New Testament. I cannot forget all the professors in the Faculty of Theology at UFS, who have shown great kindness and warmth towards foreign students. In particular, Prof. D.F. Tolmie has given his treasured time for Korean students with lasting concern and love. I am also grateful to Rev. Raymond Beckman who has read and proofread various parts of the first draft, and others who have given their reactions to it. All errors that remain are of course my own responsibility. I have also benefitted from all the staff of Inter Library loan at UFS Library for consistently friendly and expert service. The financing of this research has been made possible through an academic bursary from the University of Free State, and by an equally generous gift from Churches in Korea, and above all by my relatives and brothers and sisters of faith.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife and my daughter and son, whose love, concern, and prayer for me during the course of this study is appreciated more than anything, as well as the unfailing support of my mother.

Contents

Abbreviations ····· iv

Part I
Introduction

Chapter 1: Introduction ····· 2
1. Research Problem ····· 2
2. Research Hypothesis and Methodology ····· 3
3. Value of The Study ····· 4

Chapter 2: A History of Research of The Lukan Parables ····· 6
1. Research on the parables as a whole in the Gospel of Luke ····· 6
2. Research on the parables unique to Luke ····· 11

Chapter 3: A Methodological basis for an analysis of the Lukan Parables ····· 16
1. The Parables must be interpreted. ····· 16
2. The Parables must be interpreted within their gospel contexts. ····· 18
3. The Parables contain allegory and point to referents beyond the story. ····· 20
4. The Parables may make more than one point. ····· 22

Part II
An Analysis of The Lukan Parables and The Characteristics of The Lukan Parables

Chapter 4: An Analysis of The Lukan Parables ····· 27
1. The Good Samaritan (10:25-37) ····· 27
1-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 27
1-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 28
1-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 33
2. The Friend at Midnignt (11:5-8) ····· 36
2-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 36
2-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 36
2-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 40
3. The Rich Fool (12:13-21) ····· 41
3-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 41
3-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 42
3-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 46
4. The Barren Fig Tree (13:6-9) ····· 47
4-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 47
4-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 49
4-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 51
5. The Great Feast (14:15-24) ····· 54
5-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 54
5-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 56
5-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 59
6. The Parables of The Lost Sheep, The Lost Coin and The Prodigal Son (15:1-32) ····· 61
6-1. The Literary Context of Luke 15 ····· 61
6-2. The Parables of The Lost Sheep (15:4-7) ····· 63
6-2-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 63
6-2-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 66
6-2-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 70

6-3. The Parables of The Lost Coin (15:8-10) ····· 71
6-3-1. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 71
6-3-2. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 73
6-4. The Parable of The Prodigal Son (15:11-32) ····· 75
6-4-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 75
6-4-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 77
6-4-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 86
7. The Dishonest Manager (16:1-13) ····· 92
7-1. The Literary Context of Luke 16 ····· 92
7-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 97
7-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 110
8. The Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19-31) ····· 115
8-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 115
8-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 119
8-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 126
9. The Judge and The Widow (18:1-8) ····· 130
9-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 130
9-2. The Analysis of the Parable ····· 133
9-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 140
10. The Pharisee and The Tax-Collector (18:9-14) ····· 143
10-1. The Literary Context of the Parable ····· 143
10-2. The Aaylysis of the Parable ····· 144
10-3. The Interpretation of the Parable ····· 154

Part III
The Lukan Parables' Contribution to the Purpose of Luke's Gospel

Chapter 5: The Theological Themes of The Lukan Parables ····· 158
1. The Marginalized ····· 159
2. Wealth and Possessions ····· 165
3. Prayer ····· 173
4. Conversion ····· 182

Chapter 6: The Lukan Parables in The Travel Narrative ····· 197
1. The Delineation of the Travel Narrative ····· 197
1-1. Lk 19:44 ····· 198
1-2. Lk 19:46 ····· 199
1-3. Lk 19:48 ····· 200
1-4. Lk 19:28 ····· 202
2. The Interpretational Approaches of the Travel Narrative ····· 206
2-1. Historical Approach ····· 207
2-2. Redaction Critical Approach ····· 210
2-2-1. Christological Interpretations ····· 211
2-2-2. Ecclesiological and Mission Interpretations ····· 211
2-2-3. Combinations of Christological and Ecclesiological Interpretations ····· 213
2-3. Chiastic Structure ····· 216
2-4. Old Testament Models ····· 223
3. Christological and Ecclesiological Purpose in the Travel Narrative ····· 232
3-1. Christological Purpose in the Travel Narrative ····· 232
3-2. Ecclesiological Purpose in the Travel Narrative ····· 233

Chapter 7: A Unifying Motif of the Lukan Parables: Perspectives on the Christian Life ··· 235
1. The Relationship with Neighbours: Love and Forgiveness ····· 235
2. The Relationship with Material Possessions: The Right Use ····· 237
3. The Relationship with God: Faith and Repentance ····· 239

Chapter 8: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel ····· 243
1. Some suggested views of the Purpose of Luke-Acts ····· 243
1-1. An apologetic defense of Christianity's *religio licita* status ····· 243
1-2. A theology adapted to the parousia's delay ····· 245
1-3. The confirmation of the gospel ····· 246
1-4. A polemic against heresy ····· 248
1-5. A redefinition of relations between Christianity and Judaism ····· 249
1-6. An interest in evangelism ····· 251
1-7. An apologia for Christianity ····· 253
1-8. An apologia for the plan of God ····· 255
1-9. An apologia for Christian related to Judaism ····· 257
1-10. An effort at conciliation with Judaism ····· 258
1-11. A defense of Paul ····· 258
1-12. The ethical model for Christian living ····· 260
1-13. A multifaceted reading of the purpose of Luke ····· 261
2. The Confirmation of the gospel as the Purpose of Luke's Gospel ····· 265
2-1. The Preface to Luke's Gospel (1:1-4) ····· 265
2-1-1. The Structure of Luke's Prologue and Hellenistic-Jewish Writings ····· 265
2-1-2. The Context of Luke's Preface (1:1-2) ····· 269
2-1-3. Luke's Purpose According to the Preface (1:3-4) ····· 272
2-2. The Audience of Luke ····· 278
2-2-1. The Argument of the Christian Community ····· 279
2-2-2. A Christian Audience ····· 285
2-2-2-1. Gentile Christians ····· 286
2-2-2-2. Jewish Christians ····· 288
2-2-3. A Non-Christian Audience ····· 290
2-3. The Plan of God in Luke-Acts ····· 293
2-3-1. The Continuation and Fulfillment of God's Plan ····· 295
2-3-2. The Opposition to God's Plan ····· 297
2-3-3. The Certainty of God's Plan ····· 299
3. The Role of the Lukan parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel ····· 302
3-1. The Role of the Lukan parables as one facet of embodying God's redemptive purpose ····· 302
3-2. The Role of the Lukan parables as a service in accomplishing God's redemptive purpose ····· 305

Chapter 9: Conclusion ····· 309

Bibliography ····· 315
Abstract ····· 348

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	D.N. Freedman, ed., *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.: New York: Doubleday, 1992)
ABRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
ACNT	Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament
AFLNW	*Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Lands NordRhein-Westfalen*
AnBib	*Analecta biblica*
ASTI	*Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review*
AUS	American University Studies
AusBR	*Australian Biblical Review*
b.	*Babylonian Talmud*
2 Bar.	*2 Baruch*
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BDAG	W.F. Bauer, F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (3rd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999)
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BGU	*Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königliche Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden* (Berlin: 1895-1983)
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BibTod	*The Bible Today*
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
BNTC	Black' s New Testament Commentaries
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZNW	Beihefte zur *ZNW*
1-2 Clem.	*1-2 Clement*
CBG	*Collationes Brugenses et Gandavenses*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Monograph Series
CBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica, New Testament
CTR	*Criswell Theological Review*
CurTM	*Currents in Theology and Mission*
Eccl. Rab.	*Ecclesiastes Rabbah*
EKKNT	Evangelische-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
Exp	*Expositor*
ExpTim	*The Expository Times*
GNS	Good News Studies
Gos. Thom.	*Gospel of Thomas*
HeyJ	*Heythrop Jouranal*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	*Hervormde Teologiese Studies*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IBS	*Irish Biblical Studies*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDBSup	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplement*
Int	*Interpretation*

JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
Josephus, *Ant.*	Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*
JRE	*Journal of Religious Ethics*
JSHJ	*Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	*Journalfor the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series*
JSOT	*Journalfor the Study of the Old Testament*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
J.W.	Josephus, *Jewish War*
4 Kgdms	2 Kings (LXX)
LCBI	Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
1-3 Macc.	*1-3 Maccabees*
m.	*Mishnah*
Midr.	*Midrash*
ModTh	*Modern Theology*
MSJ	*Master's Seminary Journal*
NAC	New American Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum, Supplements
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTT	New Testament Theology
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology Series
P. Flor	*Papiri Florentini*
P. Oxy.	*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*
PRSt	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
Rab.	*Rabbah*
RB	*Revue biblique*
RBS	Risk Book Series
ResQ	*Restoration Quanerly*
RevExp	*Review and Expositor*
RevThom	*Revue thomiste*
Sanh.	*Sanhedrin*
SB	Subsidia Biblica
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBT	*Studia Biblica et Theologica*
Sir.	Sirach
SCJ	Studies in Christianity and Judaism
SCSS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series
SE	*Studia Evangelica 1, II, III (= TU 73 [1959], 87 [1964], 88 [1964], etc.)*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTU	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
SPB	Studia Post Biblica Series
Str-B	[Hermann L. Strack and] Paul BilIerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (7 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1922-61)

SVTQ	*Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*
t.	*Tosefta*
TDNT	Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; 10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1964-)
ThViat	*Theologia Viatorum*
TJ	*Trinity Journal*
TJT	*Toronto Journal of Theology*
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament commentaries
Tob.	Tobit
Tohar.	*Toharot*
TPINTC	TPI New Testament Commentaries
TS	*Theological Studies*
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testamenl Word and World
WW	*Word and World*
y.	*Jerusalem Talmud*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamemliche Wissenschaft*
ZSSR	*Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtgeschichte, romantische Abteilung*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

Part I

Introduction

The motivation for this study arises out of the question as to why Luke chose the parables unique to him that the rest of the synoptic writers did not, and incorporated them within his Gospel in the way that he did. That is to say, the question explores the motif and purpose of Luke's use of these particular parables. I hope that the answer to this question will contribute greatly to research into the purpose of Luke's Gospel.

My first task, in this dissertation, is to lay a methodological basis for a study of the parables, after establishing the research problem, hypothesis and methodology, and value of the study. For this, I, in chapter 2, will survey a history of research of the Lukan parables, dividing it into two categories, such as research on the parables as a whole in the Gospel of Luke, and research on the parables unique to Luke. In addition, it will be argued in chapter 3, that on the basis of current research, the parables must be interpreted within their gospel contexts, that the parables contain allegory and point to referents beyond the story, and that the parables may make more than one point. Furthermore, the narrative characteristic in the parables makes us consider the literary context of the parables as well as methods for a narrative analysis of the parables.

Chapter 1
Introduction

1. Research Problem

The most loved and best known of Jesus' parables occur only in the Gospel of Luke. For example, the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, the Dishonest Manager, The Rich Man and Lazarus and the like. Luke has at least fourteen parables unique to his Gospel, eleven of which appear only in the travel narrative of the Gospel.[1] The impetus for this study arises out of the question as to why Luke chose these particular parables that the other synoptic writers did not, and incorporated them within his Gospel in the way that he did. That is to say, the question explores the motif and purpose of Luke's use of these particular parables. I hope that the answer to this question will contribute to research into the purpose of Luke's Gospel.

Unfortunately, thus far, the Lukan parables have primarily been researched and analysed as individual parables, focusing on form and structural elements, without attempting to connect the results to the purpose of Luke's Gospel as a whole. Even though there are attempts to find the characteristics and theological themes of the Lukan parables in several ways, there is little attempt to link those results to the purpose of the Gospel of Luke. If anything, it is only in passing that such connections are made, except for in the work of Greg W. Forbes.[2]

However, the study of the role that the Lukan parables play in the purpose of the Gospel of Luke, could enhance our understanding of the purpose of Luke's Gospel, as well as of the Lukan parables themselves. Therefore, I, in this thesis, attempt to do just that: To go further,

---

1. At least fourteen parables are unique to Luke: the Two Debtors (7:41-42), the Good Samaritan (10:25-37), the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8), the Rich Fool (12:13-21), the Barren Fig Tree (13:6-9), the Great Feast (14:15-24), the Tower Builder and Warring King (14:28-33), the Lost Coin (15:8-10), the Prodigal Son (15:11-32), the Dishonest Manager (16:1-13), the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19-31), the Unworthy Servants (17:7-10), the Judge and the Widow (18:1-8) and the Pharisee and the Tax-Collector (18:9-14). Of those, except for the Tower Builder and Warring King and the Unworthy Servants, at least eleven narrative parables are unique to Luke in the travel narrative of the Gospel, although the Great Feast is debatable as to whether it is independent of Matthew's versions (Matt. 22:1-14). Of course, the number of parables is counted differently depending on how one defines the parable. Some scholars add the Place of Honor (14:7-11) to the Lukan parables with a certain reason. See Douglas M. Parrott, "The Dishonest Steward (Luke 16:1-8a) and Luke's Special Parable Collection," *NTS* 37 (1991), 499-515, here 505-506; Mikeal C. Parsons, "Landmarks Along the Way: The Function of The "L" Parables in the Lukan Travel Narrative," *SJT* 40 (1997), 33-47, especially 38-39; Garwood P. Anderson, "Seeking and Saving What Might Have Been Lost: Luke's Restoration of an Enigmatic Parable Tradition," *CBQ* 70 (2008), 729-49, here 729 n. 1.

2. Greg W. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 198, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

by examining the role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of Luke's Gospel, in the hope that the unique features of the Lukan parables will give us clues as to Luke's overall purpose.

2. Research Hypothesis and Methodology

My research hypothesis is that the role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of Luke's Gospel is that they function as perspectives on the Christian life. To do this, I first propose that Luke wrote to reassure his readers of the gospel which has already been preached and taught to them, especially under the detailed discussion of God's plan. Therefore, in my view, the purpose of Luke's Gospel is to confirm the gospel that he sought to convey to his readers by presenting God's plan of salvation. Moreover, given the fact that the Christian life is one of the two pivotal themes of the travel narrative of Luke's Gospel, and that the Lukan parables' theological themes converge on the Christian life, I present a unifying motif of the Lukan Parables as 'perspectives on the Christian life.' On these grounds in my research hypothesis, I question what role the Lukan Parables play in the purpose of Luke's Gospel. In order to find an answer to the question, I will proceed as follows:

First of all, it needs to be stated at the outset that I am not attempting a new interpretation of the parables, nor am I seeking to reinterpret Luke's purpose. Rather, the contribution that I seek to make to Lukan research is to fill a void in Lukan parable research by drawing together some previously unconnected strands of studies.

My first task is to lay a methodological basis for a study of the parables, after having a look at a history of research of the Lukan parables in chapter 2. Therefore, it will be argued in chapter 3, that on the basis of current research, the parables must be interpreted within their gospel contexts, that the parables contain allegory and point to referents beyond the story, and that the parables may make more than one point.

In chapter 4, I will limit my analysis of the Lukan parables to the Lukan parables in the Travel Narrative. With these criteria established for a study of the parables, I will embark on a detailed analysis of the Lukan parables, examining particularly the literary context of the parable and eliciting the major motifs from each parable. Here, my major goal is to examine each parable on its own merits, and not to force it into a preconceived framework, taking into consideration, of course, the modern interpretative trends of each parable.

In chapter 5, I will synthesize my findings, seeking a possible unifying motif. It is to be expected that the theological themes of the Lukan parables will be in congruence with, and bolster the themes that are prominent in Luke-Acts. In order to search for a unifying theme of

the Lukan parables, examining the travel narrative in the Gospel of Luke is indispensable, since all the parables that we will analyze are located in the travel narrative. To do this, I will also examine and evaluate the current scholarly views of the Lukan travel narrative in chapter 6.

In chapter 7, from the theological themes of the Lukan Parables and the results of the examination on the Lukan parables in the travel narrative, I will propose ‘Perspectives on the Christian life’ as a unifying motif of the Lukan parables. This is because all of the Lukan parables in the travel narrative are intimately related to instruction on the Christian life. Here, I will concretely delineate the ‘Perspectives on the Christian Life’ by examining how Christians should live in the world according to Jesus’ instruction which emerges from the Lukan parables, especially in terms of relationships.

In chapter 8, in order to identify the role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of Luke’s Gospel, I will survey the purpose of Luke’s Gospel. By researching the preface to Luke’s Gospel and the audience of the Gospel, I will contend that Luke’s aim is not simply to write the story of Jesus and the early church, but to show the continuation and fulfillment of God’s design which brings salvation to all people, the redemptive purpose of God. In short, Luke strives to reassure his readers of the gospel by presenting God’s plan of salvation.

Finally, I will suggest two aspects for the role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of Luke’s Gospel: the role of the Lukan parables as one facet in concretizing God’s redemptive purpose, and the role of the Lukan parables in serving to accomplish God’s redemptive purpose. Here, I will examine the role of the Lukan parables in God’s redemptive purpose, since Luke seeks to reassure the readers of his Gospel through the pattern of God’s plan of salvation. In conclusion, taking all that into consideration, the Lukan parables, as perspectives of the Christian life, play a vital role in concretizing God’s redemptive purpose into the faith-life of the Christian, as well as to accomplish God’s saving purpose.

3. Value of the Study

In recent years, literary approach to the parables has tended to overlook the other aspects of the parables, because of an excessive focus on the text itself. However, if we take a broad view of the Lukan parables as we study them, such as looking at the function and role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of the Gospel, we can gain a comprehensive understanding of the Lukan parables. Furthermore, such a broad view in examining the parables helps us find the importance of a theological interpretation to the parables, as will emerge from Luke’s

theological use of the parables later. In any event, it is clear that the results of this study could enhance our understanding of Luke's purpose and his intention and concerns in the Gospel, as well as the Lukan parables. Therefore, I do expect that the results of this study will make great contributions to the research of the purpose of Luke's Gospel.

Chapter 2
A History of Research of the Lukan Parables

Of the best known and most loved of Jesus' parables, many parables are found only in Luke's Gospel and in particular clustered in the central section of the Gospel of Luke. One therefore anticipates that there would have been a number of studied works on the Lukan parables as a whole, but in reality there are even less than thought. More recently, most of the researchers on the Lukan parables, to my knowledge, tend to be limited to an analysis of individual parables. Although there are a few works on the Lukan parables, I think that it is worth dealing with a history of research on the Lukan parables, dividing it into two categories such as research on the parables as a whole in the Gospel of Luke, and research on the parables unique to Luke.

1. Research on the parables as a whole in the Gospel of Luke

Regarding research on the parables as a whole in the Gospel of Luke, I am aware of the following five works: Those of M.D. Goulder,[1] G. Sellin,[2] J. Drury,[3] T.L. Noel,[4] and J.R. Donahue.[5] M.D. Goulder explores these differences of the parables in each gospel under five categories, concluding that the peculiarly Lukan and Matthean parables both differ enough from the Marcan parables. In the first category, 'The Subjects of the Parables', he claims that the Old Testament parable is predominantly a nature parable and this tradition is taken over in Mark, and that Mark's parables are, therefore, predominantly nature parables.[6] He contends that, unlike Marcan parables, however, Matthew prefers magnificent subjects and expands, allegorizes, and urbanizes his parables, and that Luke focuses on the people of the town leaving behind the countryside.[7] In the 'Scale of the Parables', Goulder maintains that Mark's world is the village, Galilaean village, and that Mattew has the grand scale, and

1. M.D. Goulder, "Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels," *JTS* 19 (1968), 51-69.
2. Gerhard Sellin, 'Studien zu den grossen Gleichniserzählungen des Lukas-Sonderguts: Die ἄνθρωπός-τις-Erzählungen-besonders am Beispiel von Lk 10,25-37 sund 16,14-31 untersucht,' (PhD dissertation: Münster, 1974); idem, "Gleichnisstrukturen," *LingBib* 31 (1974), 89-115.
3. J. Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* (London: SPCK, 1985).
4. T.L. Noel, 'Parables in Context: Developing a Narrative-Critical Approach to Parables in Luke' (PhD dissertation; Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Kentucky, 1986).
5. John R. Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable: Metaphor, Narrative, and Theology in the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).
6. Goulder, "Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels," 51.
7. Ibid., 52-53.

Lukan parables are down-to-earth affairs.[8] On the question of contrast parables, he states that Marcan parables do not present clear contrasts, but in contrast to Marcan parables, Matthaean parables are contrast parables, Luke has a few contrast parables in comparison with Matthaean parables.[9] In the 'Allegory', he claims that Matthew has the highest rate of allegory content and Luke much less allegory content, only 28-50%, assessing the degree of allegory content according to his percentages.[10] Goulder finally evaluates what kinds of response they call forth, under the heading 'Response Parables': In Mark and Matthew, the expected response is as follows: 'Watch', 'Be ready' and 'Believe the Gospel'.[11] On the other hand, Luke requires exclusively detailed responses such as 'Be faithful with God's money', 'Labour on', 'Go and do thou likewise', 'Imitation of the good examples in the four example stories', 'Beware and keep yourselves from all covetousness', 'Count the cost', 'Repent' and 'Give away alms'.[12] He finally concludes that "The parables of Matthew and Luke at least are by St. Matthew and St. Luke, no less than the Johannine parables are by St. John."[13] These characteristics that he contends, however, lose support in that there are a lot of exceptions which deviate from the rules. Moreover, he tends to relate his all observations to conclusions of inauthenticity too hastily, arguing allegory as a criterion of authenticity of the parables.

G. Sellin[14] divides the introductory formulas of the parables into a three-fold categorization such as ἄνθρωπος-τις, τίς-ἐξ-ὑμῶν and ὅμοιος parables: By examining the introductory formulas of the parables, he states the important fact that Luke has a preponderance of τίς-ἐξ-ὑμῶν and ἄνθρωπος-τις parables, while Mark and material peculiar to Mattew's Gospel contain exclusively ἄνθρωπος parables. On the basis of these characteristics, he attempts to establish the contention that they come entirely from the hand of Luke and not from the Jesus tradition. He also observes that Lukan ἄνθρωπος-τις parables portray three main characters who form a dramatic triangle. Of the three figures, the third figure is the formal protagonist (king, master, father figure) and one of the contrasted characters is the actual protagonist (slave, son). On the other hand, in case of two person

8. Ibid., 53-55.
9. Ibid., 55-57.
10. Ibid., 58-62.
11. Ibid., 63.
12. Ibid., 63-64.
13. Ibid., 69.
14. With relevance to G. Sellin's analysis, I am indebted in every respect to the analyses of C.L. Blomberg which appear in his PhD dissertation, 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section' (University of Aberdeen, 1982), 248-258.

parables, the soliloquies function in the place of the third characters. With respect to Dan Via's Structuralist studies under eight headings, Sellin makes his own actantial analysis which falls into three categories and analyzes the sequences of these three types.[15] Finally, he evaluates each of the eight categories of binary oppositions[16] in Via's chart. There is, however, more variety in Lukan parables as well as in his four original pure examples[17] than Sellin recognizes. His 'dramatic triangle' is found even in parables outside Lukan parables.

J. Drury picks out the features of Lukan parables under the following heading: 'Their pattern', 'their humanity', and 'the allegorical elements'. First of all, for him, the most striking feature of Lukan parables is that the crisis occurs in the middle, not at the end. In the case of the Good Samaritan and the Friend at night, the crisis happens when the traveler is left half dead at the roadside and he is rousing the neighbour at night. The Tower builder and the King at War serve as an example of failure to appreciate the mid-term crisis, and by contrast, the Unjust steward has become an example of success. In the prodigal son, it occurs when he faces penury. The rich man is unaware of the crisis, but the Unjust Judge responds better to the clamorous widow. The publican realizes his present need better than the Pharisee.[18] For Luke, Jesus is the central crisis of sacred history which places Jesus between the Old Testament and the Church. Drury contends that Jesus is not, therefore, history's end, but its turning point.[19] For him the second feature of Lukan parables is their setting in the world of human beings.[20] Mark deals with nature and Matthew enhances the human element. Lukan parables, by contrast, are all human, using many more soliloquies than Mark and

15. Including Luke 10:30-35, 18:10-14, 16:19-31, 15:11-32, 7:41-43 and Matt 21:28-31, type I parables all have double subjects and the two characters who form the double subject play roles opposite to what one's initial expectations would be. Including Matt 25:2-13, 25:14-30par., 22:1-10par., 20:1ff., 18:23-25 and Mark 12:1ff., type II parables are similar to type I and they progress more smoothly towards a climax because there is no such a reversal of roles. Including Luke 12:16-21, 16:1-9, 18:1-8 and 15:11-24, type III parables portray only two persons, but imply a third actant by means of monologue. Of the above three type, Type I and III are concerned with Lukan parables in particular. Sellin, "Gleichnisstrukturen," 94-104.

16. The eight standard types of binary oppositions are as follows: tragic vs. comic plot, episode pattern-action-crisis-denouement vs. crisis-response-denouement, subject receives object vs. subject does not receive object, subject desires to possess object vs. subject desires to communicate object, causal vs. chronological connection between events, subject unifies action vs. subject is only part of action, subject distinguished from vs. identified with ordainer and subject and ordainer are inferior/superior vs. equal. Dan Via, "Parables and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach," *Semeia* 1 (1974), 105-133.

17. His four original pure examples are as follows: (Luke 7:41-43), (Luke 10:30-35), (Luke15:11-32) and (16:19-31).

18. Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*, 112.

19. This feature is familiar to Conzelmann's work on The Theology of St Luke, the mid-point of time. See H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (New York: Harper & Row, 1960).

20. Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*, 114.

Matthew. Particularly in this section, Drury is indebted to the above views of M.D. Goulder. This is largely the result of the development of the historical pattern into a more conscious emphasis on Jesus' ministry as the "crucial-mid-term crisis."[21] Finally, the feature of Lukan parables he highlights is that Luke uses allegory less than the other two synoptics because of his emphasis on historical allegory.[22] Although Luke does not need allegory as strongly as the other two synoptics did, he likes using it within his historical realism. In the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son, the major symbols connect with the historical narrative beyond it. Samaritans and Samaria, and heretical brothers of orthodox Jerusalem Judaism take up the gospel in Acts 8, and in Luke 17:12-19, the Samaritan leper has a foretaste of the gospel. In the Prodigal Son, "the father stands for God, the older son is orthodox unreconstructed Judaism, and the prodigal son who has put himself beyond the orthodox Jewish pale by his fornicating and swineherding is typical of the sinners and Gentiles who were welcome to Luke's Church."[23] All these features show development of the historical pattern and they naturally expose Luke's free creations to us. Furthermore, Drury argues that the Q hypothesis is no longer necessary on the basis of the similarity between Lukan parables and Q parables in the journey section.[24] The main point of his work, the 'contextual readings of the parables', is evaluated to be the most persuasive and logical among works for the argument of reading the parables in their gospel context.

T.L. Noel points out that the parables largely have not been examined within their gospel contexts, nor from the vantage point of narrative criticism. He does this through his investigation on 'Current Trends in Parable Research' under five headings: 'Parables as Literary Objects', 'Parables and Hermeneutics', 'Parables as Poetic Metaphor', 'Parables as Language', and 'Toward a Contextual Reading of the Parables'.[25] In view of the failure of current trends in parables research, he proposes narrative criticism as a viable alternative. In the connection between parable and context, Noel attempts to prove that there are obvious

21. Ibid., 115.
22. Ibid., 116.
23. Ibid., 117.
24. Ibid., 117-125.
25. Noel, 'Parables in Context: Developing a Narrative-Critical Approach to Parables in Luke,' 1-69. In contrast, the research of the gospels in narrative criticism have already been progressed very well by works of several scholars: Jack D. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); David Rhoads and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982); Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1. *The Gospel according to Luke*, vol. 2. *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).

links between the parables and their contexts in six connecting devices: That is, verbal contacts, themes, persons, settings, values, and connecting phrases.[26] With respect to the question of how parables function with context, he contends that the parables should be examined in three aspects, such as plot, character and the function of smaller units in the larger narrative. As with the views of Robert C. Tannehill,[27] Noel views the plot of Luke as a tragic story that the Messiah comes to Israel, but Israel rejects him. He also maintains that four characters composed of groups and individuals, namely, Jesus, the Pharisees, the disciples and the crowd, provide some basis for the study of the parables.[28] On the above bases, Noel analyses and evaluates three parables in Luke, namely, the parables of the Sower, the Wedding Guest and the Vineyard. Finally, he concludes that the literary and thematic unity of Luke compel us to read the parables as an integral part of that narrative.[29] Favouring the unity of Luke's text, Noel's narrative-critical approach to parables in Luke opens the possibility of examining the function and role of the Lukan parables in the Gospel of Luke, though Noel himself does not pursue that.

John R. Donahue, first of all, carefully considers three situations concerning the parables: Such as, 'the parable as text', 'the parable as narrative', and 'the parable as context', investigating how a parable means. In 'the parable as text', he takes the comprehensive stance regarding the scope of parable, following C.H. Dodd's definition of the parables[30]. Although metaphor is suitable to express two necessary qualities of religious experience, such as immediacy and transcendence, he warns the readers with three cautions: Firstly, "it is not totally accurate to equate the parables of Jesus with metaphor." Secondly, "there has been an escalation of theological language about parable and metaphor." Lastly, "in comparison with the literary genres of antiquity, the parables are very close to proverbs and maxims." [31] Donahue, in 'the parable as narrative', emphasizes narrative analysis of the parables particularly in plot and character apart from meaning and point of view, which emerge easily in the study of individual parables.[32] It is the most important aspect to him to consider an

26. Noel, 'Parables in Context: Developing a Narrative-Critical Approach to Parables in Luke,' 77-83.
27. Robert C. Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story", *JBL* 104 (1985), 69-85.
28. Noel, 'Parables in Context: Developing a Narrative-Critical Approach to Parables in Luke,' 100-118.
29. Ibid., 192.
30. C.H. Dodd's definition of the parables is as follows: "At its simplest the parable is a metaphor or simile drawn from nature or common life, arresting the hearer by its vividness or strangeness, and leaving the mind in sufficient doubt about its precise application to tease it into active thought." C.H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961).
31. Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 10-11.
32. Ibid., 21-25.

expanding contextual analysis surrounding the parables. That is to say, the immediate context, the larger context, the canonical context, a history of the parables' effect or impact on theology and church life, and the reader's context in which we read, appropriate, and proclaim the parables.[33] Dealing with the major theological characteristic in the travel narrative of Luke's Gospel, he, on the above bases, analyzes eleven parables in the travel narrative of Luke's Gospel in detail. He refers to three aspects which are in harmony with the major theological directions of the Gospel as a whole, such as Luke's shift in eschatology from the end time to the everyday life of Christians, the summons to conversion, and the theology of witness.[34] It is meaningful to examine how the Lukan parables are in harmony with the theological orientation of the entire Gospel of Luke.

2. Research on the parables unique to Luke

There have been a few works on the parables unique to Luke; those of K.E. Bailey,[35] C.L. Blomberg,[36] G.W. Forbes,[37] and M.C. Parsons.[38] Bailey proposes two methodologies to interpret the parables: That is, 'oriental exegesis' and 'literary structure which is used in New Testament', as he surveys briefly the recent tendencies on the interpretation of the parables. He believes that the key to the solution of the foreignness of the culture in the parables lies in the 'oriental exegesis' with which we can understand the contemporary culture of Jesus. His oriental exegesis consists of the following three factors: Ancient Literature, The Contemporary Middle Eastern Peasant and His Oral Tradition, and The Oriental Versions. There are, however, still some lingering doubts as to how much similarity the culture preserved or retained, as he contends, particularly in The Contemporary Middle Eastern

33. Ibid., 26-27.
34. Ibid., 126-193, 204-211.
35. K.E. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).
36. Blomberg, 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section,' (PhD dissertation, University of Aberdeen, 1982).
37. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 198, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
38. M.C. Parsons, 'Landmarks Along The Way: The Function of The "L" Parables in The Lukan Travel Narrative', 33-47. In addition to the above works, there are some researches on the various approaches to Lukan parable as follows: Philip Sellew, "Interior Monologue as A Narrative Device in the Parables of Luke," *JBL* 111/2 (1992), 239-253, Frank Stagg, "Luke's Theological Use of Parable," *RevExp* 94 (1997), 215-229, Stephen Curkpatrick, "Parable Metonymy and Luke's Kerygmatic Framing," *JSNT* 25/3 (2003), 289-307, and Greg Carey, "Luke and the Rhetorics of Discipleship: The L Parables as Case Study," in ed., James D. Hester and J. David Hester, *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and His Influence* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 145-174.

Peasant and The Oriental Versions.[39] Bailey also maintains that it is crucial for exegetes to discover a literary structure which the author is using, and he takes up Four Types of Literary Structures[40] as a useful tool for the interpretation of the parables. He is indebted in many ways to the views of Bligh[41], Lund[42] and Miesner[43]. He, in reality, provides the literary outline of the travel narrative of Luke's Gospel which is constructed in ten sections and follows a precise inverted outline. With regard to his fundamental stance of the parables in general, he contends that a parable has three basic elements: Symbols[44], response and theological cluster. He argues that the purpose of a parable is to evoke a response from the listener, not an illustration, and that the response is a single response in a cluster of theological motifs and offers the unity of the parables.[45] On the above bases, Bailey analyses six parables unique to Luke but makes no attempt at a synthesis of the Lukan parables.[46] His contention has been often criticized in that the 'paraboblic ballad pattern' applied to the Lukan parables is subjective and also that many parallels proposed by him are forced.[47]

Although C.L. Blomberg's concern, at first glance, seems to be the authenticity of the Lukan parables in his PhD dissertation,[48] he in reality, is enthusiastic about tradition history's studies rather than the authenticity of the Lukan parables. He points out that what a text means today cannot be determined apart from what it meant originally, and what it meant

39. A certain aspect of Middle Eastern culture proposed by Bailey may have an exception to the standard rule. In the parable of the prodigal son, the running act of his father is highly proper behaviour, not surprising in such a situation when the lost son returned home. Whoever is in the same position could act so and such an act is not a thing that dishonors himself.

40. Bailey's claims, to be exact, are as follows: "Longer or shorter of prose that use the inversion principle for an outline. Poetic sections that use a variety of parallelistic devices in a variety of forms. Sections that have a tight parallelism in the center but are encased with one or more sets of matching sections of prose. The parables in Luke usually follow a Parabolic Ballad form that is distinct from the above." K.E. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 49.

41. John Bligh, *Galatians in Greek: A Structural Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1966).

42. N.W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942).

43. D.R. Miesner, 'Chiasm and the Composition and Message of Paul's Missionary Sermons,' (ThD dissertation, Concordia Seminary in Exile, 306 North Grand, St. Louis, 1974).

44. Bailey uses the term 'symbols' as 'comparison' or 'point of contact', giving credit for the fact that the parables do have allegorical elements in them through recent studies. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 40.

45. Ibid., 40-42.

46. Ibid., 86-206.

47. For a critique of Bailey, see M.A. Tolbert, *Perspectives on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 82; C.W. Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 44-46.

48. Blomberg, 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section'.

originally involves questions of tradition history.[49] In relation to the authenticity, he presents and contradicts the invalid criteria of the authenticity of the Lukan parables such as the use of allegory, one main point and generalizing conclusions.[50] He instead offers valid criteria that attest the authenticity of the Lukan parables, as well as demonstrating the authenticity of the Lukan parables.[51] After analysing the parables in the central section of Luke by tradition-historical exegesis, he begins to conduct exploration source and redaction criticism. With respect to redaction criticism, he concludes that although Luke either adapts his imagery to fit a new audience or highlights to fit in with his theological purposes, he in no way altered his sources so as to distort the original meanings of the parables as well as any theologically significant details in them.[52] In order to isolate Lukan and pre-Lukan vocabulary Blomberg employs the method of Gaston[53] with minor modifications in the sources' criticism.[54] He, in conclusion, suggests that Luke may have drawn on one or more written sources for his unparalleled gospel matter.[55] He also, as Talbert[56] and Bailey[57] observe and propose, analyses Luke's central section and presents the chiastic structure. Taking all that into consideration, he comes to the conclusion that Luke did not first create that structure but found it in a source document, and concludes that the use of chiasm provides further evidence that the parables are pre-Lukan.[58] Even though he analyses the Lukan parables in some detail, he makes no attempt at a synthesis of the Lukan parables. Nevertheless, his work serves to open our eyes to the parabolic tradition and the authenticity of the Lukan parables.

---

49. Ibid., 5-7.
50. Ibid., 117-125.
51. Valid criteria which he offers are as follows: inconsistency within the words of Jesus themselves, inconsistency with Jesus' teaching elsewhere, inconsistency with allegedly parallel material, inconsistency between the parable and its Lucan context, and environmental contradiction. Blomberg, 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section,' 133.
52. Blomberg, 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section,' 239-299.
53. Lloyd Gaston, *Horae Synopticas Electronicae* (Missoula: SBL, 1973). Presupposing Marcan priority, he divides Luke into five sections to underline the vocabulary characteristic of Luke, as follows: the list of vocabulary characteristic of the triple-tradition, the double-tradition material, his unparalleled material, Luke's differences from his triple-tradition material and his differences from double-tradition material, that is, Mk, Q, L, Luke add and QLk. It is, therefore, only a matter of its relative importance in research before we employ the statistical study of vocabulary to identify the characteristic of each of the gospels.
54. Blomberg, 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section,' 318.
55. Ibid., 377, 341.
56. C.H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 51-56; idem, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982), 11-113.
57. Bailey, Poet and Peasant, 79-85.
58. Blomberg, 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section,' 343-394.

Greg W. Forbes[59] sets out not only to make a unifying motif of the Lukan parables, but to link these parables with the purpose of the Gospel of Luke. He begins with a brief survey of the history of research on the Lukan parables as well as the recent tendencies of the interpretation of the parables under a title, 'The Parables: Key Factors in Historical Research.'[60] Based on the foregoing analysis, he establishes some methodological bases and then analyses the Lukan parables. What is interesting about his search for possible unifying motifs is the fact that he tries to observe it in the light of the promise-fulfilment theme as the overall purpose of Luke's Gospel and the literary setting of conflict or controversy with contemporary Judaism.[61] From what he analysed, he contends that each of the parables contains either an explicit or an implicit portrait to the character and nature of the God that had its roots in the Old Testament.[62] He also maintains that Luke is not only using the parables to depict God's nature, but he may also want to contrast Jesus' portrayal of God with the view of God held by his Jewish contemporaries.[63] As such, the Lukan parables perform not only a parenetic function but also an apologetic function to Gentile or Jewish Christians seeking definition *vis-à-vis* Judaism, in particular to Theophilus. The conclusion to be drawn here is that the portrayal of the character and nature of God of the Lukan parables is integral to the promise-fulfilment theme, whereby Luke wants to present to us that Jesus is the legitimate fulfillment of the Old Testament promise.[64] We shall deal later with his contention that all the features and themes that are present in the parables are associated with the character of God, either directly or indirectly.[65]

At the almost same time as G.W. Forbes' work, Mikeal C. Parsons wrote a meaningful article about Lukan Parables[66]. He begins with considerations of a classification of the parables in order to know whether it is adequate to his study, 'the Function of Lukan Parables in the Lukan Travel Narrative' in particular. As a result, he discards both Jeremias' ten thematic categories and Scott's classification on the basis of three of the elementary aspects of Mediterranean social life and culture since it does not assist in the organization of the

59. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 22-23.
60. Ibid., 24-51.
61. Ibid., 224, 225-260.
62. Ibid., 261-278.
63. Ibid., 279-306.
64. Ibid., 328-329.
65. For evaluation on the work of Forbes, see D. Reinstorf's review article. Reinstorf, "Luke's parables and the purpose of Luke's Gospel," *HTS* 58/3 (2002), 1281-1295.
66. Mikeal C. Parsons, "Landmarks Along The Way: The Function of The 'L' Parables in The Lukan Travel Narrative," *SJT* 40 (1997), 33-47.

parables in a way sensitive to their narrative function in the canonical, final form of Luke's Gospel.[67] Parsons believes that Lukan parables in the Lukan Travel Narrative should be aligned in a chiastic or ring structure where the parables are paired, surrounding Luke 14:7-11, which lies at the heart of the Lukan Parables in the Lukan Travel Narrative. He eventually asserts that this theme of reversal seems to be the overarching theme of the Lukan Parables in the Lukan Travel Narrative on the basis of the reversal theme of Luke 14:11 and the reversal contrast or structure of Lukan Parables. In this article, Parsons' main concerns serve not only to correct the neglect of canonical study of the parables, such as canonical form, contexts, and performance, but to explore the pre-canonical history in order to better understand the function of the parables, owing to C.H. Talbert's taxonomy of what the word "Jesus" can refer to.[68] In conclusion, he contends that Lukan parables have a rich theological resource for the life and work of the church today, and that they are also landmarks along the Way.[69] It remains rather questionable as to whether it is forced to frame the Lukan parables in a chiastic or ring structure around the choice of place at the table (Luke 14:7-11) which contains the reversal theme, although I agree with his contention that the Lukan parables in the journey to Jerusalem of Jesus become landmarks for instructing the disciples.

In conclusion, most of the research on the Lukan parables tends to be limited to analyses of individual parables. Moreover, though there are a few works that focus on the Lukan parables as a whole, they generally tend to focus on either structural features, or narrative devices and characteristics. There is little attempt to link the Lukan parables to the purpose of the Gospel. Therefore, in the light of this, it is worth investigating further the role of Lukan parables in the purpose of the Gospel of Luke.

67. Ibid., 36.

68. C.H. Talbert's classification of what "Jesus" can refer to is as follows: "1) The historians' Jesus, a reconstructed portrait, derived from the method of form criticism, useful for apologetic reasons; 2) the evangelist's Jesus, derived from redaction criticism, useful for homiletical reasons; 3) the apocryphal Jesus, useful for reconstructing the popular piety of early Christianity; and 4) the canonical Jesus, valuable for constructive theological and ethical arguments." Charles H. Talbert, "The Church and Inclusive Language for God?" *PRSt* 19 (1992), 421-39, here 434 n. 66.

69. Parsons, "Landmarks Along The Way: The Function of The 'L' Parables in The Lukan Travel Narrative," *SJT*, 47.

Chapter 3
A Methodological basis for an analysis of the Lukan Parables

Basically, I believe that the parables have metaphorical and narrative characteristics, at least in so-called narrative parables. It appears that the metaphorical characteristic in the parables elicits the allegorical approach and polyvalent meanings in connection with the interpretation of the parables. Furthermore, the narrative characteristic in the parables makes us consider the literary context of the parables as well as methods for a narrative analysis of the parables. Taking all this into consideration, it is important at the outset to adopt a methodological criterion for the analysis of the Lukan Parables.[1] In this chapter, I intend to build up some methodological bases resulting from my awareness of the lack and failure of the interpretation of the parables.

1. The parables must be interpreted.

Before going further, I would like briefly to deal with the following question: Can the parables be interpreted? There are those who believe that the parables either do not need to be, or cannot be interpreted.[2] This stems from the point of view that sees the parables as "language events"[3] in modern literary analysis, particularly in relation to the emphasis on metaphor. According to modern literary criticism, metaphors and parables cannot be reduced to literal and abstract interpretations, nor are they simply illustrations and bearers of meaning.

1. With respect to methodology and hermeneutics, R. Zimmermann's work which takes a new route in four steps gives us an insight into the exegesis of the parables of Jesus, that is, a historical perspective, a tradition-historical perspective, the perspective of the literary form of the parables and a hermeneutic perspective. See Ruben, Zimmermann, "How to Understand the Parables of Jesus. A Paradigm Shift in Parable Exegesis," *Acta Theologica* 29 (2009), 157-82; idem, *Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu*. Herausgegeben von Ruben Zimmermann; in Zusammenarbeit mit Detlev Dormeyer, Gabi Kern, Annette Merz, Christian Münch, Enno Edzard Popkes (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2007); idem, *Hermeneutik der Gleichnisse Jesu. Methodische Neuansätze zum Verstehen urchristlicher Parabeltexte*; Herausgegeben von Ruben Zimmermann unter Mitarbeit von Gabi Kern (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

2. The representative scholars who continually influence junior scholars with respect to this assertion are as follows: Robert W. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic and the Word of God* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); Paul Ricoeur, "Biblical Hermeneutics," *Semeia* 4 (1975), 27-148; idem, *The Rule of Metapher* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 1977); Sallie M. Te Selle, *Speaking in Parables: A Study in Metaphor and Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress; London: SCM Press, 1975); B.B. Scott, *Jesus, Symbol-Maker for the Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981); idem, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).

3. This term was rooted in the modern literary analysis by Robert W. Funk who, at the outset, introduced it from Ernst Fuchs who opened the door of The New Hermeneutic, which was influenced by modern philosophic thoughts of Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer. For the influence of existential philosophy on the parables, see Eta Linnemann, *Jesus of the Parables* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).

Rather the readers participate in the parabolic event and experience a language event in the reading of the parables. The parables even interpret their readers. The parables *per se* create therefore many new meanings for themselves with characteristics of autonomy and polyvalence.[4] Even so, although when we interpret the parables, the meaning not only is reduced but made inaccurately, I think that the parables must be interpreted for the reason that the parables must communicate content propositionally to persuade their audience and call to action.[5] First of all, this is largely because the attempt to apply a nonpropositional approach to interpreting the parables leads to failure rather than success.[6] For example, in the discussion of the parable of the Wedding Feast (Matt 22:1-10), Sallie TeSelle who tries to apply a nonpropositional approach to interpreting the parables concludes that the "new insight of the parable is in being brought to see that everyday situation - the wedding feast and its guest list - in a new way: invitation not by merit but by a gracious lack of concern about merit."[7] But actually this is an interpretation of the story. In the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37), B.B. Scott concludes that "the parables can be summarized as follows: to enter Kingdom one must get in the ditch and be served by one's mortal enemy."[8] This is also an interpretation and a proposition. In this respect, we can see that it is possible to capture partial meaning through propositional language.[9] On the other hand, a more important reason is because the interpretive comments in the Gospels surrounding the parables are highly propositional in nature irrespective of whether those comments are Jesus' original meaning or

4. Regarding overemphasis on metaphor and parable's power as language events, A.C. Thiselton claims that such an ability of language can be explained in the terms of performative language not in terms of word-magic, pointing out having a one-sided concern with imperatival, conative and directive language rather than the language of description or information. His polemic against the power of the word appears in his article, "The Supposed Power of Words in the Biblical Writings", *JST* 25 (1974), 282-99. On the line of this assertion, Robert H. Stein articulates that what transforms the reader is not the form of this genre, but the divine truth that they contain. Robert H. Stein, "The Genre of the Parables" in ed., Richard N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans Publishing, 2000), 48. For more standpoints of agreement with the above contention, see J.L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 26; M.A. Tolbert, *Perspectives on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 42-43; M.A. Beavis, "The Power of Jesus' Parables: Were They Polemical or Irenic?," *JSNT* 82 (2001), 3-30.

5. Craig L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove, Inter Varsity Press, 1990), 141.

6. Ibid., 143.

7. Sallie TeSelle, Speaking in Parables, *The Mysterious Parables: A Literary Study* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1977), 77.

8. Scott, *Jesus, Symbol-Maker for the Kingdom*, 29. In spite of risking a loss of meaning, he attempts to interpret the parables.

9. A.C. Thiselton, "The Parables as Language-Events: Some Comments on Fuch's Hermeneutics in the Light of Linguistic Philosophy," *SJT* 23 (1971), 437-468. Max Black and Wayne C. Booth suggest a possibility of paraphrase of metaphor in particular. Max Black, *Models and Metaphors* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1962), 45-46, Wayne C. Booth, "Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation," *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1978), 437-468.

those of the evangelists. “There is joy before the angels of God over one sinner who repents” (Luke 15:10), “make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous mammon, so that when it fails they may receive you into the eternal habitations” (Luke 16:9), and “for everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, but he who humbles himself will be exalted” (Luke 18:14). In view of the fact that the affective aspects of the parables have been ignored in the past in the interpretation of the parables, it is very important to take into consideration the “affective aspects”[10] for the audience to feel them.

2. The Parables must be interpreted within their gospel contexts.

During the last decades, parable research has been done in a way where one takes the narrative bodies of the parables out of their settings, following Form Criticism’s and Literary Criticism’s footsteps. Searching for a part of the pure story in the parables, Charles W. Hedrick puts it on the first step in his principles on interpretation of the parables under the title, ‘Separate the Parable from its Literary context’.[11] The reason he separates the parables from their literary contexts is because the literary context is not the parable itself, in the same way that a prose summary or paraphrase of the main idea of the poem is not the poem itself. It is just narrative responses to the parable.[12] Even though M.A. Tobert deeply realizes the necessity of interpreting parables within their gospel contexts, she discards the gospel presentations of the parables, since they do not provide one clear, unambiguous interpretation but also they add to the difficulties of interpretation.[13]

Even though it presents narrative responses to the parables, and seem to be contradicting

10. All communication involves both referential and commissive dimensions. While the former is primarily informative to convey information in nature, the latter is primarily affective, to bear emotion. The scholars who emphasize the aspects of affective, accepting this classification, are particularly Robert H. Stein and Klyne Snodgrass; see Stein, “The Genre of the Parables,” 30-50; Klyne Snodgress, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans Publishing, 2008).

11. Charles W. Hedrick, *Many Things in Parables: Jesus and His Modern Critics* (Louisville London, John Knox Press, 2004), 90-91. This comes to be the first step of his six steps on the guidance of the parable interpretation.

12. Ibid., 13. He contends that “the poem itself provides access to the poet’s experience, and the summary and paraphrase are narrative responses to the poet’s experience”, regarding the parables as holding such a poem’s feature.

13. M.A. Tobert, *Perspective on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations* (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1979), 54-62. She takes some examples of contradiction such as the parables of the Lost Sheep (Luke 15:4-6, Matt 18:12-13, Thomas 98:22-27) in the triple tradition, the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32), the Unjust Judge (Luke 18:2-5), the Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18:10-13), the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-35), the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-8a) and the Workers in the Vineyard (Matt 20:1-15) in the single tradition, arguing the fact that rarely are the gospel settings suitable for the parables, that the gospel summaries appended to the parables often contradict the narratives.

the parables, I believe it important that we take the gospel contexts into consideration for the interpretation of the parables as a vital factor, since literary work, particularly narratives, if we see the Gospels as narratives,[14] retains narrative unity in their works[15] but also the parables, as we shall see later, have allegorical features where some of these details at least point beyond themselves to realities at times in the gospel context. The study of how a shorter narrative coheres and functions together within their larger narrative is best explanined in Gerard Genette's Narrtive Discourse: An Essay in Method.[16] According to his theory, the main types of relationships that can connect a shorter narrative (the parables) to their larger narrative (Luke) can be divided into three relationships such as direct causal, thematic, and no explicit relationship.[17] The parables fall in the category of thematic relationship in which the shorter narrative takes the position of contrast or analogy to the larger narrative.[18] The parables shed light on the meaning of the narrative in that it recapitulates the previous saying and narrative of Jesus, and foreshadows what would take place, but also should be interpreted in light of the narrative where the meaning of the parables is determined by the narrative plot or scheme.[19] The parables stand in fundamental relationship to the story as a whole, and

14. It is unnecessary to discuss that the gospels presume to be narratives, for modern literary critics have already seen them so and produced many researches. For narrative studies of Luke-Acts in particular, see Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1982) and Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20, Missoula, Mont: Scholars Press, 1974). In relation to the contention that the gospel presentation of the parables limits the variety of possible readings by providing a content underlining certain aspects, I will not say much, since this phenomenon, namely, restriction of the variety of readings is natural when a story as a parable is embedded in larger narrative as the gospels. Moreover, we should postulate the Gospel narratives as secondary additions, not original situations, since it is the intention of the evangelists with the gospel presentation of the parables to apply their gospel narrative to their situations rather than to limit the variety of readings.

15. For the same point of view, see Hans-Josef Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten* (Munster: Aschendorff, 1978); Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*; Noel, 'Parables in Context: Developing a Narrative-Critical Approach to Parables in Luke'; Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Liteary Interpretation*, vol 1. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988); Birger Gerhardsson, "If We Do Not Cut the Parables out of Their Frames," *NTS* 37 (1991), 321-335; David B. Gowler, *Host, Guest, Enemy, and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts* (New York, Bern, Frankfurt, Paris: Peter Lang Press, 1991); Warren Carter and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables*, CBQMS 30 (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1998); Stephen Curkpatrick, "Parable Metonymy and Luke's Kerygmatic Framing," *JSNT* 25.3 (2003), 289-307.

16. Gerard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method, trans*. Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1980), 227-252.

17. Ibid., 232-233.

18. David B. Gowler in his book, 'What Are They Saying About the Parables?' as opposed to Gerard Genette, argues that this relationship between the gospel context and the parables is not dialectic but dialogic. David B. Gowler, *What Are They Saying About the Parable*? (New York: Mahwah, N.J. Paulist Press, 2000), 38.

19. Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*, 39-61.

restore their power and sense of drama in their gospel contexts.[20] If we cut the parables out of their gospel contexts, we have to assume other contexts such as the overall message of Jesus, philosophy and psychology to make sense of their stories. These contexts are, however, too far away from the text in making sense of proper meaning. Accordingly, the gospel contexts in this dissertation is defined as follows: the gospel contexts always mean the setting in the narrative of Luke which includes the parable itself that contains an introduction, conclusion, application and recapitulation, the immediate context, the larger context and the gospel of Luke as a whole narrative. I shall begin to analyze and interpret the Lukan parables in their gospel contexts.[21]

3. The Parables contain allegory and point to referents beyond the story.

In connection with this discussion,[22] it seems good to start with the work of Adolf Jülicher,[23] a new beginning and a watershed of parables research. He argues that the parables are nothing more than expanded similes which are self-explanatory, not allegories, adding to the conjecture that Jesus would not have spoken in such cryptic terms as allegory. He even progresses towards the matter of the authenticity of the parables on the basis of the artificial features of most allegories, claiming that the parables with allegories have been influenced by the Evangelists who have become aware of a need to interpret them in the line of allegories.[24]

---

20. Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (MaryKnoll, N. Y: Orbis, 1991), 169-174; Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*, 40.

21. Even though terminology and its extent vary in their works which claim that the parables must be interpreted within their gospel contexts, such as Kerygmatic context, their frames, the gospel contexts, the gospel presentations of the parables, literary context, the context and the gospel settings, the designation basically has the same meaning in holding at least an introduction, conclusion, application and recapitulation surrounding the parable. Donahue even includes two other contexts: 1. The context in connection with a history of its effect or impact on theology and church life and 2. The context in which we read, appropriate and proclaim the parables. Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 27.

22. For the Church Fathers' allegorical approach to the parables such as Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Augustine, see A.M. Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* (London: SCM Press, 1960), 21-41; W.S. Kissinger, *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography* (New Jersey: Scarecrow, 1979), 1-71; Robert H. Stein, *An Introduction to the parable of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981), 42-71.

23. A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976).

24. Ibid., 169-173. Form criticism has greatly influenced the authenticity of the parables with allegory, explaining the process of how to convert a simple parable into a complex allegory through the transmission of oral tradition. Despite showing their influence on the matter of the authenticity of the parables, their contention also loses logical force in that contrary to their argument, the parables, as Vincent Taylor pointed out, tend to be abbreviated through the transmission of oral tradition rather than expanded. Vincent Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London: Macmillan, 1933), 202-209. For the claims of Form criticism, see Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell; New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 166-205;

After the appearance of literary-critical approaches to parable interpretation, D.O. Via and J.D. Crossan are opposed to the parables as allegories or at least are reluctant to speak of the parables as allegories. In viewing the parables as aesthetic objects that possess an existential-theological dimension, Via claims that to approach the parables as allegories reduces the parables to a collection of propositional truths contained in its multiple references and miss the function of the narrative whole of the parables which projects a world.[25] Crossan too tries to make a distinction between allegories and the parables by illustrating and creating the function of metaphor: That is to say, a metaphor may illustrate the information given about the metaphor's referent to fulfill a didactic purpose, and on the other hand, the metaphor may create a new possibility, that is, participation. In this category, allegories belong to the former and the parables the latter.[26]

Apart from the elements of allegorizing (*allegorese*), to borrow Hans-Josef Klauck's phrase[27] which allocates hidden meanings excessively and anachronistically to a text that the author never intended, I believe, however, that the parables contain allegory and point to referents beyond the story. First of all, I would touch on the need to correct a thought biased against allegory that sees it as an artificial and outmoded form of literature, particularly under influence of Romanticism. Allegory has often been treated as inferior literature to others, for particularly the limitation of meaning and simplicity. Also it seems the excessive reflection on allegorizing of the church fathers which misled them to arbitrary interpretation. However, in the course of time, allegory bears testimony to be not less aesthetically pleasing and artistically elegant than the other literary type' works: Note such masterpieces of allegory like Bunyan's *Pilgrims Progress*, C.S. Lewis's *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*, Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Orwell's *Animal Farm*, Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* and Melville's *Moby Dick* and so on.[28]

A.T. Cadoux, *The Parables of Jesus: Their Art and Use* (London: J. Clarke, 1930), 19; Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972); C.H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (New York: Scribner's, 1936).

25. Dan Otto Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension* (Philadelphia: Fortress: SPCK, 1967), 4-25, 83-84.

26. J.D. Crossan, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1973), 9-22; "Parable, Allegory, and Paradox," in ed., Daniel Patte, *Semiology and Parables: An Exploration of the Possibilities Offered by Structuralism for Exegesis* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1976), 264-277.

27. H-J. Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegorese in Synoptischen Gleichnistexten* (NTAbh, 13; Münster: Aschendorff, 1978), 4-28; C.E. Carlston, "Parable and Allegory Revisited: An Interpretive Review," *CBQ* 43 (1981), 228-242.

28. Leland Ryken persuasively explains the allegorical nature of the parables, comparing the parables with the above secular masterpieces of allegory. Leland Ryken, *How to read the Bible as Literature* (Grand Rapids: Michigan; Zondervan, 1984), 199-203; Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Eassays* (Princeton:

Secondly, irrespective of how the parables are classified and defined in any way, either literary categories or in Semitic context, the parables inevitably feature allegory, since the parables take both a literal and a tropical meaning, according to two modes of meaning.[29] Moreover, we are led to the fact that the parables have a feature of allegory, when we define allegory as follows: Certain details in a narrative, such as characters, actions, symbols and the like, stand for or point to something other, not themselves. Therefore the parables are interpreted correctly and accurately only when certain elements in the parables are compared to or correspond to the other components and spiritual realities in analogy, either in the gospel contexts or the whole of the Old Testament and the New Testament.[30] In spite of disclaimers, anti-allegorical interpreters cannot avoid allegory in interpreting the parables.[31] The remaining matter now is how many details in the parables point to something other, what they refer to and how do they fit the rest of the story?

4. The Parables may make more than one point.

Do the parables have more than one point? With respect to this question, rejecting the parables as allegories, at the same time, Jülicher maintained that a parable has only one point of comparison. He, what is more, attempted to relate the term, 'tertium comparationis', to a general moral truth. Others who faithfully followed Jülicher's single point of comparison, are

---

Princeton University Press, 1957), 89-93.

29. According to Madeleine Boucher, there are only two possible modes of meaning, that is, literal meaning and tropical meaning. She claims that every kind of trope can be extended over an entire literary work, enumerating the type of trope including synecdoche, metonymy, irony and metaphor and the like. She basically divides the parables into three categories, that is: similitudes, parables that are allegorical, and exemplary stories that are extended synecdoches. She therefore concludes that the tropical meaning in a parable extends across the large unit of meaning, the whole, since all parables are tropical, even though all parables are not allegorical. Madeleine Boucher, *The Mysterious Parable: A Literary Study* (CBQMS, 6; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1977), 17-25; idem, *The parables* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1983), 24-34.

30. For scholars who view the parables as allegorical, see, Madeleine Boucher, *The Mysterious Parables* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1977); H-J. Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegorese in Synoptischen Gleichnistexten* (NTAbh, 13; Münster: Aschendorff, 1978), 4-28; Carlston, "Parable and Allegory Revisited: An Interpretive Review," 228-242; John Sider, "Proportional Analogy in the Gospel Parables," *NTS* 31 (1985), 1-23; idem, *Interpreting the Parables: A Hermeneutical Guide to their Meaning* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 18-26; Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*, 7-38; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 11-13; M.C. Parsons, "Allegorising Allegory: Narrative Analysis and Parable Interpretation," *PRSt* 15 (1988), 147-164; J.M. Ford, "Towards the Restoration of Allegory: Christology, Epistemology and Narrative Structure," *SVTQ* 34 (1990), 161-195; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 29-58; R.L. Wilken, "In Defence of Allegory," *ModTh* 14 (1998), 197-212; David P. Parris, "Imitating the Parable: Allegory, Narrative and the Role of Mimesis," *JSNT* 25 (2002), 33-53.

31. For this, see, Matthew Black, "The Parables as Allegory," *BJRL* 42 (1960), 273-287.

A.M. Hunter[32] Eta Linnemann[33] and R.H. Stein[34]. Accepting it as the first rule for interpreting parables,[35] Stein seeks to discover the basic point of a parable, when he interprets the parables. But since literary criticism, particularly the new hermeneutic has appeared, insistence on one point of comparison has been losing its persuasion. Robert Funk, Dan Via, G.V. Jones, John Dominic Crossan, Susan Wittig and Mary Ann Tolbert recognize or emphasize the polyvalence of the parables.

In recent times, there is largely a tendency to focus on the context in relation to reader-response in discussing the polyvalence of the parables. Crossan contends that the parables possess the capability of multiple meanings, as language is intrinsically polyvalent because of the act of arbitrary convention at its centre. He maintains therefore that the parables can be read in multiple contexts, and that polyvalent narration presents the play of the various plots.[36] Tolbert uses the terms of Freudian psychology to read the parable of the Prodigal Son, emphasizing the fact that it allows the interpreter to choose the particular context in which each of the parables is to be read, so as to exploit the polyvalence of the parable.[37] With regard to the creation of multiple meanings, Wittig, using a semiotic model of analysis, contends that it can be produced from the reader's interaction with the text within the context

32. Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables*, 42-91; idem, *The Parables Then and Now* (London: SCM Press, 1971), 108-121.

33. Eta Linnemann, *The Jesus of the Parables: Introduction and Exposition* (London: SPCK, 1966), 23-30. She argues that the parables have only one point of comparison because of being forms of argument. On this basis, she argues that "for this reason, we must carefully distinguish between what a parable is arguing and what it assumes. As soon as we draw from a parable a number of different significant ideas, we can be sure that we are missing the meaning that the parable had for its first narrator."

34. Stein, *Parables*, 72-81; idem, "Interpreting the Parables of Luke," *SJT* 40 (1997), 6-16.

35. His rule for interpreting parables consists of seeking to avoid allegorical interpretation, consideration of the original setting of both Jesus and Evangelist, and application to today as follows: "Parables tend to teach one basic point, seek to understand the point which Jesus was making in the parable, seek to understand the point which the evangelist was making in the parable and how does this parable apply to my life?." Stein, "Interpreting the Parables of Luke," 7-15.

36. J.D. Crossan, *Cliffs of Fall: Paradox and Polyvalence in the Parables of Jesus* (New York: Seabury, 1980), 8-9, 60-63, 96-97, 102-103; idem, "Parable, Allegory, and Paradox," in ed., D. Patte, *Semiology and the Parables* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1976), 247-281. His focusing on polyvalence lies in the reader response presented in terms of the act of arbitrary convention and the multiple contexts, not correspondence between an image and the reality depicted. For difference of meaning on the same term, polyvalence, see, Klyne R. Snodgrass, 'From Allegorizing to Allegorizing: A History of the Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus,' in ed., Richard N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids: Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000), 3-29, here 20; Jacobus, Liebenberg, *The language of the kingdom and Jesus: parable, aphorism, and metaphor in the saying material; common to the synoptic tradition and the gospel of Thomas* (BZNW 102; Berlin: New York: de Gruyter, 2001), 508.

37. M.A. Tobert, *Perspective on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations* (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1979), 68-71, 93. She employs the term, polyvalence, as multiple meanings which the reader could assign the parables from reading them in various contexts.

of the framing structure and in the context of the reader's belief system.[38]

It seems, therefore, inevitable that there exists polyvalence in the parables. I, at this stage, intend to add some reasonable grounds for accepting polyvalence in the parables. First of all, language itself, at a semiotic level, has multiple meanings which are produced from a duplex sign system which operates denotatively and connotatively at the same time. This has at least two signifieds: A stated and an unstated, namely, a *denotatum* and a *designatum*. The arbitrary nature of the sign or indeterminacy of language in the parables opens naturally the question of multiple meanings. Moreover it is more so that language has the feature of polyvalence in the sense that meaning is a choice in the paradigmatic relation.[39]

Secondly, multiple meanings arise in the parables because they, as has been observed above, can be read in multiple contexts: Particularly in the context within which the story is viewed, and in the context of the reader with individual insight, concerns and methodology to interpret the parables, that is to say, different readings of the parables by different readers or interpreters create different meanings.[40] The polyvalency of the parables can be seen to occur more strongly in multiple contexts than in the linguistic feature of polyvalence. But we must be most careful of readings in various non-Gospel contexts, for it may yield a distorted interpretation. In result, polyvalence of the parables makes the reader consider carefully and reflect deeply on interpreting the parables, not producing hermeneutic anarchy.

---

38. Susan Wittig, "A Theory of Multiple Meanings," *Semeia* 9 (1977), 75-103. She argues that the significance of the parable does not lie wholly in the context and wholly in the structure of the narrative but rather lies in the reader's own act of structuring, that is, in his efforts to find coherence and significance to understand both the parables and his own system of values and belifes.

39. According to Ferdinand de Saussure, the value of any term is determined by its environment, that is, the relations of equivalence and contrast between linguistic signs, in other words, the meaning of a word is determined by syntagmatic relation and paradigmatic relation. F. Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics* (London 1960), 123, 166; A.C. Thiselton, 'Semantics and New Testament Interpretation,' in ed., I.H. Marshall, *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1977), 75-104. It is well known to cause ambiguity which may be intended or unintended on the level of the word, syntactics, semantics, stylistics or on a total level. See, M. Silva, *Biblical words and their meaning: A introduction to lexical semantics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 149, 151; H.J.B. Combrink, "Multiple meaning and/or multiple interpretation of a text," *Neotestamentica* 18 (1984), 26-37; Hedrick, *Many Things in Parables: Jesus and His Modern Critics*, 47-50.

40. On the question of hermeneutics, I, of course, follow the fact that we should consider three dimensions, such as the author's intention, the text itself, and the response of the reader in order to find out the meaning of a text. I, as opposed to the neglect of the author's intention in modern literary criticism, still think that we must impartially take the author's intention into consideration to determine the meaning of a text, as E.D. Hirsh has strongly argued it, even though I partly do not agree with his contention that a text has one objective meaning which is begun from the author's mind. E.D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 1-67; idem, *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 1-13.

In this chapter, having examined some important issues, I have established some criteria for interpreting the parables, and proceed on the bases: (1) The parables must be interpreted. (2) The parables must be interpreted within their gospel contexts. (3) The parables contain allegory and point to referents beyond the story. (4) The parables may make more than one point.

Part II

An Analysis of the Lukan Parables and the Characteristics of the Lukan Parables

Insomuch as a methodological basis to study the parables has been laid in chapter 3, we are now in a position to begin an analysis of the Lukan parables. In the first place, I, as have been noted above, limit the analysis only to the narrative parables unique to Luke in the Lukan Travel Narrative (Lk 9:51-19:28). Second, literary contexts surrounding the parables will carefully be examined from within their immediate context to in wider literary contexts, including the Lukan Travel Narrative. Third, I shall take up a thorough analysis of the texts of the parables, considering the rhetorical devices in the parables, such as, monologue, reversal, open-end, and *a fortiori* argument. In doing this the overarching concern will be to find the theological aspects of the parables rather than embarking on an exhaustive exegesis. In the end, the analysis of the parables in chapter 4 will serve to find and assess the theological themes of the parables in the next chapter.

Chapter 4
An Analysis of the Lukan Parables

1. The Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37)

1-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

Does the story belong originally in its present context of the dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer? In the parable of the Good Samaritan, it is very difficult to settle the related intricate problem of the original unity of Lk 10:25-37. While a number of commentators[1] believe that Luke has reworked the Markan tradition because of the parallels with Mark 12:28-34, on the basis of the parallels with Matt 22:34-40, some theologians[2] think that Luke and Matthew share a common version of the incident in Q. I think, however, that Luke spoke of the parable more than once as a separate incident, since it is not only central to Jesus' teaching in the Gospels, but also a very real one much discussed in first-century Judaism.[3] Furthermore, the unity of the context (10:25-28) and the parable (10:29-37) is evident at a literary level. The parable, as J. Nolland says, needs a narrative setting and the best narrative setting is the connection to the question about the neighbour.[4] The unity is not only seen only in question and answer between the lawyer[5] and Jesus, but also in an inclusio binding the passage together with "having done" in vv. 25, 37. The unity is much stronger than many realize.

The parable of the Good Samaritan occurs immediately after the mission of the seventy (10:1-24) which can be divided into two parts: The successful mission of the seventy to the towns of Israel (10:1-20), and the privilege the disciples have in witnessing this revelation (10:21-24).[6] Although the abrupt question of the lawyer in 10:25, at first glance, seems to

---

1. E.E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 158; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (TPINTC; London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990), 464; J. Nolland, *Luke*, 3 vols. (WBC, 35; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1993), 136-40; E. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus: Introduction and Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1966), 141-42.

2. Crossan, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*, 59; J. Lambrecht, "The Message of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-27)," *LouvStud* 5 (1974), 121-35, here 207; idem, *Once More Astonished* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 79; W. Wink, "The Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan: A Communal Exegesis Approach," *RevExp* 76 (1979), 199-217, here 207.

3. For the discussion on being duty-bound to help, as a simple example, see Sirach 12:1-7: vv. 4-5: "Give to the devout, but do not help the sinner. Do good to the humble, but do not give to the ungodly; hold back their bread, and do not give it to them…"; v. 7: "Give to the one who is good, but do not help the sinner." These texts make it clear that one's help should not extend beyond the bounds of the Jewish people.

4. Nolland, *Luke*, 580.

5. K.E. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 34.

6. The structure of (9:52-56) and (9:57-62) is somewhat paralleled in (10:1-20) and (10:21-24) as follows:

sever relations with the preceding verses, Luke has, however, a thematic link between the parable of the Good Samaritan and the preceding sections along the lines of the message of the kingdom (especially 10:9, 11, 20, 21-24) and the question about eternal life in 10:25.

Given the fact that the central message of the Mary and Martha narrative (10:38-42) is hearing Jesus' word, the narrative is readily linked to the love commands in 10:27, as well as to the whole parable. Martha, in contrast to Mary, is distracted with much serving. She then goes to Jesus and says, "Do you not care that my sister has left me to serve alone?" (v. 40).[7] At this point, readers might expect Jesus to urge Mary to help her sister. But what surprises readers is that Jesus defends Mary's inactivity, rebuking Martha's anxiety: "Mary has chosen the good portion, which shall not be taken away from her" (v. 42). Jesus supports Mary's enthusiasm about hearing the word. The Mary and Martha narrative illustrates, therefore, love for God is shown by listening to the teaching of Jesus. While the parable focuses on the command to love the neighbour, the command to love God is central to the narrative. The parable and the narrative, in other words, show the necessity of both doing and hearing.[8]

1-2. Analysis of the Parable

Although the lawyer questions Jesus with the respectful appellation, there is a trap in the lawyer's question about eternal life, as seen by the information that Luke gives us. The lawyer's motive was to test Jesus rather than seek an answer to his question about eternal life. It is further confirmed by his persistent second question in v. 29. The question about eternal life might be a strategic setup for the real test which comes in the second question, the limits

---

a. The failure of the mission of disciples (9:52-56)
   (the rejection of the Samaritans to receiving Jesus)
b. The instruction of Jesus related to the above incident (9:57-62)
   (the disciples' resolution to follow Jesus)
a' The success of the mission of disciples (10:1-20)
   (the successful mission of the seventy to the towns of Israel)
b' The instruction of Jesus related to the above incident (10:21-24)
   (the joyfulness as to the privilege the disciples have in witnessing this revelation)

7. Biblical quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible.
8. For the view that The Mary and Martha narrative illustrates the love commands, see Nolland, *Luke*, 579-580; D.M. Sweetland, "The Good Samaritan and Martha and Mary," *BibTod* 21 (1983), 325-30; Herman Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), 75; Robert W. Wall, "Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38-42) in the Context of a Christian Deuteronomy," *JSNT* 35 (1989), 19-35. Considering the preceding context (9:52-10:24) and the succeeding context (10:38-42), the parable of the Good Samaritan is most likely to be related to discipleship.

to one's neighbour.[9] The lawyer would perhaps be discontent with Jesus' attitude to the law, such as Jesus' association with outcasts and sinners (5:30, 7:39), his actions on the Sabbath (6:10, 11) and his lack of concern for holiness issues such as touching the unclean (5:13. 7:14, 8:44, 54). He not only wanted to know Jesus' standpoint of the law, but wanted to discredit him.

When Jesus turns the question back on the lawyer, the lawyer cites the beginning of the Shema (Deut. 6:5) and the love of one's neighbour as oneself (Lev. 19:18). His answer to Jesus' question demonstrates that the love commands are as radical in Judaism as they are for Jesus. Some Jewish texts show us the two love commands joined together: "… I exhort you, my sons, love the God of heaven, and be joined to all of his commands." (Jub. 20:2, 7) and "… be loving of your brothers as a man loves himself… and loving each other as themselves." (Jub. 36:4-8).[10] The two love commands are integral to Judaism.

In v. 28, affirming the lawyer's answer, Jesus demands that he practices such action so as to attain the eternal life that he seeks. With respect to Jesus' demand, it is open to the question about 'works of righteousness.' Are these works of righteousness?[11] Given the whole of Jesus' teaching in the Gospels, it is obvious that this parable does not advocate earning one's salvation. Here, I can say very tentatively that Jesus is emphasizing to abide constantly in the covenant relationship with God. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to get into the matter of 'works of righteousness' more profoundly.

The lawyer tries to justify himself, casting the question of "who is my neighbour?" His desire to justify himself is, most likely, as has been noted above, an attempt to justify his original question, rather than an attempt to validate his practice to date, and an effort to regain lost honour.[12] If Jesus' answer to the lawyer's question is in line with the Jewish narrow view

---

9. John J. Kilgallen, "The Plan of the 'NOMIKOΣ' (Luke 10:25-37)," *NTS* 42 (1996), 615-19.

10. For more instances, see QS 1.1-3, 9-10; T. Iss. 5:2, 7:6; T. Dan 5:3.

11. In order to avoid the difficulties of interpretation of this verse, Mike Graves claims that the parable must be interpreted christologically, for a moral message makes the parable law, not grace. "Luke 10:25-37: The Moral of the 'Good Samaritan' Story?" *RevExp* 94 (1997), 269-75. For this issue, See the following discussions, Eduard Verhoef, "[Eternal] Life and Following the Commandments: Lev 18,5 and Luke 10,28," 571-77 in ed., C.M. Tuckett, *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997); Bastiaan Van Elderen, "Another Look at the Parable of the Good Samaritan," 109-119, here 109-110 in ed., James I. Cook, *Saved by Hope* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).

12. Jeremias, *Parables*, 202; I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 447; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke, X-XX IV*. AB 28, (2 vols,: Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 886; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 469; J. Schmid, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (RNT, 3; Regensburg: Pustet, 1960), 191; J.M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1942), 152.

of neighbour, the lawyer would believe that Jesus' action and fellowship with sinners and Gentiles are non-law. If Jesus gives an extended view of 'neighbour' that includes sinners and Gentiles, in answer to the lawyer's, then the lawyer would unmask that Jesus' definition of neighbour is against the law to which Jews adhered.

Jesus, in response, begins to tell the parable of the Good Samaritan with ἄνθρωπός τις[13] at the beginning. The description of the traveler as ἄνθρωπός τις serves to involve the audience. On this road which is located between Jerusalem and Jericho, the anonymous traveler suffers maltreatment at the hands of robbers. The terrain descends approximately one thousand meters from Jerusalem (750m above sea level) to Jericho (250m below sea level), and provides a hiding place for thieves because of the many rocks.[14] According to Strabo, the ancient Roman historiographer, this road was a notorious place for bands of robbers who lived there.[15] In this respect, the parable might well be a story with actual feeling and expression for audiences.

"Now by chance a priest was going down that road" (v. 31a). Given the fact that Jericho was one of the popular residences for priests,[16] the priest was probably returning to his residence after officiating at the temple. The audience could have anticipated that he would help the half dead, especially due to his clerical status but, contrary to expectations, "when he saw him he passed by on the other side" (v. 31b). It has been conjectured as to why the priest had acted so: The foci of these arguments have converged on the laws regarding ritual purity, not a lack of compassion and fear of robbery. Priests were prohibited from contact with corpses and allowed to be defiled only for close relatives (Lev 21:1-4; 22:4-7; Ezek 44: 25-27). But this exemption did not apply to the High Priest (Lev 21:11) or a Nazarite (Num 6:6-12). If a priest caused defilement because of contact with corpses, he is defiled for seven days and required purification measures with much costs (Num 19:11-22). In the Mishnah, both the High Priest and the Nazarites, as an exception to the rule, were allowed to attend to a neglected corpse. We're told a funeral of a neglected corpse had priority over studies of the Torah.[17] On the basis of the exception rule in the Mishnah and Talmud, some theologians

13. G. Sellin regards the characteristic of this formula as pre-Lukan and conclude that it is pre-Lukan. It appears in Sellin's analysis by Blomberg. 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section', 248-258. See also Nolland, *Luke*, 592.

14. E.F.F. Bishop, "Down from Jerusalem to Jericho," *EvQ* 35 (1963), 97-102; S.J. Kistemaker, *The Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980), 168.

15. Strabo mentions how Pompey defeated a stronghold of robbers near Jericho. (Geography, 16, 2, 41).

16. See b. Ta`anit 27a; cf. m. Ta`anit 4.2; Josephus, *Ant.* 7.365.

17. b. Meg. 3b. for some illustrations, see b, Nazir 48b; J.D. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton,

assume that the priest and the Levite in the parable belong to Sadducees who strictly kept only the law of Torah.[18]

A Levite subsequently passes by the half dead, but he also, like the priest, passed by on the other side without taking any measures. A Levite generally only kept the ritual purity whilst performing cultic tasks.[19] In this regard, a Levite is less bound by ritual constraints. If he had willingly wanted to help the half dead, he could have helped the half dead with time to spare. In view of a Levite's circumstances, it seems that the Levite passed by the half dead for reasons other than fear of defilement by contact with a corpse.[20] In any case, in spite of having more room for aid, he follows the priest.

In the course of the story at this point, the appearance of the Samaritan is a totally unexpected event.[21] A natural progression would be a Jewish layman: Since priest-Levite-layman respectively officiated at the temple, a Jewish layman naturally may be the next sequence in the stream of this story. The shock and amazement of the audience lies in the fact that it's one of the hated Samaritans that appears. The animosity between the Jews and the Samaritans has a long history[22], and the hostility between both nations have never faded away. In the 4th century BC, they built the temple on Mount Gerizim and it was destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 128 BC. The Samaritans seeking for chance for revenge, defiled the Jerusalem temple by scattering bones around its precincts in 8 AD. The animosity between the Jews and

---

Longman & Todd, 1970), 212-214; idem, "Fresh Light on the Parable of the Good Samaritan," *NTS* 11 (1964), 22-37.

18. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*, 212-214; J. Mann, "Jesus and the Sadducean Priests: Luke 10:25-27," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 6 (1914), 417-19; E. Feldman, *Biblical and Post-Biblical Defilement and Mourning: Law as Theology* (New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1977), 60-62.

19. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1969), 203-204; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 46-47.

20. R.C. Trench, *Notes on the Parables of Our Lord* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881), 314.

21. A.J. Mattill insists that Luke replaced a Jewish layman with a Samaritan in redacting the parable. Mattill, "The Good Samaritan and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: Halevy Reconsidered," *Encounter* 33 (1972), 359-76. Such a contention serves however, to distort the intention of Jesus that love does not have a boundary, nor does it permit us to choose those who we will love. See Scott, *Here Then The Parable*, 198; J.E. Breech, *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 163-65; M.S. Enslin, "The Samaritan Ministry and Mission," *HUCA* 51 (1980), 29-38, here 34-36.

22. Even though the beginning of the animosity between the Samaritans and the Jews is obscure, the verses as (2 Kings 17:24) and (Ezra 4:1-5) should be considered carefully for the origin of the animosity. After destruction of North Israel in 722 BC by Assyria (2 Kings 17:6), the king of Assyria had brought Gentiles from Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, Hamath and Sepharvaim and settled them in Samaria (2 Kings 17:24). Thereafter, the Jews returned from the Babylonian exile and not only rejected the aid of the Samaritans for rebuilding the temple (Ezra 4:1-5), but prevented the Samaritans from participation in worship at the new temple in the Jerusalem. For details, see A.D. Crown, *The Samaritans* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1989).

the Samaritans clearly appears not only in the Mishnah[23] but also in Lk 9:52-54 and Jn 4:9.

The Greek word with the intensity, ἐσπλαγχνίσθη[24] is a serious turning point in the parable,[25] breaking the pattern of "saw" and "passed by." The Samaritan responded to the wounded man with compassion, not with a sense of duty. The Samaritan is also bound by the same Torah[26] but may also be a prime target for the same robbers. Nevertheless he, like the Levite who comes to the place, comes to the man and binds up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine which, at that time, were used to soften and disinfect a wound.[27] He then puts him on his own riding animal and led him to the inn and took care of him. Before continuing his journey the next day, he asks the innkeeper to care for him and promises, if the innkeeper spends more than two denarii,[28] that he will repay any additional expenses on his return. The last measure was integral in the light of the bad reputation of the innkeepers at that time:[29] His considerate treatment will bring freedom, security and independence for the wounded man.[30]

After the telling of the parable, Jesus asked which of these three do you think became a neighbour to the man who fell among the robbers? The lawyer answers his question, "the one who showed mercy on him." Jesus then said to him, "Go and do likewise." Jesus' question here raises the question as to whether the parable answers the lawyer's original question of 'who is my neighbour?' In order to define one's neighbour, that is to say, the neighbour as object, Jesus told the neighbour as subject. Since the lawyer's initial query turns out to be a negation of the question's premise that there are boundaries to the definition of neighbour,

23. *m. Šeb*. 8.10 says that "he that eats the bread of Samaritans is like to one that eats the flesh of swine." (cf. Sir. 50.25-26). Josephus, *Ant.* 18:30; *The Wisdom of Ben Sirach* 50:25-26; Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 352-58; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 48.

24. Köster and Donahue say that this word is a messianic term of Jesus which shows God's love. Köster, H. "σπλαγχνίζομαι", *TDNT*, VII, 553-555; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 132. This word is used three times in the Gospel of Luke: (Lk. 10:33), (Lk. 7:13) and (Lk. 15:20).

25. M.J.J. Menken shows how the word, σπλαγχνίζομαι is located in a centre of the pericope. M.J.J. Menken, "The Position of ΣΠΛΑΓΧΝΙΖΕΣΘ-AI and ΣΠΛΑΓΧΝΑ in the Gospel of Luke," *NovT* 30 (1988), 107-14.

26. It is necessary to remember that Samaritans also followed Torah, and so he too has the same risk of defilement from contact with corpses, in addition the contamination is extended to his animals and merchandise.

27. This aid of the Samaritan parallels the story that the Israelites give aid to their Judean captives and take them back to their land at Jericho in 2 Chron. 28:8-15. For the medical use of olive oil and wine, see *m. Šab*. 19.2; Theophrastus, *Hist. Plant*. 9.11.1; cf. Isa. 1.6.

28. Two denarii was the cost of lodging at an inn for at least twenty four days because a day's lodging, at that time, was worth approximately one-twelfth of a denarius. See Jeremias, *Parables*, 205; D.E. Oakman, "The Buying Power of Two Denarii: A Comment on Luke 10:35," *Forum* 3.4 (1987), 33-38.

29. For the unsavory reputation of innkeepers at that time, see *m. Abodah Zarah* 2.1. H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933), 438.

30. Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 133. When the wounded man leaves, if he cannot pay the bill, he will be arrested for debt. See Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*, 218.

the parable can be seen as a deliberate corrective to the original question. The parable eliminates questions of limit, showing how far the 'neighbour' extends.[31] One cannot define one's neighbour. On the contrary, one can only be a neighbour. As T.W. Manson commented, "love does not begin by defining its objects: it discovers them" and "mere neighborhood does not create love, love does create neighborliness."[32]

Jesus emphasizes that people must put their neighborliness into practice. The emphasis on 'doing' is natural for Jesus' teaching in the Gospels particularly in Luke 6:47-49. It also might be, as P.R. Jones pointed out, that the parable betrays any religion with a mania for creeds and an anemia for deeds.[33]

1-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

Some theologians still apply some detailed allegorical interpretation to the parable of the Good Samaritan in the present day.[34] Bailey cautiously claims that Jesus, the rejected outsider, plays the role of the Samaritan in terms of the unique agent of God's costly demonstration of unexpected love.[35] B. Gerhardsson argues that the parable is about the true Shepherd who takes care of God's flock and cures their wounds, in that both "Samaritan" and "neighbour" in their Hebrew forms point to a shepherd. He contends that the emphasis was changed in the early church to a discussion of the neighbour.[36] Even though the above contentions are ingenious, all attempts to find Jesus mirrored in the parable are illegitimate allegorizing.

Unlike the above proposals, some scholars claim that the parable of the Good Samaritan is primarily eschatological.[37] Crossan argues that the metaphorical point of the parable is that

---

31. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's gospel*, 66; Nolland, *Luke*, 596; Peter Rhea Jones, *Studying the Parables of Jesus* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 1999), 306-37; R.W. Funk, "The Old Testament in Parable: The Good Samaritan," *Encounter* 26 (1965), 251-67, here 210, 221; Hendrickz, *The Parables of Jesus*, 84, 89.

32. T.W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus: As Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke Arranged with Introduction and Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1949), 261, 263.

33. Jones, *Studying the Parables of Jesus*, 314.

34. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 55-56; B. Gerhardsson, *The Good Samaritan, The Good Shepherd?* (ConBNT 16; Lund: Gleerup, 1958), 12-31; L.P. Trudinger, "Once Again, Now, Who is my Neighbour?," *EvQ* 48 (1976), 162-63; Hermann, Binder, "Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter," *TZ* 15 (1959), 176-94, here191-92; H. Zimmermann, "Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter: Lk 10:25-37," in ed., G. Bornkamm and K. Rahner, *Die Zeit Jesu* (Freiburg: Herder, 1970), 58-69, here 66-67.

35. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 56.

36. B. Gerhardsson, *The Good Samaritan, The Good Shepherd?, 12-31.*

37. Crossan, *In Parables*, 65-66; Funk, "The Good Samaritan as Metaphor," *Semeia* 2 (1974), 74-81; J. Lambrecht, *Once More Astonished* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 72; L.W. Mazamisa, *Beatific Comradeship:*

the kingdom breaks abruptly into one's consciousness and demands the overturn of values, contending that the parable was originally metaphorical which was turned into moral injunction by the Gospel tradition.[38] Reading the parable in the context of a question about the coming of God's rule, C.K. Sylvia also claims that the parable presents a kingdom of unexpected reversals where the lowest one is welcomed enthusiastically to the feast, and that the boundaries of a kingdom are drawn even wider in the parable.[39] Although the framing questions in vv. 25-28 are eschatological, the dialogue and the telling of the parable are not eschatological, nor does it depend on the message of the kingdom. The parable neither effects the experience of the kingdom nor constitutes the presence of the kingdom.

With respect to the interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan, Funk, with point of view, argues that the reader is forced to identify with the victim in the parable, since the victim is the only one present in every scene. He concludes that "the future which the parable discloses is the future of every hearer who grasps and is grasped by his position in the ditch."[40] Although reading from the victim's perspective might give us some help, it is wrong to persist to read it only from the victim's perspective, for reading from each character in the parable is also helpful. What is more, the parable is told from the standpoint of the narrator, not from the victim's perspective. In order to understand the whole story, the hearer is called to move on according to the indication of the narrator, excluding other perspectives.

It is clear that the parable of the Good Samaritan teaches us to love our neighbour and that this love is to be unconditional and unqualified, emphasizing that we must put love of neighbour into action.[41] Regardless of ethnic or social ties, people of God must show mercy

---

An Exegetical-Hermeneutical Study on Lk 10:25-37 (Kampen: Kok, 1987), 140; S.W. Perpich, *A Critique of Structuralist Exegesis, With Specific Reference to Lk 10:29-37* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1984), 200, 210.

38. Crossan argues that the parable in the Luke's version is an example story which their initial metaphorical character was stripped by the gospel tradition. Crossan, "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus," *NTS* 18 (1972), 285-307.

39. According to the argument of Sylvia, in order to inherit the land in which Israel's restoration and everlasting life will come into existence ultimately, Israelites must obey the Torah (Lev 26:3-13; Deut 30:15-20; Ezek 36:22-38, 37:24-28). Only the righteous eventually will enter the kingdom. The question of inheriting eternal life, therefore, is about how he, the lawyer can participate in God's new age. Sylvia C. Keesmaat, "Strange Neighbors and Risky Care," in ed., R.N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids: Michigan, 2000), 263-85, here 276-282.

40. R. Funk, "The Old Testament in Parable: The Good Samaritan," 214; idem, "The Good Samaritan as Metaphor," 74, 77-79. Scott also contends that the reader must identify with the victim in the ditch. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 199-201.

41. Recently, Zimmermann has argued that "four invitations of the text are developed, each with an emphasis on ethics: (1) The narrated Samaritan (The appeal structure of ethics): (2) The touched Samaritan (Ethics in the Context of Love); (3) The partisan Samaritan (Universal ethos of helping- or: Ethics of open partisanship); (4)

to all, even one's enemies. None of us must limit boundaries of care and obligation. The parable firmly rejects all prejudice and discrimination, namely, racial, intellectual, financial, religious and nationalistic prejudice, or anything else that would restrict doing acts of love. The teaching of the parable harmonizes well not only with Jesus' concern for outcasts of the society but also with Jesus' emphasis on loving one's enemies. The commandment of the practice, "Go and do likewise" not only seeks to turn a man with a mania for creeds and anemia for deeds into a man of practice, but also is our task which all of us tenaciously pursues and combats. Even though loving our neighbour as oneself is difficult, there is no alternative for followers of Jesus.

The charitable Samaritan (Social ethics instead of ethics of conscience)." See R. Zimmermann, "The etho-poietic of the parable of the good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-37). The ethics of seeing in a culture of looking the other way," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 29 (2008), 269-92.

2. The Friend at Midnight (11:5-8)

2-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

The parable of the Friend at Midnight lies in the context of an extended presentation on prayer (11:1-13), framed by three parts: the Lord's Prayer (11:1-4), which is different from Matthew's, the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8), with which we are dealing here, and 'Asking the Father' (11:9-13) which focus on God's faithfulness to response. The emphasis throughout this section (11:1-13) is on the assurances of a response in God's nature that He is faithful in his response, and in the father-son relationship that the Lord's Prayer and the last verse, 'Asking the Father', are linked by a reference to a father. In comparison with Matthew (Matt. 6:5-8, 7:7-11), D.R. Catchpole argues that the parable belongs to Q material, recovering an earlier pre-Lucan form of the parable and removing v. 8a as Luke's redactional form of the parable. While with v. 8a the parable is about persistence in prayer, like the parable of the unjust judge (18:1-8), without v. 8a the parable is simply about answer to prayer.[1] This contention related to Q material, however, has not won widespread support.[2]

A number of affinities have been noted between the parable of the Friend at Midnight and the parable of the Judge and the Widow (18:1-8). The most obvious point of comparison is that there is a striking verbal similarity between both: "Do not cause me trouble" in 11:7, and "Because this widow causes me trouble" in 18:5. The person to whom the petition is brought is, or may be, at first reluctant, but the petition is eventually granted. There are, however striking differences in a frame of the story and the content of the petition. While the Friend at Midnight is framed as a rhetorical question needing interpretive comment, the parable of the Judge and the Widow is a self-contained story needing no interpretive comment.[3] The petition in 11:5-8 is concerned with the need for bread urgently, but in 18:1-8 the concern is with the need for vindication during a long period of waiting. Given these differences, it may lead to a faulty interpretation to construe 11:5-8 in light of 18:1-8.[4]

2-2. The Analysis of the Parable

1. D.R. Catchpole, "Q and 'the Friend at Midnight' (Luke 11:5-8/9)," *JTS* 34 (1983), 407-424.
2. Those who claim that Lucan and Matthaean *Sondergut* belong to Q believe that it happened in their use of Q, the same way that both Matthew and Luke omitted material in using their Marcan source. The theory makes material hypotheses more complex.
3. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 73.
4. Construing the parable as persistence in prayer in light of 18:1-8 and 11:9-13 is a mainstream these days. However, given the above some differences, it can lead to the wrong conclusion.

In the interrogative parable[5], where does the question beginning in 11:5 end? Even though the syntax is clumsy with a number of paratactic clauses, the question clearly extends to v. 7 which follows Jesus' answer to his own question.[6] The parable begins with the formula "Who from you" which appears eleven times in the Gospels,[7] including seven times in Luke's Gospel (cf. 11:5, 11; 12:25; 14:5, 28; 15:4; 17:7). In each case, with this formula, each story starts with a simple question as to whether anyone would do some hypothetical action. All expect a negative response as the rhetorical effect, namely, "no one." Taken like this, the whole point is 'no one' would say such a thing. In other words, it is unthinkable, according to the customs of the day, that a visitor not be heartily welcomed and be provided with food and lodging.

In Middle Eastern customs, a host, as Bailey pointed out, might well provide more food than was needed as a mark of respect.[8] The saying in v. 6 "I have nothing to set before him" might mean that, given the customs of generous hospitality, I do not have such foods to treat a guest, rather than do not have any food. The petitioner probably tried to provide his friend with the best thing, such as an unbroken loaf and an ample quantity of bread. He would be aware of who had baked recently since baking was openly done in the community oven at that time. He goes to his friend who baked bread and asks for help, "Friend, lend me three loaves of bread" (v. 6).

The main point in v. 7 is as to whether the response of the petitioned is conceivable. In view of the fact that generous hospitality is not only the duty of a host but also common responsibility of the village to some extent, it is nothing but trivial excuses. It is inconceivable that the petitioned cannot give the petitioner anything because of the bother of unlocking a door and fear of making a noise that might awake his children in bed. Such a suggestion would have shocked the audience in their social community based on honour and hospitality.

---

5. It is not correct, as Snodgrass has pointed out, to change the question to a statement in translations such as "Suppose one of you" (NIV and NRSV). See Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 442.

6. 11:5-7 forms a unity into the Semitic tripartite combination of an interrogative noun-clause whose subject is *ti,j,* a relative clause setting out the real presupposition, and an assertive clause which constructs the apodosis in relation to the protasis formed by the above the interrogative noun-clause and the relative clause. D.R. Catchpole, Q and 'The Friend at Midnight' (Luke 11:5-8/9), 412.

7. Matt 6:27; 7:9; 12:11; John 8:46.

8. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant,* 121-123. It is excessive conjecture, however, that the petitioner intents to wander from house to house to get various foods except for three loaves in the middle of the night. Rather than such an excessive behaviour at midnight is out of courtesy in Eastern customs, although honour and shame center about their society and culture.

With respect to v. 8 there are three main problems: the originality of v. 8, the meaning of the noun ἀναίδεια, and the referent of the pronoun αὐτοῦ. Catchpole, as has been noted above, argues that v. 8a is the redaction of Luke in light of 18:2-5. He continues to claim that without v. 8a, the pre-Lucan parable is slightly banal and trivial, with no plain theological relevance. The argument of the originality of v. 8 relates to a viewpoint of whether the rhetorical question in v. 7 is an actual refusal[9] or hypothetical refusal. If v. 7 presents an actual refusal, then v. 8 is essential to show the petitioned person's mind changed. On the other hand, if we regard v. 7 as hypothetical, then v. 8 seems to be less necessary.[10] However, v. 8 is still necessary to drive a wedge into a certainty of an answer once more. If one understands ἀναίδεια in v. 8 as persistence in prayer, then v. 8 is all the more necessary to explain a reason for the answer.

The noun ἀναίδεια in v. 8 raises intricate linguistic problems as to whether the word is used positively or negatively. Many interpreters have traditionally translated the noun ἀναίδεια into "persistence" or "importunity", with positive meaning.[11] However, when one surveys the usages of the word and its cognates, the whole usage in classical Greek, the papyri and Josephus was utilized negatively except where Christian writers have assigned a positive use in dependence on Luke 11:8.[12] In particular, Snodgrass insists that the noun ἀναίδεια has a negative meaning, "Shamelessness" in v. 8 on the basis of a survey of about 258 occurrences of ἀναίδεια in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae date base.[13] In the light of this persuasive argument, we inevitably have to acknowledge the fact that the noun ἀναίδεια has a negative meaning. In order to settle this difficulty, while some scholars apply

9. Bailey and Herzorg assume that a rhetorical question in v7 is an original refusal. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 127-28; W.R. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*: *Jesus as the Pedagogue of the Oppressed* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 195.

10. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 75.

11. RSV; DV; KJV; TC; Weymouth; NKJ; REB; NRSV; A.C.R. Leaney, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1958), 188; W. Manson, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930), 136-37; F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976), 2:56; W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THKNT, 3; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), 234; Ellis, *Luke*, 163; W. Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke* (New Testament Commentaries; Grand Rapids:Baker Book House, 1978), 612, 616; L. Morris, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; London: IVP, 1974), 195; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 912; Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*, 132-33; R.R. Rickards, "The Translation of Luke 11:5-13, *BT* 28 (1977), 239-43, here 241-42; P. Perkins, *Hearing the Parables of Jesus* (New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1981), 194-95.

12. A.F. Johnson, "Assurance for Man: The Fallacy of Translating *ANAIDEIA* by 'Persistence in Lk 11:5-8," *JETS* 22 (1979), 123-31, here 127; D.R. Catchpole, Q and 'The Friend at Midnight' (Luke 11:5-8/9), 409-10; K. Snodgrass, "*Anaideia* and the Friend at Midnight (Luke 11:8)," *JBL* 116 (1997), 505-513.

13. Snodgrass, "*Anaideia* and the Friend at Midnight (Luke 11:8)," 506-10.

the word to the petitioned person inside who rises to avoid shame,[14] others apply the word to the petitioner outside who has the boldness in request, keeping the negative meaning of ἀναίδεια, namely "shamelessness."[15] In representative cases of understanding the noun ἀναίδεια as "avoidance of shame," Bailey, who follows Jeremias, appeals to etymology to settle the problem of the noun ἀναίδεια: That is, the translator of this story from Aramaic to Greek adds an alpha privative to the noun αἰδώς with negative meaning, namely "shame", so that in the result, it yields the noun ἀναίδεια with "avoidance of shame." He also claims that the possibilities are admirably in tune with the cultural pattern of the story.[16] However, given the whole usage, I believe that what is at the very least clear is that the noun ἀναίδεια in v. 8, namely, "shamelessness" is not a positive term but plainly a negative one.

Understanding the pronoun αὐτοῦ which occurs four times in v. 8 relies considerably on one's determination of the meaning of the noun ἀναίδεια. As has been noted above, those who understand the noun ἀναίδεια as 'avoidance of shame', regard the pronoun αὐτοῦ as the petitioned person, whereas those who comprehend the noun ἀναίδεια as 'shamelessness' with a negative meaning, refer to the petitioner as the antecedent of the pronoun αὐτοῦ. I think, however, that in light of the parallel phrase (διὰ τὸ εἶναι φίλον αὐτοῦ, Lk 19:11; Acts 18:13) to v. 8, it is more accurate to apply the four occurrences to the petitioner outside as follows:

λέγω ὑμῖν,
εἰ καὶ οὐ δώσει αὐτῷ (the petitioner)
ἀναστὰς
διὰ τὸ εἶναι φίλον αὐτοῦ (the petitioner),
διά γε τὴν ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ (the petitioner)

14. Jeremias, *Parables*, 158; K. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 125-33; E.W. Huffard, "The Parable of the Friend at Midnight: God's Honour or Man's Persistence?" *ResQ* 21 (1978), 154-60; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 89-92; A.F. Johnson, "Assurance for Man: The Fallacy of Translating *Anaideia* by 'Persistence' in Luke 11:5-8," 123-31; Nolland, *Luke*, 624-26; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 203, 213-14; C. Waetjen, "The Subversion of 'World' by the Parable of the Friend at Midnight," *JBL* 120 (2001), 703-721.

15. NEB; O.G. Harris, "Prayer in Luke-Acts," (Unpublished Thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1966), 87-88; J.D.M. Derrett, "The Friend at Midnight: Asian Ideas in the Gospel of St. Luke," in ed., C.K. Berrett, *Donum Gentilicium* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 78-87, here 83-85; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 185-87; D. Wenham, *The Parables of Jesus: Pictures of Revolution* (London:Hodder & Stoughton, 1989), 181; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 276; L.T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Sacra Pagina, 3: Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 178; Snodgrass, "*Anaideia* and the Friend at Midnight (Luke 11:8)," 505-513; idem, *Stories with Intent*, 442-448; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukean Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 77, 79.

16. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables of Luke*, 125-33.

ἐγερθεὶς
δώσει αὐτῷ (the petitioner) ὅσων χρῄζει.

The noun ἀναίδεια, therefore, refers to the shameless request of the man who comes asking in the middle of the night. The rudeness of the petitioner which was evaluated as "shamelessness" by the petitioned person, relates primarily to his conduct at midnight. The negative term describing the rudeness of the petitioner can be understood as *boldness* which the parable wants to encourage in praying. All prayers should ask their needs to God with boldness, no hesitation.

2-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

In order to avoid the difficulty of interpretation, it is not right to shift and change the focus of the parable and to speak of persistence or importunity. Nor does the parable have continual asking or knocking and initial refusal. Here, it is important to interpret the parable, keeping the negative meaning of the noun ἀναίδεια.

Even though the parable makes it difficult to understand its purpose and intent, in that there is no explicit statement, no specific application or *nimshal,* it is clear that the main point of the parable is boldness in approaching God in prayer. All those praying should approach God boldly, by throwing away all the rising disturbances in relation to one's prayer, such as a time, a place, a content of prayer, or a doubt of a prayer response and so on. This is stressed in 11:1-4 (in terms of "our Father") and 11:9-13 (in a certainty of a prayer response).

The parable, teaches in effect, the certainty of a prayer response on the basis of the character of God. If a man will get up at midnight and grant the request of a rude friend, how much more will your heavenly Father grant the requests of his children? Here is a parable contrasting God who is not like the sleeper. The parable thus encourages the believer to be confident of their prayer on grounds of the character of God. The parable ends with the sleeper's standpoint, which is compared to God willingly granting the request, beginning with the petitioner's viewpoint, with the emphasis on boldness of the petitioner, and no hesitation and discouragement in the face of opposition.[17] In other words, the point of view of the parable naturally shifts to the attitude of prayer toward the character of God.

17. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 276.

3. The Rich Fool (12:13-21)

3-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

12:4-7 and 12:13-34[1] deal with issues of fear, anxiety, and security under the motif of confidence, judgment and accountability. The theme of 12:4-7, "not to fear" is repeated and stressed in 12:13-34 once again. The parable of the Rich Fool belongs to the section of 12:13-34 which can be divided into three parts such as the Rich Fool (12:13-21), the theme of anxiety regarding daily needs (12:22-31), and the sayings concerning wealth (12:32-34). With reference to the problem of where the material of the parable of the Rich Fool comes from, though Marshall argues that the parable belongs to Q material owing to the similarity between Mt 6:19 and 12:13-21,[2] it is unlikely for the parable to be Q material because 12:33 also is similar to Mt 6:19.

Vv. 13-14 and v. 15 are open to question of the original unity of 12:13-21. Many commentators[3] consider that vv. 13-14 is made up of originally independent sayings, namely a separate saying, and that v. 15 is used to make the transition to the parable by Luke. Jeremias argues that on the basis of the Gospel of Thomas 63 and 72,[4] vv. 13-15 does not belong originally to the parable, since the two (vv. 13-14 and vv. 16-21) were not linked but separated in *Gos. Thom.*[5] Yet I think that *Gos. Thom*. 63 doesn't prove anything about the original connection in Luke, for rather, I believe, that the *Gos. Thom*. more likely depends on the Gospel of Luke, in that it is clearly secondary.[6] On the other hand, Fitzmyer seeks to demonstrate that these sayings were originally independent by making use of *Gos. Thom.*,

1. It is desirable to view 12:13-34 as one section with logical consistency rather than 12:4-59 or 12:1-13:9. According to observation of T.D. Stegman by Hermogenes's Progymnastic Exercise, 12:13-34 has a steady, coherent literary unit including eight steps of Hermogenes. T.D. Stegman, "Reading Luke 12:13-34 as an Elaboration of a Chreia: How Hermogenes of Tarsus Sheds Light on Luke's Gospel," *NovT* 49 (2007), 328-352. See also A.J. Malherbe, "The Christianization of a *Topos* (Luke 12:13-34)," *NovT* 38 (1996), 123-35.

2. Marshall, *Luke*, 521-22.

3. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 23, 55; Jeremias, *Parables*, 165; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 968; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 520; Nolland, *Luke*, 683-84.

4. *Gos. Thom.* 63: "Jesus said: There was a rich man who had many possessions. He said, I will use my possessions that I may sow and reap and plant and fill my storehouses with fruit, so that I may lack nothing. There were his thoughts in his heart. And in that night he died. He who has ears, let him hear."
Gos. Thom. 72: "[A man said] to him: Speak to my brothers that they divide my father's possessions with me. He said to him: O man, who made me a divider? He turned to his disciples (and) said to them: I am not a divider, am I?"

5. Jeremias, *Parables*, 164-65.

6. For a critical standpoint of the Gospel of Thomas, see H. Montefiore and H. Tierner, *Thomas and the Evangelists, Studies in Biblical Theology, 35* (Naperville: Alec R. Allensen, 1962), 50; Ray Summers, *The Secret Saying of the Living Jesus* (Waio: Word, 1968), 46: H. Schürmann, *Traditionsgeschichte Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1968), 232.

although he knows that it is secondary. Derrett has shown, however, that the parable suits vv. 13-14, since it gives a lesson of heirs of the kingdom about the appropriate attitude to wealth and possessions.[7] The first half of v. 15 functions as a warning against finding life in possessions, and the second as a maxim. In addition, the parable which is preceded by v. 15, is a demonstration of v. 15b. For the above reasons, it becomes obvious that vv. 13-14 and v. 15 lie in the original unity with the parable.

Bailey divides vv. 16-21 into five stanzas surrounded by two wisdom sayings such as, Goods Given (v. 16), The Problem (v. 17), Present Plan (v. 18), Future Plan (v. 19) and Good Left (v. 20).[8] I propose, in contrast, four movements as an analysis of structure regarding vv. 16-21: The Bumper Crop (v. 16), The Problem (v. 17), The Solution (vv. 18-19) and The Interruption of God (v. 20).

3-2. The Analysis of the Parable

The parable, like the parable of the Good Samaritan, is set in the context of the crowd requesting Jesus to settle the matter of the inheritance between him and his brother. Such disputes were normally entrusted to Rabbis and other respected teachers, since it is intimately linked with interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. In view of the request of the intervention and the appellation to Jesus as διδάσκαλε, there seems to be an acknowledgement of his authority. Here it is not clear whether the elder brother, as opposed to a younger brother, does not want to divide the inheritance, or the elder brother is withholding the whole inheritance. In any event, although it was encouraged that brothers should live together without splitting their inheritance, if one of them wanted to divide the inheritance, it was allowed.[9] The petitioner's motive is exposed as unsound through Jesus' striking response to the request. He is probably not seeking an impartial decision, but attempting to use Jesus' standing for his own purposes. In any case, Jesus here quickly grasps an opportunity to teach about wealth and possessions.

The noun μεριστήν in v. 14 is reminiscent of Moses' incident in Exod 2:14 with the saying 'who made you ruler and judge over us?', where he stops the quarrel between two Israelites. Even T. Gorringe argues that Jesus here is rejecting the request that Zealots want

7. Derrett, "The Rich Fool: A Parable of Jesus Concerning Inheritance," in *Studies in the New Testament*, II (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978), 99-120, here 102-103.
8. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 63-68.
9. D. Daube, "Inheritace in Two Lukan Pericopes," *ZSSR* 72 (1955), 326-34; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 59; Marshall, *Luke*, 522.

Jesus to divide the inheritance of the restored Israel to Jewish brothers, viewing v. 14 as second Moses allusions.[10] Although this event is quoted twice in Acts 7:27, 35 in a Septuagintal form with "ruler and judge," it is quite doubtful whether Luke 12:14 intends to allude to Exod 2:14. In addition, v. 13 can be pertinently explained in terms of a personal grievance, according to *m. B. Bat*. 8.1-9.10.[11] Jesus directs his concerns to teaching the moral demands of Kingdom living rather than concentrating on reconciliation or restoring brotherly love.

In v. 15, Jesus deals with the heart of the problem, not a temporary solution, that is, the matter of "covetousness", which was a common subject of moral exhortation in Greco-Roman world, as well as the New Testament.[12] The warning in v.15a is followed by a reason: "because one's life does not consist in the abundance of possessions" (12:15b). With respect to the awkward syntax of v. 15, which seems to be an overloaded sentence, it is most likely that the clumsy syntax is deliberate to produce a rhetorical effect.[13]

Jesus tells the crowd this parable as a warning against greed. The parable then functions as an illustration and an example of v. 15b. With regard to the reader's impression of the rich man, it is likely that, according to Nolland, the reader is already prejudiced against the rich in the parable on the basis of the previous negative portrayals of the rich in the Gospel of Luke (1:52-53; 6:24; 8:14).[14] V. 16 carries the sense of wealth as a gift of God, not wealth acquired by human effort: "there was a certain rich man whose land brought forth plenty." The parable betrays the planning of the rich and his attitude toward wealth and possessions, by means of the narrative device of soliloquy.

---

10. T. Gorringe, "A Zealot Option Rejected? Luke 12:13-14," *ExpTim* 98 (1987), 267-70. Derrett also views v. 14 as second Moses allusions. See Derrett, "The Rich Fool: A Parable of Jesus Concerning Inheritance," 101-102.

11. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 82.

12. Diodours Siculus called it "the metropolis of all evil deeds," in Diodorus Siculus 21.1.4 and Dio Chrysostom called it "the cause of the greatest evils," in Oratio 17. For the New Testament, See also Rom. 1:29; 2 Cor. 9:5; Eph. 4:19; 5:3; Col. 3:5; 2 Pet. 2:3, 14.

13. While Moule claims that what the syntax is awkward is due to the juxtaposition of two separate expressions, Bailey contends that this is deliberate in order to produce a rhetorical effect. Forbes looks for the reason in a combination between Moule and Bailey: "Luke may have deliberately left the words he found in his source so as to produce a rhetorical effect. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 83. For Moule's standpoint, see C.F.D. Moule, "H. W. Moule on Acts iv. 25," *ExpTim* 65 (1954), 220-21. Derrett, according to M.J. Lagrange, believes that Luke wanted to allude to Aristotle, *Nicomacheau Ethics* X, 8.9-10: "Self-sufficiency [which has a particular evaluation in the system] does not depend upon a superabundance of means, nor does conduct [i.e. moral achievement], and a man may perform noble actions without being master of land and sea." J.A.K. Thompson, *The Ethics of Aristoltle* (Harmondsworth, 1959), 308.

14. Nolland, *Luke*, 686. Forves also agrees with the contention of Nolland. See Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 83.

The rich man in the parable intends to tear down his barns and build bigger ones because his barns are too small to store the bumper crops. C. Hedrick claims that the rich man is foolish, because at the time when he should be reaping crops, he plans to tear down his barns.[15] The parable, however, only says that the ground of the rich produced a good crop, not that it is time to harvest. In the light of this it is wrong to view the rich man as foolish. Rather than his absurdities, the parable is largely concerned with his attitude toward wealth and possessions that one's life consists in the abundance of his possessions. M. A. Beavis argues that the rich man wanted to withhold grain and drive up market prices. But I cannot see any allusions or overtones of this in the parable.[16] As far as the parable is concerned, the rich man has not the least desire to sell his crops. He only plans to take care of his own needs. When it comes to storing up bumper crops, the story recalls Joseph's story (Gen. 41-35-36). However, Joseph's story differs from the parable in that he stored grain for the benefit of the community, not merely for his own benefit as the rich man in the parable. On the grounds that he had enough crops to last for many years, the rich man addresses his soul with vivid and colorful words (eat, drink and be merry), which present not only conventional language, but reflect the epitome of Epicurean values.[17] In the same way, the self-contentment of the rich man is thoroughly grounded in his possessions, and it can also be expressed as "enjoy yourself."

The striking features of soliloquy in the parable, are the use not only of the future tenses that the rich man uses to express his thoughts of being in full control of his future, but also the use of 'self-centered' language which indicates ownership, such as *my* crops, *my* barns, *my* goods and *my* soul. In this manner, the parable candidly betrays his thoughts that he himself is the owner of his life, as well betraying his attitude towards wealth that one's life consists in the abundance of his possessions. At this point, it seems as if he is a practical atheist, who thinks and acts as if God does not exist.[18]

The plan of the rich man is shattered by the abrupt intrusion of God in v. 20. God calls

---

15. Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*, 158-61. He makes the parable nihilistic, getting rid of vv. 20-21 from it. To put it another way, the parable is carrying a sense of despair, death and absurdity, not hope and future.

16. Mary. Ann. Beavis, "The Foolish Landowner (Luke 12:16b-20)," in ed., V. George shillington, *Jesus and His Parables* (Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1997), 55-68.

17. For Jewish and non-Jewish parallels, see Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 135-37; Joseph A. Fitzymyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X- X X IV,* 2:973. For Epicurean values, see Euripides, *Alcestis* 788; Lucian, *Navig*. 25.

18. Peter R. Jones, *The Teaching of the Parables* (Nashville: Broadman, 1982), 133; Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* , 141.

him a fool because he believed that he controls his own destiny: He is depending on his possessions and sought to indulge in it. Such thinking has in the end prevented him from preparing for his ultimate future. For the use of the third person plural ἀπαιτοῦσιν in v. 20 there are several possibilities: the angel of death, the possessions, the man's mistreated neighbours, or a circumlocution for God.[19] It here is most likely a circumlocution for God. The word is therefore commonly used to show that his soul was not his own, but in reality, was on loan from God. In other words, his soul was on loan from God, and now the owner wants the loan returned. At the very least what is clear is that his life was not his own. The parable has quite an intriguing conclusion in that the rich man ends up with his goods in the hands of others. In the end, things ended up beyond his control because of his death and the goods remained in the hands of others.[20]

The parable bears a likeness to the themes of wealth in Jewish writings and the writings of Greco-Roman moralists, in that the parable shares attitudes toward wealth, the suddenness of death and the moral view of possessions. In the light of this view, it is possible to conjecture that Jesus, to some extent, was influenced by the wisdom tradition. There are striking similarities especially between the parable and Sir 11:18-19:1 and En. 97:8-10. But they differ at the key points: The wealth in Sirach is obtained through diligence and self-denial, and in 1 Enoch by unjust ways, whereas in the parable the land produced a good crop not through self-labor and unjust ways. In spite of some similarities among them, there is no direct dependence on Sir 11:18-19:1 and En. 97:8-10, because of the above essential differences.[21]

Despite the fact that there is the textual variant in v. 21 omitted by Codex Bezae (D), Old Latin versions and the Gospel of Thomas, it is an undeniable fact that the parable includes this verse, for external and internal evidence: P^{45}, P^{75} and the major uncials include the verse, but also the verse is entirely fitting for Luke's narrative and necessary for the explanation of

19. Marshall follows Grundmann which regards 'they' in v. 20 as the angel of death. Marshall, *Luke*, 524. The rabbis equated the angel of death with Satan (*b. B. Bat* 16a). F. Stagg suggests that the third person plural avpaitou/sin in 20 means the possessions of the rich fool. F. Stagg, "Luke's Theological Use of Parables," *RevExp* 94 (1997), 215-29, here 224. Beavis views 'they' as the man's mistreated neighbours, because of a peasant uprising caused from the fact that the rich withheld grain and drove up market prices. M.A. Beavis, "The Foolish Landowner (Luke 12:16b-20)," 65-66.

20. Ps. 49:10 and Sir. 11:20 share the same words: "when we look at the wise they die; fool and dolt perish together and leave their wealth to others…," (Ps. 49:10); "he does not know how long it will be before he must die and leave his wealth others." (Sir. 11:20).

21. W.E. Nickelsburg, "Riches, The Rich, and God's Judgment in l Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel According to Luke," *NTS* 25 (1978), 324-44.

the parable. V. 21 is a repetition of v. 20b as well as an application of the parable. The act of storing up things for himself in v. 21 corresponds to preparing for yourself in v. 20b. Here, "being rich toward God," εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν implies almsgiving on behalf of others.[22] According to v. 33, almsgiving is like hoarding one's treasure in heaven.

3-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

Arguing on the basis of *Gos. Thom 63,* that the parable was originally a metaphorical parable about the kingdom that the church changed into an example story, Crossan maintains that the parable refers to the necessity to make proper decisions when confronted with the urgency of Jesus' kingdom message.[23] On the other hand, Scott claims that the harvest is a metaphor for the kingdom of God, since the bumper harvest can only point to a miracle from God, and that the parable presents impendence of the kingdom which exists only in a sharing community.[24] Scott's idea seems to come from his attempt at the outset to relate the heir of the inheritance in the initial question to heirs of the kingdom. I cannot, however, see any evidence to support the fact that this is a parable about the kingdom. On the contrary, if it is, it is at best only implicit in the parable.

Jeremias contends that the parable refers to future eschatological judgment.[25] But, I believe that the parable is not only about the death of the individual, but also presents a warning about eschatological judgment, in that the parable teaches us about the sovereignty of God and our accountability to him in the face of judgment.[26]

Of course, the main instruction of the parable is that one's life does not consist in the abundance of possessions. The parable not only teaches us about attitudes toward wealth and possessions, but the right use of one's wealth for others. It is all the more important to dwell on what it means to be rich toward God, at this time when it is difficult to avoid in our modern, acquisitive society that tempts us to think that one's security and pleasure are found in possessions.

22. Lk. 12:33; 14:12-14; 16:19-31; cf. Mt. 6:19-21.
23. Crossan, "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus," *NTS* 18 (1972), 285-307, here 296-97.
24. Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 138-40.
25. Jeremias, *Parables*, 165; D.P. Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts* (SNTU, B/6; Linz: Fuchs, 1982), 143; M.I. Boucher, *The Parables* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1981), 127.
26. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 87.

4. The Barren Fig Tree (13:6-9)

4-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

The context preceding the story (13:1-9) deals with the theme of the delay of the parousia and the judgment: You must be ready, because the son of man and the master of that servant will come at an hour when you do not expect him (12:35-48). His coming will bring judgment and division (12:49-53). You should wisely interpret the signs of the times and act accordingly (12:54-59).[1] Just as you must be ready for the son of man's return at all times, so the church must be ready for their Lord's return at all times. The theme of it being absolutely necessary to discern and respond appropriately to the eschatological crisis runs continuously through the following story (13:1-9).[2] Luke in particular emphasizes the continuity of thought between this story (13:1-9) and the chapter preceding it by means of the adverbial phrase ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ.

Is the connection between the parable and its context (13:1-5) original? In technical terms, it is impossible to determine whether the two were connected by Jesus, or by Luke, or in the tradition before Luke. In answering this question, Nolland contends that the close parallel relationship between 13:2-3 and 12:4-5 shows us the possibility of 13:1 having stemmed from the redactor of the parable, who has also been responsible for bringing the two units together, based on the argument of G. Schwarz.[3]

On the other hand, W.R. Farmer insists on the unity between the parable and its context through the strong affinity in structure with 15:1-31, although such a structure was created by the need of the early church.[4] Given the fact that some of the parables in Luke's Gospel, as I have pointed out previously, begin with comments from individuals or a dialogue between an individual and Jesus, it indicates that the comments and the dialogue play an important role in understanding the parables.[5] Such a literary construction usually serves Luke's purpose of

1. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*, 143-46.

2. Reading the verb πάρειμι as "come" rather than "be present", Bailey argues that the verb πάρειμι makes a break between 13:1-5 and preceding passages. In view of the flow of thought between 13:1-5 and preceding passages, his contention is not cogent. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 75; A.W. Martens, "The Parable of the Unproductive Fig Tree (Luke 13:6-9)," in ed., R.N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000), 157-76, here 169.

3. Nolland, *Luke*, 718-19; G. Schwarz, "Lukas 13:1-5: Eine Emendation," *NovT* 11(1969), 121-26.

4. W.R. Farmer, "Notes on a Literary and Form-Critical Analysis of Some of the Synopic Material Peculiar to Luke," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 305-306. In contrast, Jeremias claims that the historic present, λέγει in v.8 may indicate to have made use of tradition material. He views the historic present in Luke's parables as evidence of traditional material on the grounds that Luke usually tries to avoid the historic present, and that Luke even removed eighty nine of ninety of the historic presents transmitted by Mark material. Jeremias, *Parables*, 182-83.

5. For the same case, see Luke 10:25-38; 12:13-21, 41-48; 14:15-24; 15:1-7.

either pointing to the meaning of the parable through the sayings, or reinforcing the significance of the sayings through the parable. In this setting, the story (13:1-5) also serves not only to naturally introduce the parable with the theme of the need for repentance, but also to understand the parable. Of course, the parable, as such, is enough to present the theme of the need for repentance without its immediate context (13:1-5). However, the story (13:1-9) as a unit makes the theme clear and strong. All that matters now is that the parable, as commentators often have noted, fits its context very well. What is clear at the least is that Luke wants the two passages to be read together.

Since Luke does not include the cursing incident (Mt 21:18-22 and Mk 11:12-14, 20-25) in his Gospel, some theologians have suggested possibilities of a Lukan adaptation of Mt 11:12-14 that Luke turns the cursing incident into the parable.[6] There is, however, little reason to see any direct link between the parable and both accounts for several reasons: While the accounts of the cursing almost exclusively deals with the lack of fruit, the parable speaks of the request for tolerance and additional time, as well as the lack of fruit. The reference to the leaves of the fig tree is a vital factor in both accounts, but is not mentioned in the parable. Furthermore, there is little verbal similarity other than the words in Luke 13:6.[7]

Jeremias believes that Jesus used the story of Ahiqar, replacing the announcement of judgment in Ahiqar with a call to repentance and adding the vinedresser to the parable.[8] Although the tree that represents a son of a father was planted ideally by a stream, the tree bore no fruit. The tree requests a final opportunity to bear fruit, that is, to be transplanted to a new location just as its owner is about to remove the tree. But the request is refused by its owner in contrast to the parable.[9] The main difference between the parable and the story of Ahiqar is that the request was not granted in the story of Ahiqar.

On the other hand, Hedrick judiciously compares the parable with Pistis Sophia, 621-23 and the Apocalypse of Peter, chapter 2, as ancient interpretations of the parable, in order to search for which is the earliest version of the parable. He concludes that Pistis Sophia has

---

6. Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (2 vol.; JSNTSup 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 561-62; Drury, *Parables*, 119. For further reading, see W.R. Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition* (JSNTSup 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 1-38, 234-36.

7. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 89.

8. Jeremias, *Parables*, 170-71.

9. R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, with introductions and critical and explanatory notes to the several books* (London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1963), 775; James H. Charlesworthe (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepighrapha*, vol. 2, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985), 480.

close similarity to Luke, and that the version in the Apocalypse of Peter with the ellipsis of v.9 in the parable is paraphrased and improved later, since there are no Greek manuscripts that fill in the ellipsis of v.9 in the parable.[10] It is right to seek for the imagery for the parable in the Old Testament rather than other Jewish writings or Christian writings. The fig tree is commonly used to describe the blessing and judgment as symbol in the Old Testament (1 Kgs 4:25; Mic 4:4; Amos 4:9; Joel 1:7, 12).[11]

4-2. The Analysis of the Parable

In the parable a certain man has a fig tree planted in his vineyard. Even though the fig tree in a vineyard is unusual, fig trees and vineyards are often associated in several Old Testament texts (1 Kgs 4:25; Ps 105:33; Song 2:13; Jer 5:17, 8:13; Hos 2:12; Joel 1:7, 12; Mic 4:4; Zech 3:10), and also in rabbinic texts (Str-B 1:873). Pliny specifically mentions that fig trees be used for trellising of vines in terms of the ancient horticulture. He says that "high class wines can only be produced from vines on trees."[12] The reader is not told, however, who planted the fig tree in the vineyard and when it was planted.

The owner has been coming for three years to look for fruit from the tree but has found none. There are several reasons that fig trees might not bear fruit: The tree may be too young to bear fruit. The figs drop off prematurely because of the wrong caprification or overwatering in view of horticulture.[13] Of these possibilities, the first case is not pertinent, in that the owner unreasonably requests figs from the fig tree which is too young to bear. For whatever reason, what is important here, is the fact that the fig tree has born none for three years. With regard to the meaning of the three years, Jeremias supposes that it is now the sixth year since the tree had been planted, because it takes three years to grow sufficiently to

10. C.W. Hedrick, "An Unfinished Story about a Fig Tree in a Vineyard (Luke 13:6-9)," *PRSt* 26 (1999), 169-92, here 174-75. Even though the Apocalypse of Peter linked the parable with Matt 24:32-33 and Mark 13:28-29, there is little connection between the two accounts, except for the mention of a fig tree.

11. While Bailey seeks for the imagery for the parable in Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard (Isa. 5:1-7), Forbes suggests Mic. 7:1-7 where the wickedness of Judah is likened to one who found neither first-ripe fig nor cluster of grapes, as the closest parallel to the parable. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 81-83; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 89.

12. Pliny, *Natural History*, 17, 35, 199-200.

13. The figs of a fig tree may be expected in the first or second year after transplanting it into a field from its pot in which a young fig tree grows for three years. F.N. Hepper, *Illustrated Encyclopedia of Bible Plants* (Grand Rapids Baker, 1992), 110-111; Theophrastus, *De Causis Plantarum*, 2 9 5-6; B. Einarson and G.K. Link, *Theophrastus De Causis Plantarum 3 vols* (Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1976), 1 264-69.

bear fruit (Lev 19:23),[14] whereas Bailey claims that it may now be the ninth year since the tree had been planted, since the nine years, according to Lev 19:23-25, mean each three years for growth, forbidden fruit, and seeking the fruit.[15] However, the three years may simply point to a long time irrespective of Lev 19:23-25, for we are not told when exactly the tree was planted. It might have been an old tree that had borne in the past. In any case, the tree has had enough time to bear fruit.[16] To not have borne fruit for three years the tree paints a picture of extreme hopelessness.

"Cut it down; why does it use up the ground?" The owner decides to cut it down since the tree not only occupies space, but could bring deterioration or other hindrances to the land and other trees. If the fig tree clearly symbolizes Israel, as an Old Testament metaphor, then the destruction of the fig tree also signifies the judgment of God upon Israel (Jer 5:17; 8:13; Hos 2:12; Joel 1:7, 12; Amos 4:9), recalling the preaching of John the Baptist in Luke 3:8-9. In arguing for the typification of the fig tree, Bailey contends that the parable is addressed to Israel's leaders, for the Isaiah text is used in the parable of the Wicked Tenants to address Israel's leaders.[17] However, I cannot see any suggestions that the parable is addressed to Israel's leaders. As far as Jesus' message of repentance is concerned, it was directed to the nation in general, not just to its leaders. On the other hand, others believe that the tree is connected with Jerusalem.[18] Given the lament in vv. 31-35, it, of course, is possible that the tree typifies Jerusalem, but in the general sense, it is better to view it as the Israelite community. It is a warning of judgment on Israel because of their lack of productivity.[19]

The vinedresser suggests that the owner leaves the tree for another year, during which time he would tend the tree by digging about it and putting on manure.[20] Although the

14. Jeremias, *Parables*, 170; M.I. Boucher, *The Mysterious Parables: A Literary Study* (CBQMS, 6; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1977), 131.

15. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 82. "When you come into the land and plant all kinds of trees for food, then you shall count their fruit as forbidden; three years it shall be forbidden to you, it must not be eaten. And in the fourth year all their fruit shall be holy, an offering of praise to the LORD. But in the fifth year you may eat of their fruit, that they may yield more richly for you: I am the LORD your God" (Lev 19:23-25).

16. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 336; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 269; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 263.

17. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 81-82.

18. R.C.H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1946), 726-29; Telford, *Barren Temple*, 227.

19. Luise Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus* (trans. Linda M. Maloney: Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 63.

20. Hedrick claims that the petitioner is not an orchardist who specializes in the care of trees, but a vintner who specializes in the care of grape vines in that he proposes realistic measures in accordance with the farming manuals at that time. C.W. Hedrick, "An Unfinished Story about a Fig Tree in a Vineyard (Luke 13:6-9)," 182.

vinedresser is not convinced whether or not the tree will bear fruit by his special tending, he at least has good expectations of it bearing fruit. The ellipsis of the apodosis not only creates an aposiopesis which allows the reader to ponder whether the tree could survive another year, but is made clear by the vinedresser's second statement to the owner (v. 9b).[21] Instead of saying "if not, I will cut it down, as you have directed me to do," the vinedresser says that "you, the owner, will cut it down." It is a polite imperative or an expression of approval rather than sarcasm or insubordination.[22] The emphasis of this verse (v. 9) is put on the possibility that the owner grants a period of grace to the tree, but that period is limited as one year, if the owner approves the vinedresser's suggestion. In the parable, the judgment is not cancelled, but merely postponed. The delay here becomes a call for repentance like Rom 2:4 where the riches of God's kindness and forbearance and patience lead to repentance.

4-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

The church fathers had easily allegorized the parable as description of the Jews, human morality or the church. While Ambrose sees the vineyard as the Jewish people, the fig tree as the synagogue with the Lord coming three times seeking fruit, and the vinedresser as Peter. Augustine views the vineyard as the world, the fig tree as the human race, the three times coming as God's relation with humanity before the Law, under the Law and under grace, the gardener as saints in the church, and the cultivation and fertilization as teaching on humility and sorrow for sin.[23] Such an allegorizing of the parable still appears inevitably in the commentaries and interpretations of recent exegetes.[24] Blomberg deals with the parable as a simple allegory with three specific points of comparison in which he sees the vineyard as Israel, the owner as God and the tree as Israel's leaders, neglecting other elements in the

21. The usage of an aposiopesis is attested well in both Semitic and Classical Greek sources. Marshall, *Luke*, 556; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 91.
22. Marshall, *Luke*, 556.

23. Ambrose, *Traité sur l'Evangile de S. Luc*, ed. Gabriel Tissot (2 vols.; Sources Chrétiennes 45, 52; Paris: Cerf, 1956-58), 2:67-72; Augustine, *Sermon 110* (PL 38, cols. 638-39); S.L. Wailes, *Medieval Allegories of Jesus' Parables* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 220-25.
24. A.B. Bruce, *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ: A Systematic and Critical Study of the Parables of Our Lord* (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1886), 432; B.T.D. Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Study* (Cambridge: University Press, 1937), 115-16; Derrett, "Fig Trees in the New Testament," *in Midrash in Action and As A Literary Device Vol. 2 of Studies in the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 249-65; Madeleine Boucher, *The Mysterious Parable: A Literary Study* (CBQMS 6; Washington: CBA, 1977), 34-35, *The Parables* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983), 138-40.; K.E. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 81; Jones, *The Teaching of the Parables*, 121-24; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 268.

parable, namely the three years and the vinedresser. For Blomberg the allegory in the parable presents imminent judgment over Israel's religious leaders and God's mercy offered for a short while.[25]

On the contrary, Scott strives neither to allegorize, nor to moralize the parable. He assumes that the parable also has strong metaphorical and symbolic possibilities from his basic stance that all parables indicate the kingdom. For Scott the ellipsis of the first apodosis in v. 9 like the kingdom creates hope for the tree on the reader's part, that is, "the ellipsis creates a tension for a hearer. Is there hope possible, or is this tree barren? Can the miracle of birth come from a barren fig tree?"[26] The only hope in this situation keeps on manuring, "What else is there to do?"[27] But I cannot see any suggestion of the kingdom in the parable. He elicits the kingdom from what the parable does not say. His discovery that the ellipsis is the kingdom is not only a hermeneutical leap from the parable to kingdom, but his own personal response to the parable on basis of his general assumption that all parables point to the kingdom.

On the other hand, in another reading of the parable, Hedrick assumes that if the owner decides to cut the tree down, it becomes a story about the faulty judgment of a vineyard owner or a judgment about incompetence and irresponsibility of the owner and the vinedresser who have never taken any measures for three years in order to bear fruit. He claims, therefore, that in this sense, the cutting down of the tree is unjustified. He concludes that the parable is a story about hope that the tree may be improved, taking some examples not only in the following story that the most hopeless situation concludes with positive results such as 13:10-13, 13:18-19 and 13:20-21, but in the Old Testament holding out hope in a situation. For Hedrick hope operates as an open system on all those who are evil and the good, the pious and impious without discrimination, like the word of Jesus in Matt 5:45.[28] It is quite right for him to put the main emphasis of the parable on hope. But he not only fails to consider the allegory, moral lesson and metaphor in the parable, but also makes the parable tenuous because of his insistence on a realistic narrative about a problem in farm management.

In the parable there are three main points: the figs that the farmer expects, cutting the tree without fruit down according to the commandment of the farmer and a potential additional

25. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 269.
26. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 338.
27. Ibid., 338.
28. Hedrick, "An Unfinished Story about a Fig Tree in a Vineyard (Luke13:6-9)," 188, 190-192.

year by suggestion of the vinedresser, namely the fruit as God’s people, judgment and mercy. The parable is clearly a warning of imminent judgment and a merciful call for the repentance of Israel offered for a short while.

5. The Great Banquet (14: 15-24)

5-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

The Great Banquet appears in a dining scene in the house of one of the Pharisees. The setting in 14:1 also provides a stage for the following stories: The healing and teaching about the Sabbath (14:1-6), a lesson to the guests regarding places of honour (14:7-11), and a lesson to the host about the proper choice of guests (14:12-14). 14:1-24 has, therefore, literary unity in the setting of 14:1. All its sub-units except for the Sabbath story (14:1-6) are dinner episodes which has dinners, hosts, guests and action surrounding the table.[1] The parable also parallels 13:22-34, which challenges misconceptions about election held by Jesus' contemporaries. 13:28-29 in particular functions to some extent as an introduction to these banqueting sayings, and 13:34 anticipates the refusals of those who do not come to the banquet in the parable.

The parable of the Great Banquet has some affinities with the parable of the Wedding Banquet in the Gospel of Matthew (22:1-14) and logion 64 of the Gospel of Thomas, though there are many conspicuous differences among them too. In Matthew, the host is a king who gives a wedding banquet for his son, and in Luke the host is a man who gives a great banquet for many persons. For Matthew there are several slaves who are sent twice to the invited guests, whereas for Luke there is one servant who is sent once to the invited guests. After the rejection of the invited guests, Matthew has servants sent to only one group, but in Luke, the servant is sent first to the streets of the city and then to the highways outside. Furthermore, only Matthew has the servants attacked and killed, and the destruction of the city follows, and only in Matthew is a guest without a suitable garment sent into outer darkness. Conclusively, the parable of the Wedding Banquet in Matthew focuses on obstinate rejection and judgment, while the parable in Luke reflects concern for the outcast. Since there are similarities and differences between the Matthean and Lukan versions, it raises the question of the source as to whether the two versions are based on Q as common source, or on independent traditions. I believe that it is most likely that they stem from independent traditions (M and L), due to their many differences.[2] If one takes the view that the parable derived from Q,[3] one would

1. Willi Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14* (SNTSMS 85; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 15.

2. A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Luke* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), 359; Ellis, *Luke*, 194; H. Palmer, "Just Married Cannot Come," *NovT* 18 (1976), 255; Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 93; B. Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, 203; Jeremias, *Parables*, 63; E. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus: Introduction and Interpretation*, 166, Kistemaker, *Parables*, 198; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 237; J.E. Breech, *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man*, 114-24; A.J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000),

need to explain the main differences between them in order to be sufficiently convinced. Even though D. Hill claims that the divergences in the accounts show the freedom of oral tradition transmitted, it is not as reasonable as we might expect.[4] On the other hand, in the Gospel of Thomas, the invited guests are merchants, and the parable that has four excuses ends with a warning to the rich. Unlike the parable in Luke, the parable not only has an extension of excuses, but also a change of theme. It is therefore difficult to view the version of the Gospel of Thomas as the earlier one. Rather it is better to see that the parable reflects portions of Luke.[5]

Jeremias suggests that the parable is based on the story of the tax collector Bar Ma'yan.[6] Although the story is similar to the parable in that the invited guests refuse to come to a banquet and the poor are brought in so that the food might not be wasted, the story is quite different from the parable in its intentions. The Jewish story tries to explain how such an immoral person as a tax-collector could have been received such a good burial. That is why Bar Ma'yan has good deeds that he invited the poor to his banquet so as not to waste the food. We don't find such an intention in the parable, nor is the host in the parable a tax collector.

In contrast to this, Braun proposes that ancient symposia and symposiastic writings provide the background for the parable.[7] Symposia are, however, very different from the banquet in the parable in several ways. Symposia were generally festive meals with a place for philosophical discussion. Writings on symposia have long narratives and most people present at the meal contribute to its writings. The banquet stories in the Gospels, in contrast to symposia are brief and only Jesus gives an opinion. In this respect, I do not think that ancient

---

335; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 299, 310.

3. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 111; Fitzmyer, T*he Gospel According to Luke*, 1052; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 131; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 93, 141; Ivor H. Jones, *The Matthean Parables: A Literary and Historical Commentary* (NovTSup 80, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995),401; D. Hagner, *Matthew* (2 vols. WBC. Dallas: Word, 1993), 627; Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 129-30; Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 53.

4. D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (London: Oliphants, 1972), 301; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21-28: Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 60.

5. J.D. McCaughey, "Two Synoptic Parables in the Gospel of Thomas," *AusBR* 8 (1960), 24-28; Robert M. Grant and David N. Freedman, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1960), 170; C.L. Blomberg, "Tradition and Redaction in the Parables of Jesus," in ed., David Wenham, *The Jesus Tradition outside the Gospels* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 177-205, here 187-89.

6. Jeremias, *Parables*, 178-80.

7. W. Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*, 136-44; "Symposium or Anti-Symposium? Reflections on Luke 14:1-24," *TJT* 8 (1992), 70-84; C.L. Blomberg, *Contagious Holiness: Jesus' Meals with Sinners* (NSBT 19; Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 2005), 86-96; E. Springs Steele, "Luke 11:37-54-A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?" *JBL* 103 (1984), 379-94. Steele concludes that "in all three periscopes (Luke 7:36-50, 14:1-24 and 11:37-54) the Lukan redactor has created an appropriate setting for them based on the model of Hellenistic symposia."

symposia give the background for understanding the parable. Just as the story of the tax collector Bar Ma'yan is very different from the parable, so ancient symposia is also very different from the parable.

5-2. The Analysis of the Parable

Jesus, as I have noted previously, often makes use of an exclamation as the occasion for further teaching (9:57; 11:45; 12:13; 13:1).[8] The exclamation of one of the dinner guests, here as elsewhere, gives rise to the occasion for the parable. His declaration in v. 15 to some extent seems to expose his conviction that he will participate in the eschatological banquet. Jesus then begins to tell the parable of a man who gives a great banquet to which many people are invited. Even though the Greek term, δεῖπνον, could signify either the main meal of the evening or a banquet, in the parable δεῖπνον μέγα is a standing figure for the messianic banquet as metaphorical significance which is based on the Old Testament and Jewish tradition.[9] To address the wrong conviction of the anonymous guest, Jesus might intend to show that the time for the banquet has arrived and is not just a future event, and people must immediately accept the invitation. Since the food for the banquet is now ready, the host sends his servant to summon the invited guests to the banquet. Instead of "it" in v. 17, various modern versions prefer to read it as "all", that is to say, "all or everything is ready" (KJV, RSV, NEB, NIV, NRSV). Given the fact that the term does not appear in other very important ancient witnesses (P75, B, ℵ), it may be right to read it as "it is ready".[10] The term ἤδη lays special emphasis on the time, that is, "now" as the arrival of the banquet, and indicates that table fellowship with the earthly Jesus prefigures the eschatological banquet. In this regard, the eschatological banquet is now ready. Now is the day of salvation.[11] The parable assumes a double invitation, and this practice is attested in both Jewish and Roman

8. Opinions are divided as to whether this could either be part of the tradition or a redactional advice. Given the preceding texts on the level of narrative, it is most likely to be an original part of this narrative. See Marshall, *Luke*, 587; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According* to *Luke*, 1052, 1054; B.H. Young, *Jesus and his Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 169.

9. Psalm 23:5; Isaiah 25:6-9; 2 Esdras 2:37-41; 1 Enoch 62:14; 2 Enoch 42:5; 2 Bar. 29:1-8. Bailey takes Isaiah 25:6-9 of them as even more informative thing. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 89.

10. Hultgren insists to read it as "it is ready," presenting three reasons: "ancient witnesses, the Matthean parallel and the fact that the shorter reading is to be preferred." Hultgren, *Parables*, 332.

11. Nolland, *Luke*, 775; Jeremias, *Parables*, 180; Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus*, 92; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 95; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 98.

culture.[12] The first invitation is to let people know about the event and seeks an initial acceptance, the second tells the invited guests that it is ready and they should come to the banquet. In view of the host's earnest preparation and desire for the guests, refusal would be a terribly discourteous behaviour.

According to v. 16, there are many persons invited to the banquet. Of them only three excuses, as typical instances, are given in vv. 18-20. It is not easy to determine whether the parable follows a principle of oral storytelling in Jewish folklore that repeats the basic pattern with almost predictable regularity, over two or three times.[13] In any event, what is clear here is that the same pattern is repeated in the three excuses, although the third excuse diverges from the same pattern because of the omission of the second element in the pattern.[14] The first excuse is related to the inspection of a recently acquired field. The second excuse is connected with the test of the recently purchased five pairs of oxen. And the third excuse relates to recent marriage. With respect to these excuses, Derrett and Paul Ballard suggest that the excuses in the parable came not only from the exemptions for Holy War listed in Deut. 20:5-7 and 24:5, but also a midrash on *Targum Zeph*. 1.7-18.[15] An excuse for not attending war, though, is not consistent with the excuses not to attend a dinner party of the parable. Or rather, the military language is in Matthew.[16]

All the three excuses are flat refusals to come to the prepared banquet, and are flimsy in nature.[17] The excuses present a lack of interest in the banquet rather than a paucity of persuasion. In this regard, Jesus would want to point out that with the same feeble excuses, people are in the same way expressing their indifference to God's invitation to the kingdom

12. See Philo, Opif. *Mund*. 78; *Lam. Rab*. 4.2; Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 3.12; Esth 5:8; 6:14; Sir 13:9; Plutarch, *Mor*. 511D-E.

13. B.W. Longenecker, "A Humorous Jesus? Orality, Structure and Characterisation in Luke 14:15-24, and Beyond," *BibInt* 16 (2008), 179-204, here 186-87. For a concrete instance, see H. Schwartz, *Elijah's Violin and Other Jewish Folktales* (New York: Penguin, 1987). In terms of this pattern, the parable of Good Samaritan and the parable of the talents belong to the 2+1 pattern and the parable of the sower, the 3+3 pattern.

14. Longenecker, "A Humorous Jesus? Orality, Structure and Characterisation in Luke 14:15-24, and Beyond," 188. Even Linnemann rejects the third excuse as secondary because of the difference in form. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus*, 89-90.

15. See Derrett, "The Parable of the Great Supper," In *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), 126-55; P.H. Ballard, "Reasons for Refusing the Great Supper," *JTS* 23 (1972), 341-50.

16. H. Palmer, "Just Married Cannot Come," *NovT* 18 (1976), 241-57. It is also not probable that the parable alludes to Deuteronomy to highlight the urgency of the present situation. See Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 142.

17. Bailey expounds that in the Middle East one never buys land and oxen without thoroughly inspecting or testing them before purchasing them. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 95-98.

through Jesus' ministry. Furthermore, the parable accords with Jesus' teaching elsewhere about the danger of possessions and domestic ties in following Jesus.

The host became angry when his servant came back and reported the news to him. Then the host sent out his servant into the streets and alleys of the town to bring the poor, the crippled, the blind and the lame into the banquet.[18] In spite of carrying out the order of the host, the servant finds that there is still room at the banquet. So the master sent him out once again to the roadside and country lanes to seek out the poor.

The main issue here is how to understand the term ἀνάγκασον. While Bailey seeks to explain the need of the constraint on the basis of the Middle Eastern culture, in which the unexpected invitation must be refused,[19] Forbes interprets it in the light of the presence of the kingdom, namely, "it expresses the saving will of God, calling people to proleptic participation in the eschatological banquet."[20] Either way, the constraint should be understood as persuasion, not compulsion, given the fact that such a constraint does not fit either the teaching or the action of Jesus as a whole.

The primary questions here arise from an understanding of the various 'sendings'. Interpreters argue that the first sending indicates the mission to Israel, and the two later sendings point to an ongoing mission to Israel and to the Gentile mission, in particular, on the grounds that the servant is sent beyond the town and that there is still room at the banquet.[21] Of course, they could elicit the additional evidence elsewhere from 2:32, 3:6 that indicates the universalist perspective, and 13:28-29, where Jesus himself reflected on a Gentile mission.[22] On the other hand, irrespective of mission, the additional sendings could only have to do with an emphasis on God's concern for the poor and the marginalized of society. It is better to understand the sendings as God's concern for the poor and the marginalized of society, since the substitute guests here are obviously the poor and disabled, not the Gentiles.

In v. 24 the parable concludes with the statement that 'none of those men who were invited shall taste my banquet'.[23] The plural pronoun ὑμῖν indicates a shift to address those

18. The list recalls those listed at 7:22 and appears in 14:13 as well.

19. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 108.

20. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 102.

21. Jeremias, *Parables*, 64-65; Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 297; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 2:1053; Francois Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 15:1-19:27)* (EKKNT 3/3; Düsseldorf: Benziger, 2001), 2:506.

22. S.G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (SNTSMS 23; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 1-28.

23. It is not valid to claim that the parable here shows a tendency of anti-Semitism as God's rejection of Israel, since the parable could include other Jews among the substitute guests, not Gentiles and has no allusions that

outside the story. Depending on who here addresses the statement, the opinions are divided into two at least. If the pronouncement in v. 24 is an address of the host, it then conveys no strong threat to the audience of Jesus, nor to those in the banquet who have snubbed him. On the other hand, Jeremias who sanctions the above opinion argues that it could take a sense only in the occasion of addressing it to the excluded Jew from the eschatological banquet.[24] Of course, as Linnemann claims, it may be that the master "steps as it were on to the apron of the stage and addresses the audience" as rhetorical device.[25] It is, however, most likely that Jesus would have addressed the pronouncement[26] and if so, the Christological implications are very significant.

5-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

On the grounds of Greco-Roman literary and culture, Braun views the parable as the story retold by Luke about the conversion of the host. The host gives a dinner to the wealthy urban elite, namely the prosperous stratum in a quest for honour, but when his invitation is declined to damage his reputation and honour, he discards the whole system of valuation on the basis of honour and shame and transfers his social life to a different group. Given this view, for him the parable is directed at the rich in Luke's church who are reluctant to hang around with the poor in the church in order to maintain their social status.[27] To focus on the change of the host is a distortion of the parable in that he fails to consider the eschatological context and the emphasis on election language, and in that I cannot find out any allusion in the parable that the host gave the banquet in a quest for honour.

Viewing the banquet in the parable as the eschatological banquet, the parable then serves to emphasize the presence of the kingdom in the ministry of Jesus, in particular by Him eating with sinners and tax-collectors. It is meant that the eschatological banquet is already ready, and not only a future event like the anonymous guest thought in v. 15. 'Come now,

---

God has certainly rejected Israel. For more detailed contradiction, see Victor E. Vine, "Luke 14:15-24 and Anti-Semitism," *ExpTim* 102 (1991), 262-63.

24. Jeremias, *Parables*, 171.

25. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus*, 90.

26. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*, 109.

27. Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*, 64, 84-85, 127-31. For the same view, see Richard L. Rohrbaugh, "The Pre-Industrial City in Luke-Act: Urban Social Relations," in ed., Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 137-47; Schottroff, *The Parable of Jesus*, 204-9. Scott also argues that the parable reverses and subverts the system of honour, since the host who gave the banquet loses his honour and joins the poor, unlike the expectation of audience to the messianic banquet that those who have suffered at the hands of Israel's enemies will be restored to honour by the power of God. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 173-74.

because it is ready.' People should be responding eagerly to the summons, but they are too busy with their mundane affairs. Any excuse is inappropriate as a reason why they cannot come to the eschatological banquet when one faces the kingdom. On the other hand, the parable destroys the assumption that they as God's elect would be at the messianic banquet as one's own right. The parable also provides an unexpected answer against the conviction of the anonymous guest in v. 15 that he would be at the messianic banquet. It is also closely associated with 13:28-30, 34. The parable is showing the needs of human response with divine initiative, allowing people to exercise their free choice. In any case, the parable functions as a challenge and warning with regard to the presence of the kingdom and the contemporary predominant understanding of election.[28]

The parable also shows not only God's concern for outcasts, but functions as an introduction of discipleship that follows in 14:25-34, warning about the danger of wealth and possessions and family ties as an obstacle to discipleship, making the point that there is no more important thing in the world than attending the kingdom banquet.

28. This thought of election in the parable contrasts not only with the attitude of the Jewish religious authorities, but also with the standpoint of the Qumran community in that they forbade the disabled to attend the community meals, such as the lame, paralyzed, deaf, or blind person (1QM 7,4-6; 1QSa 2,6-10). See J.A. Sanders, "The Ethic of Election in Luke's Great Banquet Parable," in ed., James L. Crenshaw and John T. Willis, *Essays in Old Testament Ethics* (New York: Ktav, 1974), 247 -71, especially 261-263

6. The Parable of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin and the Prodigal Son (15: 1-32)

6-1. The Literary Context of Luke 15

Luke 15 is relevant to ch. 14 in that they share a banquet image. Jesus heals a man with dropsy on one Sabbath day, and then, by v. 24, with the banquet image he teaches people who are dining with him at the house of a ruler who belonged to the Pharisees. In addition, the Pharisaic attitude toward Jesus' actions in 14:1-6, correlate with 15:2 where the Pharisees and the scribes murmured, saying 'this man receives sinners and eats with them.' Furthermore, the phrase at the end of ch. 14 where "he who has ears to hear, let him hear" is naturally linked with the beginning verse of ch. 15 with the repetition of the Greek word, ἀκούειν. Here there seems to be a concrete example of the pronouncement in 14:35 as to who has ears to hear. According to 15:1, there is no doubt that the tax collectors and sinners are the ones who have ears to hear.

In regard to the relevance between ch. 15 and ch. 16, there have been some suggestions, especially in structural and thematic unity.[1] In order to find a similarity between ch. 15 and ch. 16, theologians concentrate on the connections between the parable of the Prodigal Son, apart from the first two parables in ch. 15 and the parables in ch. 16. Austin argues that there are some remarkable similarities between the parable of the Prodigal Son and the Dishonest Manager: Both parables draw a relationship between two people; in each story another person's property is used recklessly, and in the action to evade a predicament, each uses a monologue which serves as crucial turning points. For Austin, the prodigal's act of self-interest, mirrors the dishonest acts of the manager. Apart from the fact that the dishonest manager retained his former position as manager, the rest of the arguments give us an insight into understanding both parables.[2] Kilgallen contends that, just as the younger son in the parable of the Prodigal Son has the shrewdness to find and choose means to save his life by returning to his father, so the manager in the parable of the Dishonest Manager also has the shrewdness to find the means which lead to his salvation, namely a way to entry into the kingdom of God. For him, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus also urges the Pharisees to choose obedience to the Law as the shrewdness, that is, the means to enter into the kingdom of God.[3] His point of view is considerably persuasive in terms of the thematic unity between ch. 15 and ch. 16.

---

1. M.R. Austin, "The Hypocritical Son," *EvQ* 57 (1985), 307-15; J.J. Kilgallen, "Luke 15 and 16: A Connection," *Bib* 78 (1997), 369-76.
2. Austin, "The Hypocritical Son," 311-13, here 315.
3. Kilgallen, "Luke 15 and 16: A Connection," 373-76.

In addition to Kilgallen's view, I think that the lesson about possessions is a coupling ring between the two chapters, that is, the proper attitude to wealth and a right use of possessions. This common theme clearly comes to the surface in all three parables. In this respect, whoever reads the parables can easily take up the common theme from it as well. Each character in three parables is recklessly prodigal with property for their own self-contentment, regardless of its ownership. Their covetousness toward possessions eventually causes them to fall into a predicament. Taking all that into consideration, we can say with little doubt that the lesson about possessions is a common theme connecting the two chapters.

With respect to the relationship between the three parables in 15:1-32, it is more forceful to claim that there is a plain unity between these three parables rather than to isolate one from another one. We can highlight their essential unity by virtue of three features: First, on the literary level, these three parables are associated with one another not only in the introductory verses in 1-3, but in an *inclusio* with two complaints from the beginning and end of ch. 15. In Luke's use of the singular, παραβολήν in v.3, he at least understood the three parables as a single unit and wanted readers to read the three as a literary unit. In addition, an *inclusio* that is constituted by the complaint of the Pharisees and scribes (vv. 1-2) and the complaint of the elder son (vv. 28-30), here functions in the role of tying together the three parables.[4] Second, the three parables share a common theme and setting: That is to say, God's joy in response to a sinner's repentance is a common theme, and the setting of meals and eating as a common setting. Third, there is a common structure in the events: A sequence of loss, recovery and celebration. In view of these reasons, we can say that Luke at least expects ch 15 to be read as a literary unit in mind.

There have been several claims concerning the relationship between the first and second parables. While there are common aspects among them in that the Lost Sheep may have been drawn from Q, the main differences are that the Lost Coin may have been taken from Q, L and a Lukan composition or a composition of the early church.[5] We could of course add a

4. K.E. Bailey, *Jacob and the Prodigal: How Jesus Retold Israel's Story* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 60; Liebenberg, *The Language o f the Kingdom and Jesus: Parable, Aphorism, and Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the Synoptic Tradition and the Gospel of Thomas*, 416; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1076; Stephen C. Barton, "Parables on God's Love and Forgiveness (Luke 15:1-32)," in ed., R.N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus Parables* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000), 199-216, here 201.

5. In regard to the origination of the Lost Coin, for being from Q, see Breech, *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man*, 80; J. Lambrecht, *Once More Astonished: The Parables of Jesus* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 38, for being taken from L, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1073, for being drawn from a Lukan composition and the early church, see Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History*

possibility that both Matthew and Luke indicate independent versions of the Lost Sheep. In any case, what is important here, irrespective of what side we take, is that the common points and differences of the two parables function as intensification and complement each other.[6]

6-2. The Parable of the Lost Sheep (4-7)

6-2-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

Vv. 1-3 serves as a common introduction not only to the parable of the Lost Sheep, but also to the other two parables in ch. 15, since the situation of the criticism of the Pharisees and scribes is a suitable background to all three parables, either directly or indirectly, properly linking to the three parables. In relation to the authenticity of the introductory verses, Jeremias contends that through linguistic analysis Luke composed the introductory setting in light of 5:29-32.[7] Neale also considers these verses as Luke's redaction, because it lacks the features of a specific event and has an artificial feeling.[8] In contrast, Farmer argues that 15:1-2 is pre-Lukan, recognizing to what extent the fact that the linguistic evidence[9] may alone mark Luke's redaction of existing material.[10] In any case, what is important here, is the fact that this introduction is closely linked to the three parables and is appropriate here, whether written by Luke or by a pre-Lukan redactor.

The table fellowship at which Jesus receives sinners and eats with them, at the outset of Jesus' ministry (see 5:29) provides the setting for the conflict with Pharisees and scribes. In early Judaism and in antiquity, the common table carries a symbolic meaning for initiating

---

and Allegory, 140; R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 71, and for independent versions, see J. Jeremias, "Tradition und Redaktion in Lukas 15," *ZNW* 62 (1971), 172-89, especially 181; W.R. Farmer, "Notes on a Literary and Form-Critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material Peculiar to Luke," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 305.

6. H. Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1986), 139.

7. Jeremias, "Tradition und Redaktion in Lukas 15," 172-89, especially 185, 189.

8. D.A. Neale, *None but the Sinners: Religious Categories in the Gospel of Luke* (JSNTSup 58; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 155. For the same proposal, see, Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 193, 334-35; Robert L. Brawley, *The Pharisees in Luke-Acts: Luke's Address to Jews and His Irenic Purpose* (PhD dissertation, Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1978), 66-68.

9. Cadbury presents εἶπεν followed by πρός with the object in the accusative case in v. 3 as characteristic of Luke which appears in 10:29. Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγων in v. 3 also parallels to εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος, κύριε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην in 12:41. Henry J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969), 169, 202. Jeremias sees the introductory verses of ch. 15 as simply a considerable adaptation by Luke, not Lukan, indicating controversial points regarding the contention that the introduction is Lukan. Jeremias, *Parables*, 84.

10. W.R. Farmer, "Notes on a Literary and Form-critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material Peculiar to Luke," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 301-316, 302; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 111.

and maintaining sociability and the bonds of a common identity.[11] For the Pharisees, the common table was especially a means to make a distinction between the holy (themselves), and the impure (sinners or tax-collectors), in a world in which people are constantly in danger of being defiled. In particular, they believed that contact with 'sinners' not only could make them impure, but also shared their world, although the label of 'sinners' has a quiet fluctuation.[12] Such attitudes are well attested in the Mishnah and other rabbinic sources.[13] These very attitudes caused the Pharisees and scribes to become indignant over Jesus' behaviour that has the table fellowship with the tax-collectors and sinners. In this respect, the parables in ch. 15 are clearly designed to confront such an attitude.

To whom does Jesus tell the parables in ch. 15? According to v. 3, to 'them' Jesus told a parable. In the first two verses, we could just as well see 'them' as a reference to tax-collectors and sinners, as well as the Pharisees and scribes, though, at a glance, given the straightforward contents of the three parables, Jesus seems to direct his stories to the former rather than the latter.[14] It is meaningful to look at the three parables from each group's point of view, since there are extreme contrasts between the groups of characters in the introductory verses: Those that respond positively to Jesus and gather to hear him, and on the other hand, those who react negatively to Jesus and grumble about Jesus receiving sinners and eating with them.

The parable of the Lost Sheep appears in both Matthew and Luke. Even though there is crucial similarity in the two versions, interpreters find many more prominent differences between Matthew and Luke. The parable, above all, functions as an exhortation to instruct the church's leaders to be responsible for the flock, insomuch as Matthew applies the parable to a church context.[15] According to statistics on these two stories, of the sixty-five words in Matthew and the eighty-nine words in Luke, the two gospels share only fourteen common words.[16] The argument as to which is the more original remains contentious without a certain consensus.[17] It is not right that Matthew's is the more original on the grounds that the parable

11. H. Moxnes, "Meals and the New Community in Luke," *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok* 51 (1986), 158-67; Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, Massachusetts; Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 364.

12. J. Neusner, "Two Pictures of the Pharisees: Philosophical Circle or Eating Club," *AusBR* 64 (1982), 525-38.

13. *m. Demai* 2.2-3; *Lam. Rab*. 4.3-4; 1QSa 2.2-21; Sir 13:17; *m. Hagigah* 2.7; *b. Pesahim* 49b.

14. J.J. Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke* (SubBib 32, Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2008), 97.

15. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 113.

16. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 99.

17. For the priority of the Matthean version, see R. Bultmann, *History*, 171; B. Smith, *The Parables of the*

in Matthew has a more succinct form and an element of uncertainty. At any rate, it is not important here to consider the question of priority, for almost all attempts to establish which is the earlier version tend to be spurious rather than resting on solid evidence. It is reasonable to consider that Jesus told the parable on more than one occasion to different audiences for different purposes. It is therefore more likely to consider that they are independent versions of the parable, with a considerable adaptation by either each evangelist or oral tradition.

The parable also appears in the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Truth. Both the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Truth are gnostic in that the largest sheep symbolizes the gnostic Christian, and the restoration of the lost one means to become perfect.[18] Although some argue that the Gospel of Thomas 107 is based on independent tradition,[19] the fact that it depends on the Synoptics, as I have already noted earlier, is widely accepted, and affirmed strongly by Bruce Chilton.[20] On the other hand, with respect to the Gospel of Truth, Christopher M. Tuckett claims convincingly, on the basis of Van Unnik's theory,[21] that the

---

Synoptic Gospels, 189; E. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus: Introduction and Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1966), 67; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1074 and Drury, *Parables*, 139. For the priority of the Lukan version, see C.G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1968), 2:987; Jeremias, *Parables*, 40; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 153; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 406; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 148 and Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 114.

18. *Gos. Thom.* 107: Jesus said "The Kingdom is like a shepherd who had a hundred sheep. One of them, the largest, went astray. He left the ninety-nine and looked for that one until he found it. When he had gone to such trouble, he said to the sheep, 'I care for you more than the ninety-nine.'" (James M. Robinson, *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (3d ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), 137.

Gospel of Truth 31-31: He is the shepherd who left behind the ninety-nine sheep that were not lost. He went searching for the one that had gone astray. He rejoiced when he found it, for ninety-nine is a number that is in the left hand that holds it. But when the one is found, the entire number passes to the right (hand). As that which lacks the one-that is, the entire right(hand)-draws what was deficient and takes it from the left-hand side brings (it) to the right, so too the number becomes one hundred. It is the sign of the one who is in their sound; it is the Father (Quoted from *NHLE* 46.).

19. Jeremias, *Parables*, 24; W.L. Peterson, "The Parable of the Lost Sheep in the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics," *NovT* 23 (1981), 128-47; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 144 and Stephen J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1993), 71, contends that the Thomas version is more primitive than those in the canonical Gospels on the grounds that it contains no allegorizing, but his argument is contradicted in the sense that there is too allegorizing, for instance, the sheep which is the largest and most valued.

20. Bruce Chilton, "The Gospel according to Thomas as a Source of Jesus' Teaching," in ed., David Wenham, *The Jesus Tradition outside the Gospels* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 155-76, here 158.

21. He, after looking at the Gospel of Truth, concludes that it seems that the writer of the Gospel of Truth used practically and widely New Testament Canon, including Pauline Epistles, Hebrews, Revelation, Acts, 1 John and 1 Peter. Van Unnik, "The Gospel of Truth and the New Testament," in ed., F.L. Cross, *The Jung Codex* (London: Mowbray 1955), 79-129, here 122. The Gospel of Truth is counted widely to be a Christian gnostic text with Valentinian affinities at the middle of the second century.

version in the Gospel of Truth may be derived from Matthew's gospel alone.[22] In the light of this, it is desirable to see both the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Truth as secondary versions.

6-2-2. The Analysis of the Parable

The phrase, τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν, at the outset of the parable of the Lost Sheep makes the audience imagine the proper action of the shepherd in general rather than appealing to the personal experience of the hearers.[23] The suggestion that the point in this case is the point 'if you… how much more God?', found in v. 7 matches well.[24] It has been suggested by some theologians that Jesus made a sharp attack on the Pharisees with the use of a negative shepherd analogy on the grounds that shepherding was a despised occupation, since it was believed that they did not follow the law faithfully by driving their flocks into foreign land and embezzling the produce of the flock.[25] However, given the fact that the shepherd image is used widely in the Old Testament in several ways,[26] there is little doubt that the Pharisees had the OT shepherd image in mind, more than that of it being a despised trade at Jesus' time. In order to designate gods, kings, and other officers, the image of the shepherd is commonly used in the literatures of antiquity, such as writings from Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome.[27]

The one hundred sheep in the parable may be a figure devised to make the lost one immediately more conspicuous, namely, one of one hundred sheep like one of ten coins, not one of eighty-seven sheep rather than simply a picture on a grand scale and exaggeration. It is not important whether one hundred sheep is a small or large number of that time, but also it takes substantial risks to conjecture on the grounds of such reasoning: the shepherd has an

22. Christopher M. Tuckett, "Synoptic Tradition in the Gospel of Truth and the Testimony of Truth," *JTS* 35 (1984), 133-45, here 133-34.

23. Cf. 11:5, 11; 12:25; 14:28 and 17:7.

24. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 114.

25. Jeremias, *Parables*, 133; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 147; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 115. See also *m. Qid*. 4.14; *b. Sanh*. 25b, *Midr. Ps*. 23.2: "R. Jose bar Hanina taught: In the whole world you find no occupation more despised than that of the shepherd, who all his days walks about with his staff and his pouch. Yet David presumed to call the Holy One, blessed be He, a shepherd!"

26. In the OT the shepherd image presents largely as God's tender care of his people (Pss 28:9; 80:1; Jer 31:10; Ezek 34:15, 31; Mic 7:14), leaders of the people (2 Sam 5:2; 7:7; 1 Chron 11:2; 17:6; Ps 78:71-71; Isa 44:28; Jer 17:16; 23:2, 4; Zech 11:3-5, 7, 9; 11:16-17; 13:7; Ezek 34:1-22; 34:23; 37:24; Mic 5:4) and the eschatological deliverer (Mic 5:2, cf. Matt2:6).

27. Hultgren, *Parables*, 52

assistant for him, or the shepherd is rich.[28] A comparison between ἀπολωλός ('to have lost') and πλανηθῇ ('to have gone astray') shows that the perfect participle in Luke strongly underlines the lost, desperate state of the sheep.

Would a shepherd leave the ninety-nine in the wilderness to seek the one that had been lost? Interpreters' opinions are divided here into a few alternatives: That the shepherd abandoned the ninety-nine sheep, showing that the parable is unreasonable,[29] or God's mercy is a mystery[30] and the shepherd is irresponsible,[31] and that the shepherd did not in fact abandon the ninety-nine sheep, suggesting that they were driven into a cave or left in the care of another,[32] and the ninety-nine sheep should be reckoned in the light of Ezek 34:13-14, 23-25, where the flock is tended securely on the mountains of Israel.[33]

The shepherd is portrayed as the one who seems to act recklessly in an atypical fashion, in which he takes a great risk by leaving the ninety-nine in the wilderness in order to seek out the sheep that has been lost. On a literary level however, it is a means of showing that not only the lost sheep, but each sheep is so valuable that the shepherd takes great risk to find it.[34] If, after taking safe measures for the ninety-nine, the shepherd sets off to seek out the lost sheep, the parable would, in this case, become a commonplace story reducing the value of the lost one and a tension in the story as well. However, it is not important in this story how the security of ninety-nine would be, and whether the shepherd took them to his house, for such matters are not of concern in the story. Parables, like other literary works, are often more concise so as to focus on the point that it wants to convey.

The action of the shepherd when he finds the lost sheep, as he carries the sheep on his

28. While Jeremias sees the one hundred sheep as a medium size, Bailey as large size, but in Bedouin shepherd world today in the Middle East, the one hundred sheep is considerably less on condition that a shepherd alone tends the flock. Jeremias, *Parables*, 133; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 148; Hultgren, *Parables*, 53; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 102.

29. David Buttrick, *Speaking Parables: A Homiletic Guide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 219.

30. F.H. Agnew, "The Parables of Divine Compassion," *BibTod*, 27 (1, 1989), 35-40, here 37-38.

31. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 415-17; Hedrick, *Many Things in Parables: Jesus and His Modern Critics*, 14, 19.

32. E.F.F. Bishop, "The Parable of the Lost or Wandering Sheep: Mattew 18:10-14; Luke 15:3-7," *ATR* 44 (1962), 44-57, here 45, 54; F. Bussby, "Did a Shepherd Leave Sheep upon the Mountains or in the Desert? A Note on Matthew 18:12 and Luke 15:4," *ATR* 44 (1963), 93-94; B. Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, 188, n. 2; Jeremias, *Parables*, 133; Wenham, *The Parables of Jesus: Pictures of Revolution*, 100; and Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 149-50; idem, *Finding the Lost: Cultural Keys to Luke 15* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1992), 72-73.

33. Derrett, "Fresh Light on the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin," *NTS* 26 (1979), 36-60, here 59.

34. Hultgren, *Parables*, 53-54; Stephen C. Barton, "Parables on God's Love and Forgiveness (Luke 15:1-32)," 205; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 105.

shoulders may be commonplace from antecedents in the ancient Near East and the Greco-Roman world,[35] but it nonetheless emphasizes the tender care and compassion of the shepherd, as "he will feed his flock like a shepherd, he will gather the lambs in his arms, he will carry them in his bosom" (Isa. 40:11). So great is his joy at finding the lost one that he calls together his friends and neighbours for a celebration, as described in v. 7. This shows the boundless joy of God. On this, Bailey excessively puts forward the suggestion that the shepherd may have been an employee appointed by the community with responsibility for the sheep, on the grounds that an average family would have between five and fifteen sheep. "However, if this was a community flock we might have expected the pronoun (in v. 6) to read ἡμῶν, not μου."[36] The invitation to friends and neighbours to join in the joy, along with 'to lose' and 'to find' functions as bonding the three parables together.

Leaving aside the argument as to whether λέγω ὑμῖν is derived from Jesus or Luke, it is at least obvious that Luke frequently utilizes it to introduce the application of parables (11:9; 14:24; 15:7, 10; 16:9; 18:8, 14; 19:26). The phrase, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (joy in heaven), may indicate the joy of God, including that of the angels, for in general, "heaven" is a traditional circumlocution for God so as to avoid attributing emotion to God. "There will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance."

Since repentance is mentioned nowhere in the parable, it has been argued that it is a secondary application added either by Luke or by tradition during transmission.[37] It seems to be so, for the sheep and coin are inappropriate symbols of repentance, and are only found here. However, that the application is secondary in such an argument can be refuted by the following points: First of all, for completion of the story, the application is surely necessary and important. If there is no application, the parable would simply contain vague, moral truths. Furthermore, repentance is a major feature of Jesus' message.[38] Although Bailey contends that repentance in Luke 15 presents itself as the acceptance of being found,[39] it is

35. Jack Finegen, *Light from the Ancient Past: The Archaeological Background of Judaism and Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), 478.

36. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 116, n. 41.

37. Nolland thinks that the application was added to the parable to further a mission consciousness in the early church. Nolland, *Luke*, 772, 776; Fitzymer, *Luke*, 1073; F.H. Borsch, *Many Things in Parables: Extravagant Stories of New Community* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 57; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 585.

38. Luke 10:13; 11:32, cf. Matt 4:17; 11:20-21; 12:41 and Mark 1:15.

39. Bailey claims that repentance in the parable is quiet explicit, especially, in the light of Ps. 23:3, Jer. 23:1-8 and Ezek. 34:1-24. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 68-70, 91; *Jacob and the Prodigal: A Study of the Parable of the Prodigal Son in the Light of the Saga of Jacob* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 66-67, 79-82; Linnemann,

over-anxiety about repentance being viewed as a human work.[40] The parable never defines repentance. Rather, the parable underlines God's joy over the lost that is now found. Taking the three parables as a whole, there is a tension with regard to salvation between divine sovereignty in the first two parables, and human response in the third parable.[41]

Can a righteous person who needs no repentance really exist like the above mentions in v. 7? In regard to this question, there are some answers. First, some are indeed righteous in a right relationship with God, since Luke designates so in the sense that is faithful to the law concerning some characters in the Gospel (1:6; 2:25; 23:50; cf. Acts 10:22) without avoiding this term, and Jesus also uses the term with reference to the calling of sinners to repentance (5:31; Mk 2:17; Mt 9:13).[42] Second, since it is posited that no righteous who do not need repentance exist, and the Gospels anticipate that Pharisees also need to repent (cf. 7:30; 11:39-44; 12:1; 16:14-15), the reference in v. 7 is regarded as irony or sarcasm.[43] As far as it is addressed to the Pharisees and scribes, the statement could be taken as irony or sarcasm. Third, the phrase may be mere hyperbole to highlight joy over the one found, not that there is no joy over ninety-nine.[44] Fourth, the term 'righteous' does not mean 'sinless', but merely 'good standing' before God.[45] In this respect, it is highly possible for Jesus to have the more general Jew in view rather than just the hypocrites whom Jesus reproaches for their hypocritical behaviour elsewhere. It is obvious, at the very least, that the term 'righteous' here indicates those who are in a right standing with God, not sinless.

Bailey argues that the parable is framed on OT texts, showing numerous parallels with Ps. 23, Jer. 23:1-8, Ezek. 34 and the Jacob story.[46] His arguments, however, require considerable

---

Parables of Jesus, 72.

40. It depends on how one defines repentance and a sequence of salvation in relation to repentance. Can salvation occur without repentance just as the lost can be merely found? Is repentance a prerequisite for salvation?

41. Blomberg, *Parables*, 81; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 118.

42. Neale says that in the sense of being in the fold, some are righteous. Neale, *None But The Sinners: Religious Categories in the Gospel of Luke*, 163; H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, 227, n.2; W.F. Arndt, *The Gospel According to St Luke* (St Louis: Concordia, 1956), 248.

43. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 89-91; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 369; Jones, *The Teaching of the Parables*, 172; J.M. Trau, "The Lost Sheep: A Living Metaphor," *BibTod* 28 (1990), 277-83, here 281; E.R. Wendland, "Finding Some Lost Aspects of Meaning in Christ's Parables of the Lost- and Found (Luke 15)," *TJ* 17 (1996), 19-65, especially 60; Hultgren, *Parables*, 60.

44. Francis H. Agnew, "The Parables of Divine Compassion," *BibTod* 27 (1, 1989), 35-40, here 37; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1078; Wenham, *The Parables of Jesus: Pictures of Revolution*, 101; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 121.

45. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 182-83; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 108.

46. Bailey, "Psalm 23 and Luke 15: A Vision Expanded," *IBS* 12 (1990), 54-71; *Finding the Lost*, 67-92, 194-

imagination and are unconvincing. In the case of Ps. 23, neither a bad shepherd nor a lost sheep appear, in contrast to his contention.[47] Furthermore, the words, נַפְשִׁי יְשׁוֹבֵב mean merely the sense of reviving life through several times, not the sense of repentance as Bailey's argument, namely, "he brings me back." Even though the parable is more likely based on the entirety of shepherd imagery in the OT, not on a single text, of them Ezek. 34 alone has more similarity with the parable. Ezek 34:4, 16 uses both words in Matthew and Luke respectively to describe the lost sheep, that is, 'to stray' and 'to become lost'. In Ezek 34, God himself will seek out his sheep, care for them, judge their oppressors and raise a Davidic shepherd over them to tend the flock of sheep, thereby carrying the idea of sin and forgiveness, and messianic prophecies.[48]

6-2-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

In view of the fact that the introduction of the parable makes a point of 'if you… how much more God?' through the rhetorical question with a feature of a *fortiori*,[49] it is possible to say that the shepherd's actions and attitudes portray that of God.[50] The point, in this case, is that if a shepherd will go looking for a lost sheep and rejoice when he finds it, how much more will God search for a lost one and rejoice when he finds it? Moreover, it is well attested by the imagery of a sheep and a shepherd in the OT identifying them as God, the leaders and hope for God's people.

The parable also has christological significance, since Jesus' actions are of God. Keeping in mind that Jesus defends his eating with sinners in terms of God's character, that God is like a shepherd searching for the lost, it is very clear that he indeed is performing God's work, as well as reflecting the messianic prophecies as the Davidic shepherd (Ezek. 34:23). He,

---

212; *Jacob and the Prodigal*, 121-218; "Jacob and the Prodigal: A New Identity Story," Theological Review 18 (1997), 54-72.

47. Bailey believes that the shepherd in the parable is a bad shepherd in that Jesus accuses the Jewish leaders through this image, while the shepherd becomes a good shepherd in that the shepherd reflects Jesus' own ministry. Bailey, "Psalm 23 and Luke 15: A Vision Expanded," *IBS* 12 (1990), 54-71; *Finding the Lost*, 67-92, 194-212.

48. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 107.

49. This feature of Luke 15 as a whole makes the culmination of the sequence in the third story, presenting a cherished animal (a sheep), a valued object (a coin) and a treasured person (younger brother) in order. Frans Jozef van Beeck, "Lost and Found in Luke 15: Biblical Interpretation and Self-Involvement," *ExpTime* 114 (12, 2003), 399-404, especially 400.

50. Against this, both Crossan and Scott do not view the shepherd as God, but a seeker who searches for the advent of the kingdom, and a foolish shepherd who gambles all in an uncertain situation, respectively. Crossan, *In Parables*, 72; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 417.

therefore, must associate with sinners, who from a shepherding point of view, are lost so as to seek out and save the lost. Jesus demonstrated that the kingdom is present through his reception and eating with sinners. In this respect, the story is to be indirectly a kingdom parable. On the other hand, in relation to the imagery of a shepherd as the religious leaders of Israel, Bailey's argument is right in that Jesus is here saying that the Pharisees and scribes, as the current religious leaders, have failed to tend the flock of Israel. It is not correct, however, that the responsibility for being lost attributes to the shepherd in the parable on the grounds that in Middle Eastern culture one is reluctant to ascribe blame to oneself,[51] for any portrayal of a bad shepherd is not found in the parable. In any event, it is at least clear, from an audience perspective, that the actions of the shepherd in the parable immediately draw a comparison between the imagery of a shepherd in terms of success and failure. On this level, the parable may charge the religious leaders at that time with not doing their task in searching for the lost.

The parable above all centers around seeking and joy. Audiences should not only see the love of the searcher, that is to say, how much value the shepherd places on the lost by taking the risk of leaving the ninety-nine in the wilderness and laying it on his shoulders, but also the immense joy of heaven in finding the lost on earth: "he calls together his friends and his neighbours, saying to them, Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost," and "there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous people who have no need of repentance" in vv. 6-7. While the love of the searcher is, in particular, concerned with sinners and tax collectors, the great joy of finding the lost has to do more intimately with Pharisees and scribes, implicitly conveying cessation of animosity towards Jesus' actions with sinners.[52] In addition, there is a premium on a soteriological theme that includes even the outcast with limitless grace, thereby showing the concern of God for the marginalized.[53] This is also one of the dominant themes of the Gospel of Luke.

6-3. The Parable of the Lost Coin (8-10)

51. Bailey contends that instead of a saying that 'I' lost the sheep, in Middle Eastern culture they are used to expressing that 'the sheep' went astray. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 66-67.
52. Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 102.
53. Bailey finds a redemptive motif in the sense that the shepherd pays a physical cost to restore the sheep by placing it on his shoulders, whereas Derrett seeks a redemptive motif in that the bringing of the lamb is necessary preparation for the Passover. The latter however seems, to excessively stretch the point of soteriological themes. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 75-76; Derrett, Fresh Light on the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin," 44-45; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 124.

6-3-1. The Analysis of the Parable

The parable is generally called the twin of the parable of the Lost Sheep, just as 13:18-21 (Mustard Seed and Leaven) and 14:28-32 (Building a Tower and King Going to War), since they share the same meaning. In addition, for Luke, it is a frequent occurrence to find pairs of accounts with men and women.[54] Although there are negative feelings towards women among Jesus' contemporaries, there is, as I have already pointed out in the Lost Sheep, not the least intention to stimulate resentment toward the Pharisees and scribes with the mention of a woman as the protagonist in the parable.[55]

Unlike the previous parable, Jesus here does not begin with the phrase 'what woman from you', to compare his audience to a woman, but rather the parable takes up 'Or what woman'. Nevertheless, the story, as in the parable of the Lost Sheep, does follow the logic of 'How much more!', i.e. logic that progresses from the lesser to the greater. If a woman will look industriously for a lost coin and rejoice at finding it, how much more will God search for a lost one and rejoice at finding that one?[56]

One drachma was offered as one day's wage for a day worker, and was usually equal to a denarius in the first century.[57] Although the value of ten drachmas is not small, she could be reckoned as rather poor, for that would explain well her diligent search.[58] With respect to the coin, Jeremias suggests that the woman in the parable may have worn a headdress on which the ten coins would have been strung together,[59] whereas Bailey suggests that the coin may have been the woman's necklace.[60] However, coins pierced were not customary in the

54. Cf. 1:6-7; 2:36-38; 4:25, 38; 7:11-15, 36-50; 8:1-3, 19-21, 43-56; 10:38-42; 11:27; 13:10-17. It may be a Lukan strategy to highlight the role of women. There is a similar rabbinic parable to that of the ten coins in which the lost one symbolizes the words of the Torah. The phrase used in the parable to search for the lost one (a *sela* or an *obol*) is striking: "he lights 'lamp after lamp', 'wick after wick' until he finds it." Cant. *Rab*. 1.9.

55. Against this argument, see Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 158; idem, *Finding the Lost*, 93, and Hultgren, *Parables*, 64.

56. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 113.

57. See Tob. 5:14. The word 'drachma' is mentioned only here in vv. 8-9 and seven times in the LXX (Gen. 24:22; Exod 39:2; Tob. 5:14; *2 Macc*. 4:19; 10:20; 12:43; *3 Macc*. 3:28). Marshall thinks that Luke would have translated the amount into coinage familiar to his readers, saying the fact that in 300 B.C. a drachma represents the value of a sheep, but during the first century had been considerably devalued. Marshall, *Luke*, 603.

58. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1081; Hultgren, *Parables*, 66. Jülicher, as opposed to this extrapolation, imagines that she is not poor but belongs to the middle class. Jülicher , *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 316-17. Schottroff even claims that a woman would have received half a drachma for a day's wage. Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 154.

59. Jeremias, *Parables*, 134-35.

60. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 157. He suggests later that the woman in the parable may be the one entrusted with the financial management of the home, and therefore the ten coins represent the woman's life savings. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*,102-103.

ancient Near East. What is more, although *m*. Kelim 12.7 is presented as evidence to support a headdress, this would presume that the coin had already lost its value as a coin. In other words, coins pierced for use as an ornament would have little value as a coin.[61]

The woman's diligent search presents a threefold question: "Does not one light a lamp and sweep the house and seek diligently until she finds it?" She lights a lamp and sweeps the house, expecting to hear the coin tinkle, since the house would have had little natural light, because, if it had windows, the windows would be small.[62] The Greek word ἐπιμελῶς and the phrase ἕως ὅτου οὗ εὕρῃ represent her diligent and exhaustive efforts.

When she has found it, she calls together her friends and neighbours to rejoice with her. It is preferable to view the gender of her friends and neighbours in this verse as feminine, in contrast to those of the Lost Sheep. Once again, as in the parable of the Lost Sheep, communal joy over the found is experienced, again with the analogy to the joy experienced in heaven. Even though 'the angels of God' in v. 10 replaces 'in heaven' in v. 7,[63] it carries the same meaning, with the parallel between the rejoicing of the shepherd/the woman, with his/her friends and neighbours, and that of God with the angels in heaven.

6-3-2. The Interpretation of the Parable

With regard to a female reading of this parable, Durber argues that these parables in Luke 15 are sexist, on the basis of a patriarchal culture, revealing a lack of images of women, in particular in the parable of the Prodigal Son, or presenting images which are in themselves sexist. In addition to that, she assumes that these parables are addressed to men, not to women. Even though the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin are parallels, for Durber there are significant differences, in that the readers less closely identify themselves with the female domestic than with the male owner of sheep. She assumes from both introductions, of v. 4 ("If one of you") and v. 8 ("Or again if a woman"), and that the woman's comparison with God is less obvious in the parable of the Lost Coin, than the shepherd in the parable of the Lost Sheep, for, while the shepherd is referred to as God in 'the greater joy in heaven', the

61. Derrett, "Fresh Light on the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin," 40-41; Susan Marie Praeder, *The Word in Women's Worlds: Four Parables* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988), 39; Hultgren, *Parables*, 66; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 114.

62. Beaten earth or stone was commonly used to make floors of houses. Near Capernaum in particular basalt was plentiful, which were used for floors. Peter Richardson, *Building Jewish in the Roman East* (Waco, Tex: Baylor University Press, 2004), 76-81.

63. A.F. Walls, "'In the Presence of the Angels' Luke 15:10," *NovT* 3 (1959), 314-16.

woman is simply compared to the angels in the phrase 'the joy among the angels of God'.[64] However, her arguments are well countered by Batten, who contends that the parable of the Lost Son subverts the patriarchal values by the father focusing on the unity of the family rather than on the matter of honour and dishonour.[65] What is more, the phrase 'the angels of God', is simply a circumlocution as reverential expression, and not reference to the woman.

On the other hand, Barbara Reid contends that in the parable, Jesus aligns himself with 'Woman Wisdom' as 'Sophia' incarnate, who searches for the simple among human beings (Prov 1:20-23; 8:1-5), and asks all to her banquet (Prov 9:1-11), comforting those who feel lost, and challenging those who are leaders of the community.[66] Although her observations give insight into the applications of the parable, yet I cannot find any connection between these verses of Proverbs and the parable.

Beavis claims that the stories about women in the Bible have been misidentified in traditional patriarchal interpretation through Santor's quilt which betrays the fact that these women in the five stories[67] have been misrepresented as sexual sinners in spite of all the innocent women. She concludes that Luke 15:10 is also the distorted epigrammatic formulation of the general principle by malestream or patriarchal interpretation, and suggests a corrected epigrammatic formulation of the general principle as follows: "Likewise, I tell you, the angels of God rejoice more over one innocent person who is vindicated than over the repentance of the sinners who have abused them."[68] Despite the fact that v. 10 (or v. 7) plainly focuses on the repentance of one sinner, it is incorrect to place the emphasis of v. 10 (or v. 7) upon one innocent person. In addition, it is overspeculation that women listeners, as opposed to a male audience, get a different message, since they identify themselves with biblical women whose virtues have been distorted into vices in the patriarchal interpretation.[69] On the contrary, it depends rather on how the audience feel themselves, that is, as the righteous person or sinful person, as opposed to identifying with men or women.

What we can say at the very least is that it is not only something new and surprising for

64. Susan Durber, "The Female Reader of the Parables of the Lost," *JSNT* 45 (1992), 59-79, here 70-72.
65. A. Batten, "Dishonour, Gender and the Parable of the Prodigal Son," *TJT* 13 (1997), 187-200.
66. Barbara E. Reid, "Beyond Petty Pursuits and Wearisome Widows: Three Lukan Parables," *Int* 56 (2002), 284-94, here 288-89.
67. Eve (Gen. 1-3), Huldah (2Kgs 22; 2 Chron. 34), Mary Magdalene (Mt. 27:56, 61; 28:1; Mk. 15:40, 47; Lk. 8:2; 24:10; Jn 19:25; 20:1, 18), the Samaritan woman (Jn 4:7-30) and Martha (Lk. 10:38-42; Jn 11:1-44).
68. Mary Ann Beavis, (ed.), "Joy in Heaven, Sorrow on Earth: Luke 15:10," in *The Lost Coin: Parables of Women, Work and Wisdom* (Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 39-45, here 44-45.
69. Even Beavis says that v. 10 controls the reader's interpretation of the three parables in Luke 15. Beavis, "Joy in Heaven, Sorrow on Earth: Luke 15:10," 39-40.

Jesus to use women in his parables and teaching, but also it provokes a person to rethink about the status and function of women.

The parable has the same essential point as the Lost Sheep as seen in the common themes of 'lost', 'seeking', 'finding' and 'rejoicing', but nevertheless, the parable, unlike the risks taken in the parable of the lost sheep, puts the emphasis on the woman's diligence in seeking for the lost coin, as well as on her persistence until she finds it. In the analogy of God and Jesus, God is at work in Jesus' ministry to rescue his people and to fulfill his promises to restore Israel. Jesus' association with tax collectors and sinners is part of that work. In this respect, the parable functions as defense of Jesus' table fellowship. Given the fact that the parable puts weight on 'rejoicing' at conversion more than on the finding, with application to the sinner, repentance is ultimately the goal, in relation to the Pharisee and Scribe, the cessation of grumbling at Jesus' table fellowship with tax collectors and sinners is surely the aim.[70]

6-4. The Parable of the Prodigal Son (11-32)

6-4-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

As far as the authenticity of the parable is concerned, Schottroff views the parable as a later Christian polemic against the Pharisees, claiming that the themes of repentance and forgiveness are characteristic of Lukan soteriology.[71] On the same line, Drury argues, that Luke constitutes the story as an allegory of salvation history, noting the rift between traditional Judaism and Gentile Christianity.[72] The parable's authenticity has however been supported by the following reasons: First, early Christians would not describe the Pharisees with the positive comments regarding the elder son. Second, the teaching of the parable corresponds to Jesus' teaching elsewhere. Third, the parable has artistry and power. It is therefore desirable to accept the parable's authenticity.

---

70. Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 102.

71. Schottroff, "Das Gleichnis vom verlorenen Sohn," *ZTK* 68 (1971), 27-52. Heininger also rules out vv. 18-19, 21, 24a-b in the parable to reconstruct the original parable, viewing repentance as secondary addition to the parable. But Carlston insists that the repentance presented here is not Lukan, since while the younger son in the parable is simply accepted by his father, Luke has a moral emphasis entailing fruits of repentance. B. Heininger, *Metaphorik, Erzählstruktur und szenisch-dramatische Gestaltung in den Sondergutgleichnisse bei Lukas* (NTAbh, 24; Münster: Aschendorff, 1991), 146-53; C.E. Carlston, "Reminiscence and Redaction in Luke 15:11-32," *JBL* 94 (1975), 368-90.

72. Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels*, 141-47. See also Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 609-18; Heikki Räisänen, "The Prodigal Gentile and His Jewish Christian Brother, Lk 15:11-32," in ed., F. Van Sebbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden, *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. (Leuven: University Press, 1992), 2:1617-36.

With respect to the authenticity of vv. 25-32, J.T. Sanders rejects the authenticity on the linguistic basis, because of more distinct Lukan language used in vv. 25-32. According to his argument, the first part of the parable contains numerous non-Lukan grammatical and vocabulary traits, whereas the second part of the parable (25-32) includes a heavy concentration of Lukan terms and meanings. This claim was refuted, however, by Mary Tolbert who demonstrated that there is close structural parallelism between both halves (vv.11-24 and vv. 25-32) in the alternating between narrated discourse (ND) and direct discourse (DD)[73] as well as C.E. Carlston, as has been noted in the above footnote.

On the other hand, Goulder suggests that Luke created the parable of the Prodigal Son from his knowledge of Matthew's parable of the Two Sons. It is difficult, however, to find correspondences between two accounts. Even the vocabulary for 'sons' is different. Matthew uses τέκνα in 21:28, whereas Luke uses υἱούς in 15:11.[74]

Although the parable has somewhat unique characteristics, such as drawing a family, having two stages,[75] and comprising of the longest story, the parable is, in theme, closely related to both the parable of the Lost Sheep and the parable of the Lost Coin, in particular in the father's remarks in vv. 24, 32.[76]

While some theologians propose a two part or four part division in the parable,[77] most

73. Tolbert, *Parables*, 98-100.

ND	the younger son's journey away (vv. 12b-16)
DD	his decision to return (vv. 17-19)
ND	his father's reception (v. 20)
DD	his confession and his father's response (vv. 21-24a)
ND	the elder son's return home (vv. 24b-26)
DD	the servant's explanation (v. 27)
ND	his father's reception (v. 28)
DD	his accusation and his father's response (vv. 29-32)

74. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 609-14.

75. Other two-stage parables are the Unmerciful Servant (Matt 18:23-35), the parable of the Banquet (Matt 22:1-14), Lazarus and the Rich Man (Luke 16:19-31) and the parable of the Pounds (19:11-27). In addition, the parable is one of triangle parables, so-called, monarchic or three point parables in which an authority figure relates to two subordinate and contrasted persons or groups. The reason why such parables are called monarchic parables is that the protagonist related to two persons is a king or a master. R.W. Funk, Parables and Presence (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 25-50; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 171.

76. James A. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative* (BIS 88, Leiden: Brill, 2007), 106, 108.

77. For viewing it as two parts, see J.T. Sanders, "Tradition and Redaction in Luke 15:11-32," *NTS* 15 (1969), 433-38; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 128; Stephen C. Barton, "Parables on God's Love and Forgiveness (Luke 15:1-31)," 209; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 106-108. But Scott later prefers not to divide the parable into any parts, for the audiences of the parable, as opposed to the written text, would have heard it in one breath or in a continuous line without a division. Scott, *Re-*

scholars suggest three parts, even though there is no consensus of opinion as to whether the first section includes vv. 11-12, 11-19, or 11-20a. I believe, however, that it is reasonable to accept three parts, as follows: the younger son's departure and return (vv. 11-20a), the father's reception (vv. 20b-24), and the older son's reaction (vv, 25-32).[78]

6-4-2. The Analysis of the Parable

In the parable, the readers, at the outset, encounter a father who has two sons. It is surprising and striking that stories contrasting two sons are common in the OT, Jewish parables, and Greco-Roman stories and declamations.[79] The story may not be, therefore, strange, but quite familiar to audiences.

The younger of them said to his father, "Father, give me the share of property that falls to me." And he divided his living between them. The younger son would receive a third according to Mosaic law (Deut. 21:17; m. B. Bat. 7.4-5), for the eldest son has the primary responsibility to care for the parents, as well as take a leadership role in family matters. Other sons, of course, also have responsibility for their parents (e.g. Reuben's role as leader, see Gen 37:29-42:38).

In relation to the younger son's request, views are divided into two groups: That it was unusual, or that it was common enough. On the grounds of Jewish writings (Sir. 33.20-24,[80] *m.B.B.* 8:7,[81] *t.B.B.* 2:5[82] and *b.B.Mes* 75b[83]), W.O.E. Oesterley, B.D. Smith, Linnemann

---

Imagine the World: An Introduction to the Parables of Jesus (Santa Rosa, California; Polebridge Press, 2001), 69. For four parts, see Holgate, Prodigality, *Liberality and Meanness in the Parable of the Prodigal Son: A Greco-Roman Perspective on Luke 15:11-32* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 46; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 124.

78. See A.T. Cadoux, *The Parables of Jesus: Their Art and Use* (London: J. Clarke, 1930), 123; G.V. Jones, *The Art and Truth of the Parables* (London: SPCK, 1964), 121-22; Robert Funk, "Structure in the Narrative Parables of Jesus," *Semeia* 2 (1994), 51-73, here 63; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 152; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 174; Hultgren, *Parables*, 73.

79. In the case of OT, there are Cain and Abel, Isaac and Ishmael, and Jacob and Esau. For Jewish materials with stories of two sons, see Philo, *Prov*. 2.2-6; *QG* 4.198; *Sifré Deut*. 48; *Gen Rab*. 30.10; *Lev. Rab*. 37.2; *Num. Rab*. Prologue 2; *Eccl. Rab*. 3.15; *Midr*. *Pss*. 9.1; *Pesiqta de Rab Kahana* 15.4. For Greco-Roman materials, see Terence, *The Brother*; Seneca the elder, *Controversiae* 2.4; Teles, *Autark*. 95-96; Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 27-41; Horace, *Satirae* 2.3.168-86.

80. Sir 33:20-24: "To son or wife, to brother of friend, do not give power over yourself, as long as you live; and do not give your property to another, in case you change your mind and must ask for it. While you are still alive and have breath in you, do not let anyone take your place. For it is better that your children should ask from you than that you should look to the hand of your children…. At the time when you end the days of your life, in the hour of your death, distribute your inheritance."

81. *m.B.B.* 8:7: " If a man assigned his goods to his sons he must write, 'From today and after my death.'…R. Jose says: He need not do so. If a man assigned his goods to his son to be his after his death, the father cannot sell them since they are assigned to his son, and the son cannot sell them since they are in the father's possession.

and Scott contend that the practice may be widespread and common.[84] According to Sir. 33.20-24, *m.B.B.* 8:7, *t.B.B.* 2:5 and *b.B.Mes* 75b, the property could be bequethed as a gift during a father's lifetime. However, in this case, the usufruct of the property still belonged to the father and both a donor (the father as a legator or a testator) and a donee (the son as an heir or an inheritor) could not dispose of it. If a donee disposed of the property to someone, the buyer could not take possession of it until the death of a donor. In the same view, John S. Kloppenborg suggests that Greco-Egyptian papyri may provide insight into the parable with respect to the issue of legal practice.[85] He summarises the results of his observations by concluding that the son's request for a division of the property during his father's lifetime was common, and that it was not a death-wish and an insult.[86] However, the cases in Greco-Egyptian papyri are inadequate in relation to this parable, in that the division of the property was not made by the son's request in each case. In the case of *BGU III* 993, the testator, as in Gen 25:6,[87] seems to give voluntarily, not by the inheritor's demand, as a gift to his daughter,

---

If his father sold them, they are sold [only] until he dies; if the son sold them, the buyer has no claim on them until the father dies. The father may pluck up [the crop of a field which he has so assigned] and give to eat to whom he will, and if he left anything already plucked up, it belongs to [all] his heirs."

82. *t.B.B.* 2:5: "Under what circumstances have they ruled, 'A sharecropper is given an oath when he is not subject to a claim?' So long as he is a sharecropper. When a sharecropper leavers his status as sharecropper of this field, he is like anybody else [i.e., can obtain title through usucaption]. A guardian-when a guardian leaves his status as a guardian, he is like anybody else. A son who took his share of his father's estate, a woman who was divorced, they are like everybody else."

83. *b.B.Mes* 75b: Our Rabbis taught: Three cry out and are not answered. Viz., he who has money and lends it without witnesses; he who acquires a master for himself; and a henpecked husband. 'He who acquires a master for himself'; what does this mean?-Some say: He who attributes his wealth to a Gentile; others: He who transfers his property to his children in his lifetime…."

84. W.O.E. Oesterley, *The Gospel Parables in the Light of their Jewish Background* (New York: Macmillan, 1936), 183-84; B. Smith, *The Parables in the Synoptic Gospels*, 194; Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus*, 74-75; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 111.

85. John S. Kloppenborg, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son and Deeds of Gift," *NovT* 130 (2008), 169-194, here173. Greco-Egyptian papyri he surveyed is as follows: *BGU* III 993; *P. Flor.* I 99; *P. Cair. Goodsp.* 6; *P. Oxy*. II 273; *P. Lond*. III 880; *P. Fay*. 97 and the like. For him there is a premium on *BGU* III 993 that having expended his possession, a prodigal implores reconciliation with his mother, and on *P. Flor.* I 99 that the parents of a prodigal accuse of prodigality and ask to be registered their denunciation of him in order to protect themselves from the creditors.

86. The results of his observations as follows: "First, none of them is a called a διαθήκη and none uses the terminology, καταλείπειν normally found in wills. Second, whether or not the need of gift contains the phrase μετα τὴν ἑαυτῆς τελευτὴν, it seems clear that in most cases the property effectively transferred at the time of the gift. Third, with deeds of gift it is not necessary to suppose that a gift to one son or daughter would automatically imply that the entire parental estate was divided. Fourth, there is no indication at all that opprobrium attached to the transfer." Kloppenborg, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son and Deeds of Gift," 188-89, 192.

87. Having given gifts to Ketu'rah's sons, Abraham sent them away to safeguard Isaac's portion from them prior to his death. "But to the sons of his concubines Abraham gave gifts, and while he was still living he sent them

Tasemis, and to his wife, Tsennesis, during his lifetime, in order to safely keep their portions from his sons whom he might not have favoured.

In contrast, Bailey and Hultgren stand by the claim that the practice was unusual. Bailey argues that the younger son's request was especially unusual, thereby provoking his father's anger as if he was wishing the father dead. For him the Sirach text simply reflects the prevailing community attitude, not the widespread community practice, indicating the fact that the focus of the issue is on the father distributing his property, not on the son's request, unlike in the parable.[88] Hultgren also claims that the younger son's demand not only constitutes an insult to the father's honour, but also is tantamount to wishing the father dead.[89] In the light of all this, I find it difficult to conclude that the practice was widespread and common. It seems more desirable to say that it was unusual.

Nevertheless, the father grants his son's demand. Even though there is no explanantion as to why he did so, and the story simply continues to go forward, such a decision would not have impressed the audiences with an incompetent father not being able to control his son. However, it indeed is not right here to seek for the father's fault, namely, partiality in excessive tolerance that he grants his younger son even usufruct as well as inheritance, as will be discussed later in some detail.[90] That the father distributes his property to his sons is equivalent to dividing the father's living as his means of subsistence, although the two words, βίον (living) and οὐσίαν (property) are used as synonyms in v. 12 and v. 13.[91] There is the issue as to whether the elder son's portion was given to him when the younger son received his portion. D. Daube maintains that the elder son did not receive his portion, whereas Derrett argues that he did.[92] It is reasonable to believe that although the elder son received his portion, the whole usufruct of his part would still have remained in his father's control.

After converting the property into cash, the younger son departs from home for a distant country, thereby not only going back on his obligation that the son has to honour and sustain their parents in their old age, as spelled out in Exod 20:12 and Deut 5:16, but also exposing his mind that he frees himself from any obligation to his father or his family as a whole: His

---

away from his son Isaac, eastward to the east country." Gen 25:6.

88. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 119-20.

89. Hultgren, *Parables*, 73.

90. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative,* 107.

91. Bailey and Scott show how the word, βίον is important in the Middle East and what the term, βίον means in the wordplay. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 119-20; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 111.

92. David Daube, "Inheritance in Two Lukan Pericopes," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichgte* 72 (1995), 326-34, here 329-33; Derrett, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son," in *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976), 100-25, here 108.

distance from them is not merely geographical, but psychological.[93] On the other hand, Jeremias argues that it is very normal for the younger son to leave for a distant country, on the grounds that in the first century CE, many Jews emigrated abroad, since there were frequent famines in Palestine and they preferred to live abroad rather than in their own country.[94] In connection with the younger son's disposal, Jeremias says that it would have been realistic for the younger son to dispose of his portion, given the fact that *t.B.B.* 2:5 implies the right to possession and usufruct of the inheritor, although *m. B.B.* 8:7 states that neither the father nor the son could dispose of the land prior to the father's death.[95] Derrett argues that even though the father in no way was obliged to divide his property, still less give his younger son the right of disposal, his tolerant policy of treating the nearly grown-up son makes it possible to divide and dispose the property.[96] In spite of the prohibition of disposing inheritance during the father's lifetime in *m.B.B.* 8:7, the younger son, at any rate, cashes it in anyway and departs for a distant country.

It is not easy to determine whether, while being there, the younger son's life is immoral, through the term ἀσώτως, which can be generally translated as "loose living" (RSV, NASB), "riotous living" (KJV, ASV), "wild living" (NIV) and "dissipated" or "wild and disorderly" (*TDNT*).[97] Although the elder son's charge against his brother in v. 30 may imply the younger son's immorality, the charge could reveal the elder son's conjecture or imagination rather than the reality, when we put more confidence in what the narrator says in v. 13, than in the statement of the elder son as a character within the play in v. 30.

The younger son who lost all his property is confronted with the bigger problem, a severe famine, which he could not have anticipated. As he recognizes his desperate need, he begins to seek employment among the citizens of that country, and gets a job from a Gentile, feeding pigs. Such a phenomenon, expressed as "attachment behaviour" in psychology terminology, represents a desire to attach oneself to 'something greater'.[98] Neither working for a Gentile

93. Hultgren, *Parables*, 75.

94, Jeremias, *Parables*, 129; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 153; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 134.

95. Jeremias, *Parables*, 128-29.

96. Derrett, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son," 106-107.

97. See Werner Foerster, "ἀσώτως, ἀσωτία," *TDNT*, I, 506-507.

98. Jeremy Duff and Joanna Collicutt McGrath comment that "attachment behavior" as a psychological reaction to trauma and life adversity, is helpful to greater openness to spirituality, that is often seen in the aftermath of terrible events. Jeremy Duff and Joanna Collicutt McGrath, *Meeting Jesus: Human responses to a yearning god* (London: SPCK, 2006), 63; for the more details, see Janoff Bulman R, *Shattered Assumptions: Towards a new Psychology of trauma* (New York: The Free Press, 1992).

nor feeding pigs was a favourable thing for a Jew. Tax-collecters working for Gentiles are treated as sinners, which, of course, include their iniquity to happen when they collect taxes. In addition, according to *b.B.Qam.* 82b,[99] the man who feeds swine is cursed, because according to the law pigs are unclean.[100] He wanted to eat the carob pods eaten by pigs, which was refused him, since the carob pod may have been considered a valuable food due to the severe famine.[101] He is spent personally and financially. Therefore the scene focuses on his low and miserable life, more than on the abandonment of his religious customs.

Does the expression, εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν ("came to himself") in v. 17 mean that he repented? Jeremias contends that the expression reflects a Semitic phrase signifying repentance.[102] To be sure, there are similar expressions elsewhere, but none of them are related to a circumlocution for repentance. Rather than being a euphemism for repentance, the expression simply expresses his desire to get himself out of his horrible situation.[103] It is desirable to argue that the expression is nonetheless something of a prelude, leading him to repentance. What is more, it is even more likely to be a prelude to repentance given the fact that such real-life boundary situations not only can grow true religion, but also can allow him to let God in.[104]

In his soliloquy, the younger son makes a decision to return to his father, recalling the abundance of his father's hired servants. Likewise, he intends to confess his sin to his father: "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you, I am no longer worthy to be called your son, treat me as one of your hired servants." His soliloquy raises two important questions: What was the younger son's sin against heaven and his father?, and is his soliloquy together with his returning later an expression of repentance? In regard to his sin, there are many suggestions, such as, his violation of the command to honour his parents in the OT (Exod

99. *b.B.Qam.* 82b: "Cursed be the man who would breed swine, or teach his son Greek philosophy"; *m.B.Qum*. 7.7: "None may rear swine anywhere"

100. Lev 11:7; Deut 14:8; Isa 65:4; 66:17; *1 Macc*. 1:47; *2 Macc*. 6:18; 7:1.

101. Nolland maintains that he was too closely monitored to even steal the pods. Nolland, *Luke*, 773.

102. Jeremias, *Parables*, 130; E. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus*, 76; J. Creed, *Luke*, 197; Marshall, *Luke*, 607; R. Aus, "Luke 15:11-32," 457; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 53; Wenham, *The Parables of Jesus: Pictures of Revolution*, 110; Stein, *Parables*, 120.

103. G. Jones, *Art and Truth of the Parables*, 182; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 590-91; F. Borsch, *Many Things in Parables*, 41; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 153; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 173-75; idem, *Finding the Lost, 131*; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 115-16; Hultgren, *Parables*, 76; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 138; G.W. Ramsey, "Plots, Gaps, Repetitions, and Ambiguity in Luke 15," *PRSt* 17 (1990), 38-41; Philip Sellew, "Interior Monologue as a Narrative Device in the Parables of Luke," *JBL* 111 (1992), 246; Fernando, Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke* (JSNTSup 252, London: T & T Clark Interntional, 2004), 138-43.

104. Jeremy Duff and Joanna Collicutt McGrath, *Meeting Jesus*, 64; Pargament, K, *The Psychology and Religion of Coping: Theory, practice and research* (New York, Guilford, 1997), 154.4.

20:12), as I have pointed out, the request for his share of the possessions, his covetousness, his squandering, his lifestyle and his neglect of his father. It is better to consider all these possibilities together, rather than discard any of them.

In the question as to whether the younger son's confession and return are sincere acts of repentance, Bailey argues that it is not repentance, for if so, then the parable is inconsistent with the teaching of repentance in the two former parables as the acceptance of being found.[105] Along the same lines, Kilgallen contends that it is merely his own self-interest to get better food, as he has lived from the beginning of the story with his own interests in view.[106] Even though there is certainly no mention of repentance in his monologue, it must be recognized that his confession and change are at least sincere.[107]

When the father sees at a distance his son coming home, with compassion, he runs to meet the younger son and embraces him. According to Sir 19:30, walking posture had quite an important meaning for a man. A dignified man, therefore, did not run. In addition, for Oriental nobleman, running was shameful, because of the exposure of his legs.[108] In spite of such customs, the father runs to welcome his younger son, thereby astonishing the audiences in the parable. Although the parable is in the tradition of Oriental custom, it must be considered that such a custom can be broken in particular situations, such as that in the parable, to put it in other words, the running in that situation at no point brings shame to the father.[109]

What here allows for afresh is the point that the father's actions are not so exaggerated or unexpected that such actions cannot lie in the range of common father's behaviour. In this

105. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 85, 130; idem, *Poet and Peasant*, 173-80. However, it is unreasonable, in order to define the meaning of repentance in Luke 15, to merely involve in Ps 23:3 which emphasizes on the active role of God, not passive one in the recovery, since it is not desirable to draw an accurate picture of repentance only from it.

106. Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 106; Breech, *The Silence of Jesus*, 195-96; Rohrbaugh, "A Dysfunctional Family and Its Neighbors (Luke 15:11b-32)," in ed., V.G. Shillington, *Perspectives on the Parables: Images of Jesus in his Contemporary Setting* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997), 141-164, here 143; Buttrick, *Speaking Parables: A Homiletic Guide*, 284.

107. Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 581-82.

108. B. Malina and R. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary*, 372; Jeremias, *Parables*, 130; Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 143-46; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 155; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 138; Hultgren, *Parables*, 78.

109. LaHurd also argues that such a custom can be transgressed in this situation on the basis of interviewing contemporary Arab Christian women and anthropologists' contention that societal norms and written codes do not tell us all the behaviours in the society. C.S. LaHurd, "Re-viewing Luke 15 with Arab Christian women" in ed., Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff, *A feminist companion to Luke* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 246-68.

respect, while audiences in the parable might not have been astounded by the father's actions, the younger son must have been astounded by the unexpected father's favour.

The term ἐσπλαγχνίσθη, as in Luke 10:33, expresses the divine compassion, seen therefore in all father's actions of running, embracing and kissing. With respect to Bailey's contention concerning the running and embracing of the father, it is excessive conjecture that such behaviour of the father is to protect his younger son from the entire village who were filled with hostility because of his son returning.[110] There is no evidence implying that in the parable.

In the father's unexpected warm welcome, the younger son does not deliver his prepared speech to his father, in particular the word, μίσθος[111], for it is not only prevented by his father, but it would also insult his father's love.[112] The father, in contrast to the suggestion which the younger son plans to propose, orders that he be clothed in the best robe, a ring put on his finger, sandals for his feet, and a great feast thrown to celebrate his return.

Various meanings have been proposed for the best robe,[113] a ring,[114] sandals[115], and a great feast with the fatted calf[116], but it would be best to view them as symbols of the younger son's recovery to his position as his precious son, accepting him again, and forgiving his past

110. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 142-51. He here tries to draw the meaning of the incarnation (the father's running outward) and atonement (the father's embracing, the costly actions of the father or in the calf).

111. Bailey, following Derrett's opinion, contends that the younger son plans to repay the lost money to his father through working as a hired servant on the grounds that the word, μίσθιοι indicates 'a hired servant' unlike δοῦλοι (bondsmen) or παῖδες (slaves of a lower class). Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 176-77; Derrett, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son" 65.

112. Nolland, *Luke*, 785; Kistemaker, *Parables*, 221; Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 152.

113. Jeremias comments that 'the best robe' points to the garment of salvation in which any eschatological significance is conveyed in relation to Isaiah 61:10. "I will greatly rejoice in the LORD, my soul shall exult in my God; for he has clothed me with the garments of salvation, he has covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decks himself with a garland, and as a bride adorns herself with her jewels." (Isaiah 61:10). cf. Mk. 2:21; Matt. 5:3, 11:5; Lk. 4:18, 7:33. Jeremias, *Parables*, 189.

114. Metzger argues that wearing the ring indicates that the younger son has (re)acquired authority of the estate, although he is not sure how much level of authority he is (re)invested from his father because there is no comment on that. He believes that the audiences in the parable would have thought of the father as the foolish and incompetent, and the family as a very wealthy one. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 98-99.

115. Rengstorf claims that putting on shoes is a sign of insistence on ownership in the Middle East on the basis of Ps. 60:8, "Moab is my washbasin; upon Edom I cast my shoe; over Philistia I shout in triumph." However, his contention is rejected correctly by Bailey's demonstration that at that time the custom had already disappeared and was no longer practiced. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 185-86, n200.

116. The feast is so great that over a hundred people can eat, akin to that which has been prepared for the marriage of the eldest son, or the visit of the governor of the province, or some such occasion. In this respect, only in the case of a communal celebration, the festive celebration takes place beyond the home. Against Bailey's contention, the communal celebration means to share the pleasure with the whole village rather than to reconcile the younger son with them..

iniquity, rather than seeking to find a specific meaning in each one.[117] Now the focus moves to the present celebration. There still are arguments as to whether the celebration alludes to the messianic banquet, given the context of forgiveness and salvation in the father's proclamation in v. 24, the imagery may well convey the messianic banquet.[118]

The father's declaration in v. 24 is naturally associated with the proclamations in the first two parables, juxtaposing 'dead' and 'alive again' with 'lost' and 'found'. The repeat of the same declaration in v32 still more reveals that the father's rationale for this celebration lies in the younger son's safe return. As for the word νεκρός, there are several suggestions, such as being morally dead',[119] cutting off from the family,[120] being dead to his father's love[121], and being totally dead (physically, psychologically and spiritually).[122]

The third scene of the parable shifts from the celebration to the field, where the elder son is returning from his work. When he draws near to the house, he hears music and dancing, so he asks a servant what is happening. Although it is quite strange that the elder son did not instantly hear the news, the story continues to flow. The servant then reports repeatedly and briefly that 'your brother has come, and your father has killed the fatted calf, because he has received him safe and sound'. In the servant's report, there seems to be an intention to emphasize the father's extravagant actions in the light of the reference of the fatted calf, instead mentioning a celebration.[123] The elder son gets angry at the news and refuses to enter in and join the celebration. Incorrect is here such speculation that the elder son is angry because his brother may be supported once again by the family estate,[124] since according to vv. 29-30, his resentment is entirely toward his father.

The father, as he did with his younger son, goes out and pleads with the elder son to come inside and join the celebration. But the elder son answers his father: 'Look! For so many

117. Blomberg thinks of those as indicating the degree of the younger son's restoration. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 178; Nolland, *Luke*, 785, 790; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 594; Stein, *Parables*, 120; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 118. But Hultgren see those as a status of honour for the best robs, the granting of authority for ring and freedom for shoes on his feet, emphasizing full restoration of the young son. Hultgren, *Parable*, 79; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 155.

118. Cf. Lk. 13:28-29; 14:15-24; 19:9; 22:16, 18. See Stephen Barton, "Parables on God's Love and Forgiveness," 211.

119. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 140.

120. Rengstorf, *Re-investitur*, 21-22.

121. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 159-60.

122. F.H. Borsch, *Many Things in Parables: Extravagant Stories of New Community* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 42.

123. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable* , 119.

124. Derrett, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son," 67; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 120.

years I have served you, and I never disobeyed your command; yet you never gave me a kid that I might make merry with my friends. But when this son of yours came who has devoured your living with harlots, you killed for him the fatted calf.' The key point in his list of grievances is the partiality of his father's behaviour, that is, his excessive generosity towards his younger son, and his excessive stinginess towards his elder son, seen from the son's point of view. In this regard, this part of the parable is reminiscent of the attitude of the labourers in the vineyard (Mt. 20:11-12). The younger son, to be sure, has devoured the father's living, but the phrase μετὰ πορνῶν seems most likely to be the elder son's imagination, as I have pointed out above, since there is no evidence to indicate that the elder son has received any report about his brother's life abroad.[125] At any rate, here he humiliates his father by refusing to enter into the celebration, describing his father as stingy and partial, and by speaking of his brother as ὁ υἱός σου, "this son of yours" which intimates that his father is responsible for his brother's iniquity.

His words here betray a problem in his relationship with his father. He has the spirit of a slave rather than a son, the mind of merit and reward, rather than love and graciousness from his father. It seems not to hush up raising an analogy between the elder son and the Pharisees and scribes.

But the father does not get angry in his response, nor does he rebuke his son, instead he shows the same generosity and love that he displayed to his younger son: "Son, you are always with me, and all that is mine is yours. It was fitting to make merry and be glad, for this your brother was dead, and is alive; he was lost, and is found." In his response, the father desires to show that he has identical love for both sons, and is not partial, and that it is reasonable enough for the whole family to celebrate the younger's return. If there are audiences who expect the younger son to remain the favorite, the parable subverts such a thought.[126] Likewise, even though the younger son's life is filled with iniquity, the father makes the elder son aware of the fact that he still is his brother in the phrase

125. Bailey comments that the Eastern versions and commentaries never carry a concept of immorality in relation to μετὰ πορνῶν. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 122-24. Metzger notes that during the first century such an expression is at least a stereotyped way that Jews stereotype Gentiles as sexually depraved, as in Romans 1:18-32. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 103-104. For the stereotypical characterizations of Gentile behaviour, see Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (Sacra Pagina 6; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996), 65, 76-77.

126. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 122-25; A. Troost, "Reading for the Author's Signature: Genesis 21:1-21 and Luke 15:11-32 as Intertexts," in ed., Athalya Brenner, *A Feminist Companion to Genesis* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 251-72.

ὁ ἀδελφός σου οὗτος.[127]

The father leaves the decision to join the celebrations in the hands of his elder son, and the open-ended conclusion makes the audience reflect on the outcome too. The open-end in the parable functions as an invitation for the hearers to take the same attitude toward sinners as the father, who feels compassion and love toward the younger son.

6-4-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

There is a great deal of suggestions with regard to background to read the parable. First of all, in the case of the OT background, it includes Jacob's reception (Genesis 33), Joseph's elevation and his reception of his bothers (Genesis 42 and 45), commands regarding rebellious sons (Deuteronomy 21:18-21), Psalm 23 and 103, Jeremiah 31:10-20, 1Kings 8:47-51, Hosea. 11:1-9, and so forth.

Bailey claims that Jesus' three parables in Luke 15 can be explained through Psalm 23, seeking thirteen common motifs between the three parables and the Psalm.[128] Furthermore, he argues that Jesus here retold Jacob's story, drawing out fifteen similarities between the parable and Jacob story.[129] On the one hand, Drury finds parallels between the parable and Joseph's story in Genesis 41, 42 and 45, particularly in the scene regarding famine. He also sees it in that Joseph rushed to meet his approaching father Israel and threw his arms around his neck in contrast to Luke's scene, and in Joseph's elevation with Pharaoh's ring and fine clothes and his reception of these brothers.[130] On the other hand, in connection with Deut 32:6-26, Derrett suggests that the parable may plausibly be regarded as a sermon on Deut 32:6-26 and elaborated through the aid of Deuteronomy 21-22.[131] With regard to Jeremiah 31:18-20, N.T. Wright contends that the background of the parable is Jeremiah 31:18-20 which is about exile and repentance of Israel as God's dear son. For him the parable portrays the exile and the restoration of Israel, since the younger son represents Israel returning from exile and the elder son the mixed multitude resisting Israel's return.[132] Seeing the fact that all

127. T. Corlett, "This Brother of Yours," *ExpTim* 100 (1988), 216.

128. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 11, 194-212.

129. Bailey, "Jacob and the Prodigal Son: A New Identity Story: A Comparison between the Parable of the Prodigal Son and Gen. 27-35," *Theological Review* 18 (1997), 54-72. He, in a recent work, displays three elements as the points of comparison and contrast between two stories as follows: Dramatic content that is nearly identical, dramatic content that is reused with some changes and radical reversals. Bailey, *Jacob and Prodigal: How Jesus retold Israel's story* (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2003). 132.

130. Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels*, 144.

131. Derrett, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son," 100-101.

132. N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, vol. 2 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*

these texts are appropriately related to the parable, they do in some way give insight into the reading of the parable. However, it is important to recognize that none of them show enough similarity to view these texts as the source of the parable.

R. Aus, with respect to rabbinic influence, investigates the relationship between the parable and the rabbinic parable of the rise to fame of Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus. In addition to common elements in the basic structure,[133] he observes that there are parallel motifs and similar verbal associations. He concludes that Jesus made use of contemporary popular material like rabbinic traditions that were also applied to Rabbi Eliezer, claiming the fact that both depend on a common oral folk-tale of Semitic origin, in view of the fact that neither one draw on the other.[134] K. Rengstorf suggests that the parable can be understood against the background of the Jewish *k^{e}tsatsah*, the legal act of separation or disowning a person who was cut off from the community for breaking the rules of society. Although it is accepted in part by Bailey, he presupposes too much that is not in the parable,[135] for example, he views 'this your brother was dead' as 'cut off', and regards 'the best robe' as the younger son's former clothes which were taken off when the Jewish *k^{e}tsatsah* was performed by the community.[136] What is more, the parable does not reflect the fact that the younger son sold real estate to a Gentile, or that he married an unclean Gentile woman as is the case in Rabbinic literature concerning the ceremony of *k^{e}tsatsah*.[137]

Greco-Roman influences provide us with another point of dispute: Holgate contends that the parable is similar to the Greco-Roman topos 'On Covetousness', but also the parable is projected to provide moral instruction on covetousness, liberality and stinginess.[138] For him

---

(Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 125-31, 242, 254-55.

133. Elements of their basic structure are as follows: "(1) The setting of both stories is a family farm, where fieldwork/plowing is done by the brother(s). (2) A son voluntarily leaves his father and brother(s) for another place. The relationship of these persons to one another is then disturbed. (3) The son experiences, in a different location, abject poverty and hunger. (4) At the reunion scene of father and son there is public reconciliation between the two. (5) This reconciliation causes the jealousy of the older brother/other brothers. (6) Both narratives close with an open end." R.D. Aus, "Luke 15:11-32 and R. Eliezer Ben Hyrcanus's Rise to Fame," *JBL* 104 (1985), 460.

134. Aus, "Luke 15:11-32 and R. Eliezer Ben Hyrcanus's Rise to Fame," 443-69, here 469. He finds fourteen motifs of the parable as parallels in Jewish Joseph traditions. Aus, *Weihnachtsgeschichte, Barmherziger Samariter, Verlorener Sohn. Studien zu ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1988), 126-73.

135. Bailey, *Finding the Lost*, 121-122.

136. K.H. Rengstorf, *Die Re-investitur des verlorenen Sohnes in der Gleichniserzählung Jesu Luk. 15:11-32* (AFLNW 137; Köln: Westdeutscher, 1967).

137. L. Rabinowitz, *Midrash Rabbah*, ed., H. Freedman and M. Simon (London: Soncino, 1938), 87. Cf. P. Kid, 1, 5; P. Ket, 26d; P. Kid, 60c; P. Ket, 11:10.

138. Holgate, *Prodigality, Liberality and Meanness in the Parable of the Prodigal Son*, 132-251.

the younger son here represents the vice of prodigality, the father that of liberality and the elder son that of stinginess. On the whole, his argument is grounded on the assumption that Luke's intended readers would have been familiar with Greco-Roman ethical and philosophical rhetoric. In relation to Greco Roman influences, the other side of the coin is that the parable describes the wisdom ethos of the household, especially in the ideals of Hesiod that forms the preservation and accumulation of goods, and honest and hard work. Wolfgang Pöhlmann argues that the outlook of the elder son in the parable, in keeping with the thinking of Hesiod,[139] should be held in esteem, since his behaviour presents the need to preserve and increase goods so as to avoid poverty and hunger. For him, such a perspective of the elder son enables the audiences to perceive the kingdom.[140] However, the parable not only goes beyond such moral instruction which may be a subsidiary theme, but also what is worse neglects the Palestinian setting of Jesus' ministry.

Rohrbaugh suggests a sociological approach that the parable is about propriety and shame in a dysfunctional family, focusing on the reconciliation of the whole village and two sons. For him the celebration takes places only to reconcile the village. In the setting of Jesus, the parable is to instruct responsibility to both family and community, and generosity in the face of scurrilous behaviour for the quarrelsome disciples. The parable displays an improbable sort of kingdom in which prudence is not the highest value, just as the father who breaks all the conventional rules of honour, and who divides his property, runs to deliver his prodigal son, and even plead with his elder son humiliating himself.[141]

G.V. Jones,[142] M. Tolbert[143] and Breech view the parable as mirroring human relations

139. He extends his studies concerning household literature to Xenophon, Aristotle, the Stoics, and the Neopythagoreans, beginning with Hesiod. Wolfgang Pöhlmann, *Der Verlorene Sohn and das Haus: Studien zu Lukas 15:11-32 im Horizont der antiken Lehre von Haus, Erziehung und Ackerbau* (WUNT 68; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1993).

140. Pöhlmann, *Der Verlorene Sohn and das Haus: Studien zu Lukas 15:11-32 im Horizont der antiken Lehre von Haus, Erziehung und Ackerbau*; Herman Hendrickx, "A Man Had Two Sons: Lk 15:11-32 in the Light of the Ancient Mediterranean Values of Farming and Household," *East Asian Pastoral Institute* 31 (1994), 46-66. For comparisons and contrasts between Synoptic parables and Greek literature, see Mary Ann Beavis, "Parable and Fable," *CBQ* 52 (1990), 473-98.

141. Rohrbaugh, "A Dysfunctional Family and Its Neighbors (Luke 15:11b-32)," 163-64.

142. He first thinks in the existential perspective that the parable is not only a microcosm of the human situation in every era, but only an archetypal pattern of human existence and then he observes psychoanalytic aspects that the parable presents the human predicament and dynamics as estrangement, longing and return, grace, anguish and reconciliation. G.V. Jones, *The Art and Truth of the Parables*, 167-205.

143. By means of Freud's analysis of the elements of the psyche, that is, id, superego and ego, Tolbert seeks to understand the parable as bearing peculiar similarities in the three characters, in particular, in the father, the central figure of the parable and the basic human desire for reconciliation and restoration of unity. Tolbert, *Perspectives on the Parables*, 93-114.

in some aspect of psychoanalytic theory. Breech believes that the parable exposes the basic problem of triangular human relationships. For him the return of the younger son comprises a most tragic story, seeing the father as a pathetic figure and the elder son as seeking a sign of the father's love, not things. Seeing the father as a negative figure, he rather speculates about the danger that the father's love and forgiveness can lead the younger son to parasitical and decadent behaviour.[144]

Among feminist scholars, Durber argues that the parable is constructed in a patriarchal legal and inheritance system in which a father divides his property between his sons, since there are no women in the parable, asking where the mother and sisters are. For her, the lack of images of women looks like sexism, revealing the fact that they came from a patriarchal culture, and that they have been written by men and for men.[145] Following Rohrbaugh, even Beavis regards the story as a dysfunctional family in which his son had not only been sexually molested by his father, but also the father's emotional reaction, that is to say, the sight to his son, his embrace and tender kisses can display a nurturing, maternal upbringing.[146] Obviously misled are those that try to find a feminine emphasis in the father's actions or other aspect of the story, those that see a problem on account of the fact that there is no mother. The parable has nothing to do with feminist concerns.

In economic terms, Metzger observes and concludes that the younger son is portrayed only as living wastefully, and the father is described as the foolish and incompetent estate manager and paterfamilias, whereas the elder son's voice in the parable challenges the audiences against overconsumption and wealth. The elder son is evaluated highly as one who has dutifulness, prudence, fiscal responsibility and justified anger.[147] On the other hand, Susan Eastman argues that it is possible to repent, forgive and reconcile only in the economics of grace that in his father's house there is enough and to spare, and that the father gives away his property, and even property that is willed to his elder son according to a bewildering generosity, not the wisdom in a world as Sirach warning a foolish father against

144. Breech, *The Silence of Jesus*, 184-212. His contention is followed by R.Q. Ford that thinks of the father even more negatively as one who hinders two sons' development. R.Q. Ford, *The Parables of Jesus: Recovering the Art of Listening* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 90-114.

145. Durber, "The Female Reader of the Parables of the Lost," 70.

146. Beavis, "Making Up Stories: A Feminist Reading of the Parable of the Prodigal Son," in ed., Mary Ann Beavis, *The Lost Coin: Parables of Women, Work and Wisdom* (Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 98-123, here 117.

147. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 106-108.

giving too much to his children.[148] However, Nolland contends that the parable cannot be about attitudes to and the use of money or possessions, due to the close link between the father and God, in which the father's actions mirror God's action. Having observed the degree of God's role and money's role in the Lukan parables, he concludes that of the Lukan parables, only two and three are parables about the use of money or possessions.[149]

Thus far from the discussion of approaches and backgrounds for reading the parable, good possibilities have been suggested. What is important, however, is that none of them are so comprehensive that they appropriately cover the whole content of the parable, in spite of the insight they give into understanding the parable. The following can be identified as the salient points of the parable.

First of all, the purpose of the parable is an invitation to celebrate and rejoice as shown explicitly in vv. 23-24 and 32. What is also of immense importance in the parable is the emphasis on the father's joy over the return of his younger son.[150] This purpose, as the pivot of the preceding two parables, fits the theme well which Luke plans to convey in this bundle of parables in chapter 15. In view of the analogy, if God rejoices at the return of sinners, how much more will God's people jump with joy over the return of a sinner? The people of God should not only be willing to participate in the celebration, but also be filled with joy over the return of sinner.

Secondly, in relation to the introduction of vv. 1-2, the parable functions as a defense of Jesus' association with sinners.[151] Like the instruction of the parable, if Jesus' receiving sinners and eating with them reveal God's mercy and forgiveness, then the Pharisees and the scribes' grievances must be stopped.[152] The point, in relation to the story between the elder son and his father, lies in understanding grace rather than partiality and envy. If the elder son continuously clings to self-righteousness and the mind of merit and reward, he will never

148. Susan Eastman, "The Foolish Father and the Economics of Grace," *ExpTim* 117 (2006), 402-405.

149. John Nolland, "The Role of Money and Possessions in the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32)," in ed., Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan, 2005), 178-209, here199-205, 206.

150. Lambrecht, *Once More Astonished*, 50; Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus*, 80.

151. Hultgren, *Parables*, 84-85; Jeremias, *Parables*, 131; Nolland, *Luke*, 791. But Crossan objects to a defense of Jesus' association with sinners, arguing that the parable is about the reversal of the human condition. Crossan, *In Parables*, 74.

152. Forbes contends that the parable displays two pictures regarding a stark portrayal of the attitude of the Pharisees and the scribes. In the relationship of the elder son with his father, "the religious authorities have misunderstood the nature and character of their God" and in the relationship of the elder son with his brother, "they have forgotten their relationship to their fellow Israelites." Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 148-49.

understand his father's generous and unmerited actions. After all, his obstinacy makes him fail to feel his father's love, even to find the fact that he has been living in the shade of his father, "Son, you are always with me." But if having discarded his own standpoint, he stands in his father's position with love and compassion towards his younger son, he will obviously understand the grace offered without any cost and unconditional forgiveness. In the case of the preceding two parables, he is to treasure the mind of the shepherd and the woman who place tremendous value on their lost one. The open-end of the parable makes the invitation to the audience all the more strong. Jesus' aim is not to rebuke, but to persuade.[153] Having abandoned their grumbling, will they join in celebrating God's feast which comes with Jesus' ministry?

Thirdly, the purpose of the parable lies in the father's love and compassion.[154] At the heart of the parable is the father's love towards his sons in which the father deals impartially with his sons. His love not only enables repentance for the younger son, but could also prospectively, demolish the elder son's hostility and grievances and elicit participation in the celebration. Along this line of analogy, God, whom Jesus represents in his ministry, is identical with the forgiving and merciful father presented in the parable.

Finally, if we can elicit a subsidiary theme from the parable, it is an attitude to and use of wealth and possessions. The younger son squanders his inheritance in loose living. The elder son expresses a complaint about his father throwing a great feast for the scoundrel, while the father generously uses his property, not only to restore his younger son but to celebrate the return of his younger son.[155]

153. Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables*, 61; L. Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; ed., J. Roloff; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), I, 136.

154. Helmut Thielcke, *The Waiting Father* (London: J. Clarke; New York: Harper and Bros, 1959), 17-40; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Luke* (Atlanta: John Knox; Lundon: SPCK, 1984), 247-48; Marshall, *Luke*, 604.

155. For more detail, See Eastman, "The Foolish Father and the Economics of Grace," 402-405. It is also possible, to some extent, to read two parables in the following chapter according to the economics of grace.

7. The Parable of the Unjust Steward (16: 1-13)

7-1. The Literary Context of Luke 16

It is clear that Luke 15 and the parable are related in literary and thematic aspects.[1] Even though there is a change of audience in 16:1,[2] the parable has the same scene as Luke 15. It implies not only that the parable is told at the same time and under the same setting as ch. 15, for want of a transition of the scene in ch. 16, but also that a relationship, at the very least, exists between the two chapters. Moreover, there are a good deal of common motifs between the parable and the Prodigal Son. Both begin with ἄνθρωπός τις ("a certain man") in Greek, and both squander material possessions entrusted to them. Both abruptly face a crisis of starvation and dismissal, and both use a monologue to express their inner feelings and plans. Both in the end are given unexpected forgiveness and commandment from the father and the master. Donahue, in addition to the above, provides five more similarities between two parables.[3]

R.A. Piper seeks for the similarities and relationship between the two chapters in a thematic unity, the theme of the acceptance of sinners which is an issue of Lukan community composed of a significant number of Jewish Christian and Gentile God-fearers. He claims that with ch. 15 as a start, the theme of the acceptance of sinners in effect flows into ch. 18 in which God accepts the tax-collector as a sinner, with a focus on acceptance rather than

---

1. Kilgallen, "Luke 15 and 16: A Connection," 370-71; Austin, "The Hypocritical Son," 307-315; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 108-109; Scott, *Re-Imagine the World: An Introduction to the Parables of Jesus*, 88; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 153; Nolland, *Luke*, 2:796; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1095; Marshall, *Luke*, 617; Stein, *Luke*, NAC, vol. 24 (Nashville: TN: Broadman Press, 1992), 411. The most commentators recognize that the conjunction, *καὶ* in v. 1 generally functions as a connector of the following parable with the previous one.

2. Michael R. Austin, following J.R.H. Moorman, contends that "it is a feature of Luke's presentation that he switches attention from one group of hearers to another, thus:"

15:3 "So he told them [the Pharisees] this parable …"
16:1 "He also said to the disciples …"
16:15 "But he said to them [the Pharisees] …"
17:1 "And he said to his disciples …"
17:20 "He answered them [the Pharisees] …"
17:22 "And he said to the disciples …"
18:9 "He also told this parable to some who trusted in themselves and despised others [the Pharisees] …"

See Austin, "The Hypocritical Son," 310-11; J.R.H. Moorman, *The Path to Glory: Studies in the Gospel according to Saint Luke* (London, SPCK, 1963), 192.

3. The additional elements are as follows: the father and master as protagonist, self-serving motives, acceptance into the house of hope, increasing tension by literary devices, open-ended, Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 167-68.

repentance in each parable.[4] Granted, his contention gives fresh insight into the understanding of the six parables in Luke 15-18, but I see no evidence that there are hints of issues of Lukan community related to the acceptance of sinners in these chapters, nor are there signs in the parable that the debtors are compelled to pass on the reductions to the wider populace, and that the master's predicament in the parable represents that of the Pharisees. He is inclined to read all the parables in ch. 15-18 in the light of the issue of the acceptance of sinners in Lukan communty, identifying the division between Pharisees and tax-collectors and sinners with a quarrel of Jewish Christian and Gentile God-fearing on the grounds of J.T. Sanders and P.F. Esler's contention.[5]

On the other hand, Bowen views the unifying element of the five parables in ch. 15-16 as the word οἶκος, that appears at the climax of the story in the series, and that represents the kingdom of God. The common message among the five parables is that admission into the kingdom of God is only by means of gracious invitation, not by means of one own actions or personal status. For Bowen the latter part of the Parable of the Prodigal Son in which the elder son scorns the unmerited invitation, provides in fact the transition for us to understand the Parable of the Unjust Steward. Even though the steward in the parable achieved his goal, "eternal tents," he, Bowen says, fails to obtain what he tried to earn, since what he acquires is solely a temporary, perishable abode, according to an ironical reading in v. 9.[6] However, in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, the word οἶκος in vv. 6, 8 represents simply the place for celebration or the stage for the story rather than an image of the kingdom. What is more, the focus of the return of the younger son, has more to do with the bosom of his father than

4. Ronald A. Piper, "Social Background and Thematic Structure in Luke 16," in ed., F. Van Segbroeck, *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (3 vols, Leuven, Leuven University Press, 1992), 2:1637-62, here 1641-46. He argues that although in the parable, the primary audience are obviously designated as "disciples" in v. 1, the duality of audience, as v. 14 shows, may allude to an intra-church problem, as 15: 1-2 shows the double audience in a sharp contrast. In this respect his contention is more convincing than Bailey's argument that the shift in audience is intentionally ambiguous for the message is directed at the disciples and Pharisees. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 108.

5. J.T. Sanders argues that the Pharisees in Luke are Christian Pharisees, not non-Christian, concluding that these hypocrites are not true members of the Christian. J.T. Sanders, "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts," in ed., D.E. Groh and R. Jewett, *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders* (Lanham, Md: University Press of America, 1985), 141-88, here 161, 177-81, 187-88. With Lukan community, the community of Luke, P.F. Esler claims, composed of a great deal of Jews and Gentile God-fearers. And the composition of Luke centers on an ardent desire to present Christianity as the legitimate development of Judaism. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*: *The Social and Political Motivations of Lukan Theology* (SNTSMS, 57, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 69.

6. C. Edward Bowen, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward *Oikos* as the Interpretative Key," *ExpTim* 112 (9, 2001), 314-315.

simply the house. Moreover, it is mere excessive conjecture that the steward obtained eternal tents, since, with the open end, we are left without any information as to whether the steward achieves his aim.

There is a lingering heated controversy with respect to the relationship between vv. 14-18 and two parables in ch. 16, or the connection between vv. 14-15 and vv. 16-18. For Marshall and Schmid, it is highly doubtful that vv. 14-18 relate to each other and to the preceding and following parables in ch. 16 as well. Marshall argues that the connection between vv. 14-18 and the two parables is artificial as well as irrelevant, in particular in the light of the observation that the motifs of the law in vv. 16-18 are inappropriate in connection with the themes of the material possessions in vv. 19-31. In addition, the connection between vv. 14-15 and vv. 16-18 is far from obvious.[7] In similar vein Schmid claims that vv. 16-18 has nothing to do with the foregoing and subsequent verses, and what is more, he says there is no logical connection among the three verses themselves.[8] From a different standpoint, Fitzmyer feels that seeing these three verses as an inexplicable intrusion of unrelated material, vv. 16-18 has no relation to the thrust of Jesus' comments in vv. 1-15.[9] In contrast, Bailey considers a possibility that there exist the two discussions regarding the money and the life to come (vv. 9-15 and vv. 19-31), and the two eschatological warnings together (vv. 1-8 and v. 16) in the original Jerusalem Document, while he sees v. 17 as the addition by Jewish Christians, and v. 18 as having nothing to do with the context.[10]

However, most interpreters concede that they may relate to each other and to the context in a chain of thoughts.[11] Ellis and Talbert suggest that vv. 14-15 anticipates vv. 19-26, and vv. 16-18 expects vv. 27-31. Ellis, with the perspective of a thematic-literary parallel, says that while both vv. 14-15 and vv. 19-26 focus on the distinction between divine and human values,

7. Marshall, *Luke*, 624-25.
8. J. Schmid, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (vol 3., Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1960), 262.
9. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel of Luke*, 1095, 1114. Since they, as a part of the Q material, stand in different contexts and placement in Matthew, it is most likely that the verses may be a misguided insertion of foreign material.
10. Bailey, *Poet and Peasnt*, 117.
11. Francis John Moore, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward," *ATR* 47 (1965), 103-05; R.J. Karris, "Poor and Rich: The Lukan Sitz im Leben," in ed., Talbert, *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (Danville, VA/Edinburgh: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion/ T & T Clark, 1978), 112-25; B. Byrne, "Forceful Stewardship and Neglected Wealth: A Contemporary Reading of Luke 16," *Pacifica* 1 (1988), 1-14; J.J. Kilgallen, "The Purpose of Luke's Divorce Text (16:18)," *Bib* 76 (1995), 229-38; idem, "Luke 15 and 16: A Connection," 369-76; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 171-72; Ellis, *Luke*, 201; Talbert, *Reading Luke. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*, 156; D.J. Ireland, *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God: An Historical, Exegetical and Contextual Study of the Parable of the Unjust Steward in Luke 16:1-13* (NovTSup, 70; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 122-138; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 153.

both vv. 16-18 and vv. 27-31 converge on the observance of the law, making a starting point of major partition in his outline of Luke's central section at Luke 16:14, such as 16:14-18:14.[12] In a similar way, Talbert suggests that vv. 14-31 is an attack on the Pharisees' assumptions about wealth, and that vv. 19-26 function as the exposition of vv. 14-15, while vv. 27-31 plays the role of an illustration of vv. 16-18.[13] On the other hand, vv. 14-31 continues and stretches, Ireland contends, the polemic against greed which stands as a foundation for Jesus' teaching in vv. 1-13. For him, vv. 14-31 clarifies the exhortation in v. 9, but also enhances the understanding of the parable of the Unjust Steward by the eschatological background, in particular in v. 16.[14]

Given the fact that v. 14 concerns avariciousness, which is related to both the preceding parable and the subsequent parable in ch. 16, one will take it for granted that vv. 15-18 may be meant to refer to the same problem. With such perspectives in mind, I believe that the underlying theme of vv. 14-18 is Jesus' polemic against the self-righteousness of the Pharisees as once has been presented in the attitude of the elder son in Luke 15. Above all, Jesus in vv. 14-15 notes the radical mistake that sets aside God's sight in establishing their self-righteousness. If anything, the Pharisees assess their righteousness only in the eyes of other people, who never know one's hearts. This is not a single example of their mocking, but an illustration of their entire character. Such valuation of their righteousness causes them to go on towards ostentation or hypocrisy. As with wealth, the desire of Pharisees to win the public recognition before people appears inevitability in the love of money, since their attitude towards wealth is rooted in something deeper, their thoughts that regard wealth as a special blessing for careful obedience to the law.[15]

The statement in v. 16[16] implies that, with Jesus' coming and the proclamation of the

12. Ellis, *Luke*, 210.

13. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*, 156-59.

14. Ireland, *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God*, 122, 138.

15. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1113; A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922), 387-88; Derrett, "Fresh Light on St. Luke XVI. II. Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings," *NTS* 7 (1960-61), 364-80, here 376; R. Summers, *Commentry on Luke* (Waco, TZ: Word, 1972), 192; J. Volckaert, "The Parable of the Clever Steward," *Clergy Monthly* 17 (1953), 332-41, here 341; Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*, 156; David B. Gowler, 'Socio-narratological Character Analysis of the Pharisees in Luke-Acts' (PhD dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989), 261. The Pharisees' scoffing in v. 14 presents for them no conflict between piety and wealth, no contradiction in serving God and Mammon together, for identifying wealth with righteousness.

16. There have been a lot of controversies over the matter of their material and their appropriateness for the context, without consensus. All of these verses have parallel in Matthew as part of the Q material as follows: Luke 16:16 par Matt 11:12-13; Luke 16:17 par Matt 5:18 and Luke 16:18 par Matt 5:32.

kingdom of God, a new epoch has opened up. In other words, the old period of God's revelation through the law and the prophets has ended and a new period of revelation through Jesus' coming and ministry has begun. Now the kingdom of God is being preached and everyone is forcing their way into it.[17] Through Jesus the new epoch has come, but nevertheless the law in v. 17 has permanency and abiding validity as before. In v. 18, Jesus takes an erroneous example of their observances of the law in which they pride themselves, the topic of divorce, and affirms the permanency of the law. The saying that "they have Moses and the Prophets; let them listen to them." in the latter half of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is connected with the Pharisees' attitude of the law in vv. 16-18, and the first half of vv. 19-31 is suitable for the Pharisees who loved money and justify themselves vv. 14-15. Thus vv. 14-18 reinforces and amplifies Jesus' teaching in vv. 1-13, putting wealth and money into the law, and eschatology as preparation for the kingdom.

The parable of the Unjust Steward in vv. 1-13 and the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, as has been pointed out previously, are closely related to each other thematically. The two parables beginning with the phrase ἄνθρωπός τις are tied together into the theme of wealth as both a positive instance and negative one for stark contrast. Seen in the instruction of v. 9, the rich man in vv. 19-31 fails to use his wealth to make friends who will welcome him into eternal dwellings, by not giving alms to Lazarus who begs at his gate, while the steward uses wealth rightly to win friends who will welcome him into eternal dwellings, showing the right way to behave.[18] Wealth in the two parables, what is more, is considered in an eschatological

17. For the correct interpretation, it is important to know how the word βιάζεται is to be understood, since it may be taken as either a middle voice or a passive voice. Almost all of the commentators prefer the word βιάζεται as reading in the middle voice that now all people have access to the kingdom, but resolute action is necessary so that they enter into the kingdom, whereas there are some interpreters who claim and support reading it in the passive voice rather than in the middle voice. According to their suggestion, the meaning of v. 16 is as follows: "The kingdom of God is being preached and everyone is forced into it." or "Everyone is earnestly invited or urged to enter into the kingdom." or "everyone is under pressure." For interpretation in passive voice, see Godet, *Luke*, 2:259; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1117-18; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 116; Juan B. Cortés and Florence M. Gatti, "On the Meaning of Luke 16:16," *JBL* 106 (1987), 247-259, here 255, 257; Byrne, "Forceful Stewardship and Neglected Wealth: A Contemporary Reading of Luke 16," 1-5; Ilaria L.E. Ramelli, "Luke 16:16: the Good News of God's Kingdom Is Proclaimed and Everyone Is Forced into It," *JBL* 127 (2008), 737-58. Ramelli, seeing the word βιάζεται as a theological passive in the sense that God is mentioned as the Lord of the kingdom itself, understands v. 16 as the passive meaning that "everyone is pushed by God into his kingdom through its proclamation." In order to demonstrate it, he provides arguments derived from Luke's Gospel itself, the ancient translations and patristic exegesis by detailing ten items.

18. It is not surprising that the contrast between the two parables in ch. 16 has been noted by many commentators, for it at first glance comes into view without difficulty. See Michael Ball, "The Parables of the Unjust Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus," *ExpTim* 106 (1995), 329-330; Derrett, "Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings," 370; Marshall, *Luke*, 632; Morris, *Luke*, 252; Plummer, *Luke*, 390.

situation in that the steward faces immediately dismissal from his master, and that the rich man faces his death abruptly. In any rate, it is clear that two parables have a close connection to each other in the overarching thrust of wealth and possessions.

7-2. The Analysis of the Parable

The parable, as in the preceding parables in Luke 15 and the parable that follows in vv. 19-31, begins with the phrase ἄνθρωπός τις which is a Lukan characteristic, and, as in Luke 12:16 and 16:19, introduces a rich man with a steward as a manager of his estate. Even though it is supposed that the peasantry has had antipathy towards an exploitative and predatory wealthy elite in first century Palestine,[19] it is not necessarily right to assume that the audiences would either have antipathy towards or loath the rich man in the parable.[20]

There have been controversies as to whether the steward in the parable is an agent for the owner or a slave. But in either case, it is skeptical, to what extent, whether it can influence over our understanding of the parable. Mary Ann Beavis, following W.O.E. Oesterley's insistence that the word οἰκονόμος in the parable would be a slave like the '*vilicus'* (the farm overseer or the estate manager) in a Roman household,[21] continues the controversy of the issue, preferring to read the οἰκονόμος in the light of Greco-Roman literature, in which case the οἰκονόμος in the parable is a slave, and this possibility is supported by W.G. Rollins' list.[22] On the other hand, Rene A. Baergen maintains, that although the rich man's οἰκονόμος

19. Against Bailey's contention that there are no ruthless landowners in the synoptic parables, see particularly Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 240-41. For the similar standpoints of the agrarian society in the first century Palestinian, see also Derrett, "Fresh Light on St. Luke XVI. I. The Parable of the Unjust Steward," *NTS* 7 (1961), 198-219 and in *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), 52-77; J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Story of the Dishonest Manager (Lk 16:1-13)," *TS* 25 (1964), 23-42, here 32-33; B.B. Scott, "A Master's Praise: Luke 16:1-8," *Bib* 64 (1983), 173-88; L.P. Trudinger, "Exposing the Depths of Oppression (Luke 16:1b-8a): The Parable of the Unjust Steward," in ed., V.G. Shillington, *Jesus and his Parables: Interpreting the Parables of Jesus Today* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 121-37, here 131; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 156; Stephen I. Wright, "The Parable of the Shrewd Manger (Luke 16:1-13)," in ed., R.N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus Parables* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000), 224-230; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 109-133.

20. Bailey goes so far as to speculate that the master is clearly a part of the community as a local aristocrat. He proceeds to portray the master as a high moral character whose mercy after all makes the steward's debt reduction feasible. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 90.

21. W.O.E. Oesterley, *The Gospel Parables in the Light of Their Jewish Background* (New York: Macmillan, 1936), 193.

22. His classification of the servile types or functions is as follows: ἀνδράποδον (slave taken in war); ἐνδογενής, οἰκογενής (home-bred slave); οἰκέτης, οἰκέτις (domestic slave); θεράπων, θεράπαινα (personal slave); παῖς, παιδάριον, παιδίσκη (slave boy/girl); οἰκονόμος (slave in charge of household or estate); σῶμα, σῶμα γυναικεῖον (a term used in inventory lists). W.G. Rollins, "Slavery in the NT," *IDBSup*, 830-32.

might be an exception to the rule of ancient slavery, he refutes this possibility, outlining three points through the lens of ancient slavery which presents new insight into the parable. To put it more clearly, the rich man's immediate response in vv. 1-2 and praise in v. 8a can be explained simply from the fact that in the lens of ancient slavery, the slave was considered to be entwined in his master's honour, and that slaves praised by their masters occur on several occasions, and is not foreign. Moreover, the fact that many managerial slaves participated in the fortunes of the elite households makes the act of the steward feasible.[23] More recently, Fabian E. Udoh contends that the word οἰκονόμος here is a person of servile status as in Xenophon's and Pseudo-Aristotle's ἐπίτροπος, and Columella's, Varro's, and Cato's *villicus*. According to the demarcation in the classical Greek and Hellenistic periods, while in household and estate management, the title represented people of servile status, outside household and estate management, the word pointed to people who were not servile.[24] Granted, the above observation sheds light on understanding the function and the role of slaves in general. If anything, it is all the more desirable and feasible that the steward in the parable is the rich man's manager overseeing his estate, because the steward did not anticipate demotion, physical punishment or sale, as a typical slave might have, but only dismissal, according to his soliloquy. In addition, his master only considers dismissal as opposed to other possibilities.[25]

The master has received charges against his steward of squandering his possessions. Here, some questions arise in the reader's mind regarding the charges against the steward. Who filed the accusations? What is the content of the charges? Are the accusations fair? Even though it seems plausible that the accusations arise from the jealousy, retribution and greed of the tenants, according to John G. Lygre,[26] as far as the accusations are concerned, the audience is left with no information. The content of the charge relates to the wasting of his

23. Rene A. Baergen, "Servant, manager or slave? Reading the parable of the rich man and his steward (Luke 16:1-8a) through the lens of ancient slavery," *Studies in Religion /Sciences Religieuses* 35 (2006), 25-38, here 32-34.

24. Fabian E. Udoh, "The Tale of an Unrighteous Slave (Luke 16:1-8[13])," *JBL* 128 (2009), 311-335, particularly 314, 320.

25. Derrett, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward," 198-219; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 92; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 241; Jennifer A. Glancy, "Slaves and Slavery in the Matthean Parables," *JBL* 119 (2000), 67-90, here 72-79; idem, *Slavery*, 113-15, here 109; Forbes, *The God of God*, 156; Hultgren, *Parables*, 148; Scott, *Re-Imagine the World*, 89-90; Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 157. Glancy sees the steward in the parable as a freedman in classifying many stewards in which there were slaves, freedmen and freeborn men.

26. He simply speculates that if in a position with any authority, there is anyone that engages in thoughtless boasting or spending, it is most likely that tenants who they did not hire are jealous or suspicious of a steward. John G. Lygre, "Of What Charges? (Luke 16:1-2)," *BTB* 32 (2002), 21-28, here 23.

master's goods, διασκορπίζων τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτου. The word "squander" can have quite different meanings: 'to disperse simply' or 'spend extravagantly'. If the meaning of διασκορπίζων is seen as "scatter," then the charges may be considered as unjust accusations, since it can present simply a lack of attention to using his owner's possessions responsibly in operating a business.[27] By contrast, if we take the negative meaning, namely, "to spend extravagantly," one then takes the accusations for granted, for the steward would have misappropriated his master's goods for selfish or immoral activities. This is reminiscent of the prodigal son's loose living expressed in the word διεσκόρπισεν in Luke 15:13.[28] On the other hand, Kloppenborg argues that the reason why the steward is dismissed is not the wasting of his goods, but the damage to his social honour.[29] It is important to note however, aside from the dictionary meanings of the word, that it is a very complex problem to solve given his silence over the charges, his monologue, and the commendation of the steward in v. 8. In any case, it is reasonable to view the steward's silence as an admission of his guilt, although his defense and excuse would be useless or only further provoke his master to anger in first century Palestine's social situation. Moreover, if the charges are unjust, the steward would do his best to prove his innocence at a critical moment, not yielding to any social code at that time.

The master commands his steward to submit the account books, since he is to be dismissed from his stewardship. Surrendering the account books,

27. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 257, idem, "Praise," 179-80; Beavis, "Slavery as an Interpretive Context," 48; Lygre, "Of What Charges?" 25; J.S. Kloppenborg, "The Dishonoured Master," *Bib* 70 (1989), 474-95, here 479-86, 487-88; Wright, "The Parable of the Shrewd Manger," 224; Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*, 157-62; John Dominic Crossan, 'Structuralist Analysis and the Parables of Jesus: A Reply to D. O. Via, "Parable and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach,'" *Semeia* 1 (1974), 50-54. Via and Crossan see the parable as a comic, pricaresque and rascal story which avenges his master on his unjust charges. With regard to the content of the charges, there are several suggestions. Stein, Herzog and Lygre argue that it is of inefficiency, incompetence, or inattention to duty. Even B.H. Young views it as dishonest business dealings rather than ineffectual management. Stein, *Parables*, 109; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 244; Lygre, "Of What Charges?" 24, 27; Young, *Jesus and his Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching*, 233.

28. L.M. Friedel, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward," *CBQ* 3 (1941), 337-48, here 337-38; Fitzmyer, "The Story of the Dishonest Manager (Lk 16:1-13)," 31, n19; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 97; Stanley E. Porter, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-13): Irony is the Key," in ed., David J.A. Clines, S.E. Fowl, and S.E. Porter, *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 127-53, here 140; Forbes, The God of God, 156; Hultgren, *Parables*, 149; David Landry & Ben May, "Honor Restored: New Light on The Parable of The Prudent Steward(Luke 16:1-8a)," *JBL* 119 (2000), 287-309, here 297-98; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*,110-11. For the comparison between the prodigal son's squandering and the steward's one, see Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 167; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1100; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 244.

29. Kloppenborg, "Dishonoured Master," 486-93. His point is followed by Landry and May, Lygre and Metzger.

ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας σου means to give the steward time for the finishing touches, so that his master can pass it over to the new manager to be employed. To put it more exactly, the steward, as Bailey contends, is instantly dismissed and all that remains is for him to hand the account books to his master, and is not in progress or in the midst of dismissal.[30]

The steward, in his soliloquy, foresees the desperate future life which he might face, and reveals his plan to handle it. Lygre claims that, in comparison with the prodigal son's soliloquy, the steward does not voice any remorse in his soliloquy though it is the most logical place to express it. In the light of this one deduces then that the charges are filed unjustly by the owner, if anything, the accusations are put for preservation of the owner's honour.[31] He fails, however, to grasp that the soliloquy is not a literary device merely for the expression of a character's straightforward remorse, but also to reveal a character's inner thinking to audiences or readers. On the contrary, the fact that the steward in his soliloquy foresees a most miserable future (apart from the possibility of seeking new employment) implies that the charges are just. If his dismissal because of the events involved in his wrongdoing becomes known to the other tenants or merchants who have the capacity to hire him, presumably none of them would hire him as a manager for themselves. Digging work is beyond his physical strength[32] and his pride cannot bring him to beg as noted in Sir 40:29,[33] therefore, he has resolved to plan for his safe future. His plan becomes clear as the story proceeds: If he grants favours to the debtors in the form of debt reductions, when he is removed from his stewardship, they may welcome him into their homes. Even though it

30. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 97.

31. Lygre, "Of What Charges?" 25-26. Lygre argues that the reason why the steward did not pursue legal procedures was that it was useless because, according to Fitzmyer's suggestion, persons holding subservient positions did not have proper recourse to legal action in Roman-occupied rural areas. Fitzymyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 175.

32. Apart from digging in agriculture as manual labour which audiences can envision easily, Beavis' contention is excessive conjecture that digging means to be sent away to do hard labour in a stone quarry. Even Herzog argues that for the steward digging means not only to drop out the class of retainers into the class of expendables, but to face a death from malnutrition from which the class of expendables generally suffers. Beavis, "Ancient Slavery," 49; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 242. Against Landry and May's contention that the steward's soliloquy is a frank, sober assessment of his (in)abilities, not as a expression of his unwillingness to mingle with the lower classes, if anything, his attitude here, as Scott has pointed out, makes remote from the audiences who are composed of people to have largely to live by physical labor, thereby he voices that he want to continuously live in the world of the wealthy, even after being fired. Landry and May, "Honor Restored," 300; Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*, 161; Breech, *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man*, 105-106; Kloppenborg, "The Dishonored Master," 491; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 263; Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 158.

33. Sir 40:29. "It is better to die than to beg."

indeed is odd that he had no relatives or friends who would welcome him into their homes, or that he saved nothing for his basic provisions while he stewarded, it is not difficult to understand such situations, given the fact that his lifestyle, as alluded to in v. 1, was formed as habit of squandering his own possessions, like the younger son in the preceding parable.

According to his plan conceived before, he begins with the debt reduction after summoning his master's debtors. It is not essential to the parable's main point whether the steward summons the debtors one by one privately, or all of them together to one place.[34] The amount of the debts is huge. In the case of one hundred *baths* of oil, it would be equivalent to about 800 or 900 gallons or to the wages of about three years for the average worker. And in the case of one hundred *kor* of wheat, it would be about 1100 bushels or one-half year of labor for the average worker.[35] The debtors benefit the equivalent of about 500 denarii by the debts reduction. The steward then acts as an agent as if the master did it himself, in accordance with the Jewish law on agency.[36] With the quantities involved and the nature of the commodities, Piper, following Danker's study of benefaction in the Greco-Roman era,[37] argues that the debtors who receive the debt reduction would have been forced to pass on the reductions to the wider populace who relied on these foodstuffs, which were the basic foodstuffs of the ancient Mediterranean world.[38] Yet he is not so much alleviating the suffering of the poor as ensuring his own survival. There is, to be exact, no suggestion to support that he indeed hoped to help the poor through the debt reduction.

With respect to the debt reduction, there are several further points, such as the interest, the steward's commission and the principal. Derrect, following P.W. Pestman's survey, argues that the audience would consider the debt reduction as the elimination of the original interest, since the interest rate on food commodities in Egypt was fifty percent, which is like the amount of the debt reduction in the parable.[39] The main problem with the usury or interest,

34. The word ἕκαστος is read generally each or every. See BDAG, 298.

35. Jeremias, *Parables*, 181; Douglas E. Oakman, "Jesus and Agrarian Palestine: The Factor of Debt," in ed., Kent Harold Richards, *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1985), 57-73, here 71; James Breech, *The Silence of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 107-8; Nolland, *Luke*, 799.

36. Derrett, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward," 201, says that "the three great maxims of the Jewish law of agency are as follows: (1) A man's agent is like himself. (2) There is no agency for wrongdoing. (3) It is presumed that an agent executes his commission." See also *b. Gittin* 77b; *b. Baba Mesi*^{e}*a* 96a; *b. Qiddušin* 43a; *b. Baba Qamma* 113b; *b. B. Qam*. 51a, 79a; *b. Qiddušin* 42b and *b.* ^{e}*Erubin* 31b.

37. F.W. Danker, *Benefactor. Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St Louis, Clayton Publishing House, 1982), 75-76.

38. Piper, "Social Background and Thematic Structure in Luke 16," 1649-51.

39. Derrectt contends that "in considering the customary interest on loans one has to differentiate between loans of money and loans of consumer goods such as grain, wine, salt, and such like. Demotic loans were drawn in the

contends Derrect, is that it is an anachronism, being derived from other centuries and other cultures, lacking evidence for the first century Judea. On the other hand, Fitzmyer contends that the steward sacrifices his own commission.[40] Marshall also feels that the commission theory is in line with v. 9, in as much as he is using his own money.[41] It seems absurd, however, that the steward expects the debtors to welcome him into their homes, having taken 100 per cent commission from them. In addition, it is indeed odd that the steward's large commission would have appeared on the bill.[42] In view of the very large amounts of the reductions as equivalent to about three years' wages, it would be very strange for him to all of a sudden experience a financial crisis. Taking all that into consideration, the most proper reading is that the steward reduced the amounts of debts which were due to his master, namely, he forged the actual amounts owed.[43]

In what follows, I will deal with the cruces interpretum in the parable which include v. 7,[44] v. 8a,[45] v. 8b[46] and v. 9.[47] The suggestion that the parable ends with v. 7 is not

---

form of acknowledgement of debt, interest not being specified separately. Greek loans of money usually do state the amount of interest. With regard to demotic and Greek loans in kind the debtor used, particularly in the time of the Ptolemies, to pay a compensation of 50 per cent of the goods borrowed, as interest. This is a fixed amount regardless of the duration of the loan. Derrett, "'Take Thy Bond… and Write Fifty' (Luke 16:6): The Nature of the Bond," *JTS* 23 (1972), 438-440, here 438, 440; Marshall, *Luke*, 614-16.

40. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1097-1101; Margaret D. Gibson, "On the Parable of the Unjust Steward," *ExpTim* 14 (1902-03), 334; Paul Gächter, "The Parable of the Dishonest Steward after Oriental Conception," *CBQ* 12 (1950), 121-31; Ellis, *Luke*, 200-201; Halvor Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 140.

41. Marshall, *Luke*, 615.

42. Stein, *Parables*, 109.

43. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 86-100; Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*, 158-61; Breech, *Silence of Jesus*, 108; Kloppenborg, "The Dishonoured Master," 490; Porter, "Steward," 131-32; Ireland, *Stewardship*, 73-82; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 255; Scott, *Hear Then the Parables*, 263-65; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 158; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 410-11.

44. Those who contend that the parable ends with v. 7 and all the rest is secondary addition are as follows: H. Preisker, "Lukas 16:1-7," *TLZ* 74 (1949), 85-92; Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 175-76; N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (London:SCM Press, 1967), 115; Crossan, *In Parables*, 109; Ellis, *Luke*, 198-99; W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THKNT 3; Berlin, 1984), 318; Hunter, *The Parables Then and Now*, 100-101; Jeremias, *Parables*, 45-46, 182; Leaney, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 223; D.E. Oakman, *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day* (Studies in the Bible and early Christianity 8; Lewiston, N.Y. 1986), 150; Hans Weder, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern. Traditions-und redaktionsgeschichtliche Analysen und Interpretationen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 262-64; Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 160.

45. Those who argue that the parable ends with v. 8a and the rest is application include R.W. Funk, *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*, ed., R. Funk, Roy W. Hoover and Jesus Seminar, (New York: Macmillan, 1993), 358-59; Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 15:1-19:27)*, 67-68; W. Loader, "Jesus and the Rogue in Luke 16:1-8a: The Parable of the Unjust Steward," *RB* 96 (1989), 518-32; Combrink, "A Social-Scientific Perspective on the parable of the 'unjust' steward (Lk 16:1-8a)," *Neotestamentica* 30 (1996),

convincing, since, if the parable has no response in v. 8a, with no resolution, the audience in the parable is left with the situation in which they do not know whether the steward's scheme was successful or not.

Recently, Ryan S. Schellenberg has sought to understand the unity between the parable and the sayings appended to it (vv. 9-13), as well as the identity of the κύριος on grounds of *metalepsis.*[48] In his view, Luke habitually blurs the boundary between the metadiegetic world of the parable and the diegetic world of Jesus and his hearers.[49] That is to say, Luke's story of Jesus intrudes into a metadiegetic universe as an embedded narrative, the parables.[50] The unexpected intrusion of the diegetic κύριος, namely, *metalepsis* compels the audience to

---

281-306, here 292; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 192; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 254; Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 118; Kloppenborg, "The Dishonoured Master (Luke 16:1-8a)," 475-79; Landry and May, "Honer Restored," 303; Beavis, "Slavery as an Interpretive Context for Servant Parables," 52; Baergen, "Servant, manager or slave?" 25; Lygre, "Of What Charges? (Luke 16:1-2)," 21; W.L. Liefeld, *Luke*, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 988; Parott, "The Dishonest Steward (Luke 16:1-8a)," 499-502; Scott, "A Master's Praise," 174-176; Topel, "On the Injustice," 218-19; Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*, 156-57; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 163; B. Smith, *The Parables in the Synoptic Gospels*, 110; I.J. Du Plessis, "Philanthropy or Sarcasm? Another Look at the Parable of the Dishonest Manager (Luke 16:1-13)." *Neotestamentica* 24 (1990), 1-20, here 2; Fitzmyer, "The Story of the Dishonest Manager (Lk 16:1-13)," 27-28; Piper, "Social Background and Thematic Structure in Luke 16," 1648; Fabian E. Udoh, "The Tale of an Unrighteous Slave (Luke 16:1-8[13]), 314; Marshall, *Luke*, 620; Stein, *Parables*, 111; Nolland, *Luke*, 801-2; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*,123

46. Those who claim that the parable ends with v. 8b and the rest is application include W. Oesterley, Parables, 198; J.M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London, 1930), 201-3; K.H. Rengstrof, *Das Evanglium nach Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1969), 189; Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 2:505; Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 291-92; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 107-109; Hultgren, *Parables*, 146-48.

47. Plummer, *Luke*, 380, 386; Geoffirey Paul, "The Unjust Steward and the Interpretation of Luke 16:9," *Theology* 61 (1958), 189-93, here 192; D.R. Fletcher, "The riddle of the unjust steward: Is irony the key?" *JBL* 82 (1963), 15-30, here 20; J.C. Wansey, "Parable of the Unjust Steward," *ExpTim* 47 (1935-36), 39-40; F.J. Williams, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-9). Notes on the Interpretation Suggested by the Reverend R.G. Lunt." *ExpTim* 66 (1955), 371-372; M. Krämer, *Das Rätsel der Parabel vom ungerechten Verwalter, Lk 16:1-13* (Zürich: PAS, 1972), 132-33; Richard H. Hiers, "Friends by Unrighteous Mammon: The Eschatological Proletariat(Luke 16:9)," *JAAR* 38 (1970), 30-36, here 32; Ireland, *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God*, 94-96; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 411-12.

48. As will be explained in the next footnote, *Metalepsis* means 'the transgression of the boundary between narrative levels.' R.S. Schellenberg seeks to demonstrate that "Luke habitually blurs the boundary between the metagiegtic world of Jesus' stories and his own story of Jesus." Ryan S. Schellenberg, "Which Master? Whose Steward? Metalepsis and Lordship in the Parable of the Prudent Steward (Lk. 16:1-13)," *JSNT* 30 (2008), 263-288, here 269-73.

49. According to the terminology of G. Genette's study of narrative level, the first narrative level is the diegetic or intradiegetic level and contains the primary narrative like Luke's story of Jesus, and the second level is the metadiegitic level like that which we find in the parables, and finally, there is extradiegetic material addressed by the implied author like that which we find in Luke's prologue. See Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, 228-34, 92-94. Cf. M. Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (trans. C. van Boheemen; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 142-49.

50. Schellenberg, "Which Master? Whose Steward? Metalepsis and Lordship in the Parable of the Prudent Steward (Lk. 16:1-13)," 268.

reconsider and re-evaluate their understanding of lordship, stewardship and debt in the parable as a metadiegetic narrative.[51] The audience confronts not only a new understanding of loyal stewardship between the meticulous collection of the master's debts seen in the parable as faithful stewardship, and debt release as the image of forgiveness of sins in Luke's story of Jesus, but also a determination of a selection between two different κύριοι, each requiring an entirely different allegiance. In the light of the diegetic motif of debt reduction, the steward's behaviour is praised by the diegetic κύριος. Why then is the steward explicitly called unjust? Because the commendation of the diegetic κύριος does not alter the norms within the metadiegetic narrative, that is, the steward's actions were unacceptable in the metadiegetic narrative. In addition, even by the criteria of the diegetic κύριος, the steward's behaviour is not unjust, since he relies on reciprocity rather than divine reward.[52] In the steward's attempt to settle the problem of the κύριος, verse 8a and the inadequateness of the appended sayings (8b-13) to the parable give us an insight into understanding the parable. However, it is quite doubtful whether Luke, as Schellenberg was also worried,[53] was aware of the concept of metalepsis and used such a narrative trope.

Even though the majority of interpreters hold that the parable does end with v. 8a and the rest is the application of the parable, I view vv. 8b-9, which is Jesus' application of the parable, as an original part of the parable, and the rest in vv. 10-13 as Jesus' other sayings on the use of wealth. If the parable ends with v. 8a, the audience, as with the ending at v. 7, will also be placed in the situation that they do not know why the parable is told. Vv. 8b-9 plays a crucial role in making the story effective. Against Jeremias' contention that vv. 8b-13 is an attempt to explain the parable, it is not so much explanations to settle vexing problems of the parable as proper applications focused on the eschatological crisis and the wise use of material resources. Vv. 10-13, in line with vv. 8b-9, are more extended applications which match the parable well. However, the origin of the verses is unclear, that is to say, whether the verses could be sayings joined together with similar words and theme, or could have been a unit from the beginning.

The issue that follows on the demarcation of the parable in question, is the reference of ὁ κύριος in v. 8a. Jeremias sees the master in v. 8a as Jesus, on the grounds that the master in the parable would not have praised a deceitful steward, and that the usages (eighteen of

51. Ibid., 273.
52. Ibid., 278.
53. Ibid., 269.

twenty-one times, and Luke 18:8 in particular) of κύριος in Luke's Gospel, substantiate the fact that the master in v. 8a is Jesus.[54] However, the possibilities within the parabolic material, as Bailey's contention, vanish, for the usages where κύριος refers to the master in the parables (12:37, 42b; 14:23) are superior in numbers to that of Jesus in the parables (12:42; 18:6).[55] Furthermore, there is quite an adequate reason for praising the steward for his prudence, and such cases frequently occur in the Greco-Roman literature as the typical picaresque works, in which a master had no choice but to commend his slave overcoming his crisis and outsmarting his master by using his wits.[56] In the case that there is no clear indicator that the "master" refers to someone other than the prior two examples in v. 3 and 5, one should generally assume that the reference to the "master" afterwards refers to the same person, since where shifts occur, there are clear indicators, as in 12:41.[57] Fabian E. Udoh recently claims that in v. 8a "the lord's (master's) praise has been overlaid with the Lord's (Jesus) praise,"[58] showing three instances (Luke 12:42abc; 19:25ab; 18:6ab) in which the householder speaks with Jesus' voice. Here there exists "positive and productive use of ambiguity"[59], where at the same time many things are specified, or where the reader need not choose between them. In this respect there is only one (L)lord in the narrative, whereby the parable is indeed more meaningful. In so doing, Jesus can also urge the children of light to be prudent in their generation without a transitional phrase to reintroduce his comments.[60] Udoh's suggestion makes the parable more meaningful, but also at a literary level offers a clue for a resolution of the vexing problem in v. 8a.

Most importantly, in connection with v. 8a, there remains the question about why the master praises his steward. It is at least clear that what is praised concerns his actions in vv. 5-7, and not his initial behaviour. Derrett contends that the master was praising the steward for revealing a pietous reputation in eliminating the usurious amounts on the bill, in keeping with Mosaic usury law. According to his view, the master's own illegal activity over against the

54. Jeremias, *Parables*, 45.
55. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 103.
56. Beavis, "Ancient Slavery as An Interpretive Context for the New Testament Servant Parables with Special Reference to the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-8)," *JBL* 111 (1992), 37-54; Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*, 158-61; Scott, "A Master's Praise," 173-188.
57. Stein, *Luke*, 414, idem, *Parables*, 107; Du Plessis, "Philanthropy or Sarcasm?" 8.
58. Udoh, "An Unrighteous Slave (Luke 16:1-8[13])," 335.
59. Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976), 47.
60. Udoh, "An Unrighteous Slave (Luke 16:1-8[13])," 325-327. Although on account of the ambiguity established, a tension arises in the narrative, there is no latent narrative confusion.

prohibition of usury might have had a potential crisis to be exposed someday.[61] On the other hand, Fitzmyer argues that what is praised is due to the elimination of the steward's own commission as a sign of repentance, and his prudence.[62] Interpreters emphasizing the 'honor-shame' background, argue that the master is praising the steward because the steward retrieves and raises the master's honour or his social reputation by redistributing wealth[63] and eliminating the usury[64] or the illegal hidden interest due to the steward himself.[65] It is untenable to try to settle the problem of the master's praise by viewing the steward's action in vv. 5-7 as honest, for there is an apparent reference that called the steward τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας in v. 8a. Unlike the above suggestions, Bailey feels that the steward is praised for his wisdom in his action to preserve himself in vv. 5-7, revealing confidence in the master's generosity and mercy which he has experienced in his initial wrongdoing of v. 1. It is doubtful, however, whether the dismissal is a generous punishment to the steward given the risk to his life. What is all important here, is that the praise can stand regardless of the benefit brought to the master, but the parable can be used to encourage the emulation of the unjust steward. Notice that the bad characters are used to make a good point in Luke 11:5-10, 11:11-13 and 18:1-8. All things considered, the best understanding of the master's praise lies in the prudence or wisdom concerned with his own security, that is to say, his initiative plan or ability to match means with end, seeing his behaviour of vv. 5-7 as unjust. In summary, it is better to view that the master speaks with Jesus' voice, with the same reasons for commendation.

Fizymyer sees vv. 8b-13 as three separate sayings of Jesus attached to the parable (vv. 8b-9, vv. 10-12 and v. 13) by the pre-Lukan tradition, focusing on moralizing and allegorizing in the Gospel tradition.[66] But in consonance with Jeremias, vv. 8b-9 at least, as have been argued above, is an original part of the parable from Jesus. What is more, the parable has to

61. Derrett, "Unjust Steward," 217.

62. Fitzmyer, "The Story of the Dishonest Manager (Lk 16:1-13)," 36-37; Ellis, *Luke*, 200-201; Kistemaker, *Parables*, 232; B.E. Beck, *Christian Character*, 28-30; P.S. Wilson, "The Lost Parable of the Generous Landowner and Other texts for Imaginative Preaching," *Quarterly Review* 9 (1989), 87-99, here 87-88.

63. Combrink, "Social-Scientific Perspective," 303.

64. Landry and May, "Honor Restored," 301.

65. Stephen I, Wright, "Parables on Poverty and Riches (Luke 12:13-21; 16:1-13; 16:19-31)," in ed., R.N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000), 217-239, here 225. Lygre claims that the steward's debt reduction leads his master to be honorable among the tenants, set aside any reference to whom the amounts of the debt reduction belong to. Lygre, "Of What Charges?" 26. On the other hand, Kloppenborg sees the master's praise as a subversion of the cultural codes on basis of honour-shame system. Kloppenborg, "The Dishonoured Master," 492-3.

66. Fitzymyer, *Luke*, 2:1105.

be read with vv. 10-13 together in a single unit irrespective of being the pre-Lukan tradition or Luke's clumsy redaction, since it is intended to be read together with vv. 8b-13 on a literary level. The steward, according to Jesus' division, belongs to the sons of this age who act with more wisdom in their affairs than the sons of light. Given the fact that while the sons of this age carry a negative sense as 'worldly', the sons of light convey a positive meaning as a common biblical metaphor for truth and salvation (Isa. 9:2, Jn 1:4-5, Jn 12:35-36, 1Thess 5:5 and Eph. 5:8).[67] Here, Jesus appears to see the parable's primary audience to be followers and the sons of light. Jesus upbraids his disciples in that the disciples as the sons of light unlike the steward do not know how to live wisely in line with the kingdom which is brought by Jesus.

The word μαμωνᾶ in v. 9 appears to be a neutral term for money or property, as synonymous with the word ὑπάρχοντα for property in v. 1. In terms of etymology, the word μαμωνᾶς seems to be derived from the אמן meaning to 'be reliable' or 'to trust'. When the word μαμωνᾶ is connected with ἀδικίας, it can have various meanings, namely, money is obtained by unrighteous means, or belongs to this world, or tends to corrupt. Given the fact that τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας is contrasted with the true, namely, true wealth in the verses that follow, the expression here describes the tendency of money to corrupt or to enslave.[68] As for ὅταν ἐκλίπητε, "when it is gone," the meaning can be considered by two options: when the money is gone,[69] or when 'life' or the 'age is gone'.[70] In view of the death of two rich men in 12:20 and 16:22, it is more likely that the phrase indicates the latter. 'They' in "they may welcome you" indicates friends that could be the poor, or angels, or a circumlocution of God. The expression τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς refers to eternal habitations as the bosom of *Abraham* in 16:22, having an eschatological connotation. In short, Jesus'

67. The Qumran Essenes too used the term "the Sons of light" as a self-designation of God's elect (1QS 1:9, 2:16, 3:13, 24-25, 1QM 1:3, 9, 11, 13). Marshall, *Luke*, 621; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 602; Ireland, *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God*, 87; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 163; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 124; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 107, who view the phrase "the sons of light" as the indication concerned with eschatology.

68. Kosmala and Flusser seek for a similarity in Qumran to argue that money is part of this world as "wealth of evil" (CD 6,15; 8.5; 4Q183 5) and "wealth of violence" (1QS 10.19). Flusser, D. "The Parable of the Unjust Steward: Jesus' Criticism of the Essenes," in ed., James H. Charlesworth, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 176-97, here 178-80; Hans Kosmla, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward in the Light of Qumran," *ASTI* 3 (1964), 114-21, here116. For a tendency of money to lead to dishonest, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1109; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 184-85.

69. Marshall, *Luke*, 621; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 168; Wright, "Parables on Poverty and Riches," 228.

70. Stein, *Luke*, 416; Kistemaker, *Parables*, 234; Morris, *Luke*, 249; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 603; Ireland, *Stewardship*, 100-101; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 415.

followers are strongly encouraged to use worldly money to help the poor so that when this age is gone their friends will receive them into the eternal home. Even though in the teaching of Jesus there seems to be a tension between giving without expectation of return (6:30, 32-35; 11:4), and giving with expectation of a future reward (12:33), it seems as if Jesus here allows and encourages self-interest among his disciples.[71] In this respect, the parable plays a role as a positive instance concerning the proper use of unrighteous money in the light of the eschatological perspective.[72]

Vv. 10-13 shifts the focus from employing the parable as a positive example to using that as negative instance. In contrast to the steward who was prudent but dishonest and unfaithful, the sons of light, as a number of interpreters have emphasized,[73] are to be wise and faithful. Jesus, as Marshall maintains,[74] gives a general principle from human experience in verse 10, namely, "He who is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much; and he who is dishonest in a very little is dishonest also in much." Jesus continually applies the general principle to the disciples in verses 11-12 with a rhetorical question. They have no choice but to infer that no one would do so. In order to come to such a conclusion, as Bailey's claims,[75] Jesus uses an antithesis and a parallelism.[76] Through this observation, we find that the parallel members of each side of the antitheses, (ἐν ἐλαχίστω, ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνα, ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ and ἐν πολλῷ, τὸ ἀληθινὸν, τὸ ὑμέτερον) are synonyms. In other words, in view of the unrighteous mammon in verse 11 with regard to that of verse 9a, "a very little"[77], "the

71. Green, *Luke*, 594; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 125; Duff and McGrath, *Meeting Jesus*, 107; Wright, "Parables on Poverty and Riches," 227; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 417.

72. Almsgiving here, as Marshall has pointed out, should not be counted as salvation by good works as generosity, but as a testimony to discipleship. Marshall, *Luke*, 622; Ireland, *Stewardship*, 102-103, 216; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 169.

73. Ellis, *Luke*, 198; Fletcher, "Riddle," 21; Grundmann, *Lukas*, 319; Marshall, *Luke*, 622; Ireland, *Stewardship*, 108; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 169. Against this suggestion, see Descamps, "Composition," 51; Jeremias, *Parables*, 47.

74. Marshall, *Luke*, 623. He notes that "the saying is a good example of a secular truth being used as a basis for a religious lesson."

75. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 110. Bailey claims that the inversion principle is used in verses 10-12 and 13 as well as in verse 9.

76. The parallelism is as follows:

ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ/καὶ/ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστιν, (v. 10a)
καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἄδικος/καὶ/ἐν πολλῷ ἄδικός ἐστιν. (v. 10b)
εἰ οὐν/τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ/πιστοὶ/οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, (v. 11a)
τὸ ἀληθινὸν/τίς ὑμῖν/πιστεύσει; (v. 11b)
καὶ εἰ/ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ/πιστοὶ/οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, (v. 12a)
τὸ ὑμέτερον/τίς ὑμῖν/δώσει; (v. 12b)

77. N. Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and*

unrighteous mammon"[78] and "someone else's property"[79] appear to be worldly wealth. In the same way, if the unrighteous mammon in verse 11 represents worldly wealth, true riches in antithesis of the unrighteous mammon in verse 11 properly appear to be "heavenly treasures", in contrast to "worldly wealth". Accordingly, "in much", "true riches"[80] and "property of your own"[81] indicate heavenly treasures. A striking feature of verses 10-12 is that one's use of worldly wealth has a bearing on the heavenly things of the coming age.[82] The antithetical nature in verses 10-12 is eschatological, contrasting this age and the next, the earthly and the heavenly, the temporal and the eternal.[83] Jesus' disciples, therefore, must use their worldly wealth faithfully in eschatological expectation. If they are not faithful with worldly wealth, they will not be entrusted with true riches.

The contents of v. 13 are well recapitulated in the last sentence, that is, "You cannot serve both God and Mammon." The closing saying may be a warning against being unfaithful in God's service and a warning against being enslaved by mammon.[84] Jesus here seems to personify mammon as an evil, powerful, cosmic force diametrically opposed to God's plan to set at liberty those who are oppressed.[85] The pursuit of wealth and wholehearted allegiance to God are mutually exclusive. V. 13 makes it clear that unfaithfulness in the use of worldly wealth reveals ultimate loyalties and heart attitudes.[86] If the disciples use their worldly

---

Notes (NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 414 n. 18. Geldenhuys mentions that this description warns the disciples against overrating their value.

78. The word, ἀδίκῳ in verse 11, in contrast to verse 9a is here an adjective. But the meaning can be translated as "unrighteous mammon," as verse 9a.

79. In relation to this word, there are two opinions. First, τω ἀλλοτρίω in verse 12 refer to man's role as a steward of material possessions. Second, τω ἀλλοτρίω emphasizes the foreign or alien nature of worldly wealth when seen from the perspective of a citizen of heaven.

80. The word, τὸ ἀληθινὸν means that which is of true value and of permanent quality. According to Marshall, "behind the τίς of the rhetorical question lies the figure of God." Marshall, *Luke*, 623. Nolland also claims that "God is clearly lurking beneath the surface of these words." Nolland, *Luke*, 807.

81. Marshall, *Luke*, 624. Marshall maintains that this word, ὑμέτερον which depicts treasures of heaven will be the disciples own inalienable possession, contrasting between what does not belong to the disciples and what will really belong to them.

82. H.A.W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament: Luke* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880), 228. Meyer views true riches as the salvation of the kingdom of Messiah.

83. Kosmala, "The Unjust Steward in the light of Qumran," 119. Kosmala contends that the words, πιστὸς and ἄδικος in verse 10 are essentially eschatological terms and then verse 10 has an entirely eschatological content: "if you are ἄδικος, if you have the smallest share in the ἄδικία of this world, you will have no share in the coming Kingdom."

84. Marshall, *Luke*, 624. The Gospel of Thomas expands this saying as follows: "A man cannot mount two horses or stretch two bows," (*Gos. Thom.* 47).

85. Green, *Luke*, 586; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 192; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 246.

86. Talbert, *Reading Luke. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*, 155. Talbert, in connection with this, says that "one's use of wealth points to whom one serves" and Johnson notes that "the way

wealth faithfully, it is to express that they serve God with wholehearted love. While if the disciples use their worldly wealth unfaithfully, it is to express that they do not serve God. In conclusion, the disciples' use of wealth is tied to their future in heaven. Given this, the disciples must manifest their own position in the eschatological perspective[87] without hesitation.

7-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

In what follows, I shall discuss some of the sociological approaches to the parable among recent interpretative methods of the parables before coming to the conclusion. In relation to interpretation emphasizing the honour-shame background in Social Science Criticism, Kloppenborg argues that the master initially dismisses his squandering steward for maintaining his honour, but inasmuch as the master later on praises his steward who proceeds to do dishonest acts by reducing the account, he fractures the cultural codes and expectations of the listener. In doing so, the master's conversion from the honor-shame codes of his society is a reflection of the kingdom.[88]

For Combrink, the parables are polyvalent in nature, so the meaning of the parable is not fixed in any one interpretation. As v. 8a deconstructs its own metaphorical structure, as Scott contends,[89] it disturbs the final interpretation and at the same time has lasting effect on the audience.[90] The master merely dismisses his steward who damaged his own reputation by wasting his goods, not throwing him in prison in order to prevent further loss of honour as a result of his steward. Counting on his masters' mercy and generosity, the steward reduces the debts of the debtors, which in the end become redistributing wealth and re-establishing balance in the society to limited good. Inasmuch as the master praises the steward, typifying the steward as ἀδικίας in v. 8, while both he and his steward acquire public praise, both the stereotyped image of the master and that of the steward are shattered by his praise for the steward and by qualifying the steward as ἀδικίας. Combrink comes to the conclusion that the parable deconstructs the symbolic universe of the audience as well as our symbolic universe

---

one handles possessions expresses concretely the quality of one's response to God." L.T. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possession in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 39, Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 158.

87. This verse, with regard to the service of God, reminds us of Matt. 25:31-46. "And the King will answer them, 'Truly, I say to you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me.'" (Matt. 25:40).

88. Kloppenborg, "The Dishonourd Master (Luke 16:1-8a)," 492-93.

89. Scott, *Hear Then the Parables*, 265.

90. Combrink, "Social-Scientific Perspective on the Parable of the Unjust Steward," 303-304.

and challenges the audience's values and beliefs as well as ours.[91]

Through the honour-shame background and the parallel reading with the parable of Prodigal Son, Landry and May claim that the master dismisses his steward squandering his property, since his honour in the community is threatened by the public perception that he cannot control his employees. Given statements that "superiors were judged by the behaviour of their subordinates" by Xenophon, Socrates and Seneca,[92] it is reasonable enough to take such an assumption into consideration. The steward confronted with a crisis seeks to reduce the debts of the debtors, so as to salvage his reputation as a loyal steward in the community. Irrespective of what side interpreters take, that is to say, removing part of usury or the steward's own commission, or the principal part of it, honour is brought to his master by the debts reduction.[93] Eventually the steward's plan makes a great coup to elicit his master's praise for restoring his master's honour by his wise actions, whereby the steward's reputation is also recovered as loyal and good.[94]

Herzog regards the accusation brought against the steward as the charges of hostile intent, not moral charges in the situation that "the master will always keep a suspicious eye on this steward, but also the tenants will continuously envy the steward's power over them."[95] The master summarily dismisses his steward, whereby he is faced with a borderline situation to drop out of the class of retainers into the class of expendables. In spite of belonging to the system of injustice, he never leaves it, nor does he just give up. He gives both the debtors and his master benefits by removing the hidden interest against the prohibitions of the Torah and oral torah.[96] The steward as the vulnerable struggles against his own survival in the world that elites as his master govern, by means of the weapons of the weak, namely, by the debts reduction of the debtors in his restricted acts. The parable shows "how the weapons of the weak can produce results in a world dominated by the strong."[97]

Wright, following Herzog, argues that it is prophetic and practical because the steward subverts an unjust system by means of an act of justice removing hidden interest in keeping with the prohibitions of the law. In doing so he simultaneously benefits his master, the debtors and himself, because it is something that "an ordinary person under pressure can do

91. Ibid., 304.
92. David Landry and Ben May, "Honor Restored: New Light on the Parable of the Prudent Steward," 299.
93. Ibid., 301.
94. Ibid., 309.
95. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 224.
96. Ibid., 257.
97. Ibid., 258.

here and now, not a revolutionary action for the future."[98] For him the charges are a slanderous accusation in the oppressive system and the reason why the steward is called unrighteousness in v.8 is a general perception of their characters, not a climax action in vv. 4-7 where he cancels the hidden interest in line with prohibitions of the law. Even though "the structures of this world are unjust, there remains still the possibility of a creative and proper use of the world's unrighteous mammon", when we take v. 9 into account.[99]

Jesus praises the steward who uses money to make friendships. That, Schottroff contends, is why he plays a role of a model for a praxis that can be applied by Christian communities.[100] To put it more concretely, paradoxically, the sons of light can learn something from a treacherous money man, that is, it is of using money to build friendships in the world. For Schottroff, the steward who could be business manager, not a slave, is a cheat from the first moment and continues to violate the law (the Torah, Roman law, provincial law) in reducing the debts of the debtors due to his master for his own interest. In addition, she regards the master and the debtors as people within the realm of merchandising rather than tenants, leases and landowners, on the grounds that the magnitude of the debts are large sums, but also on the grounds that the account book is the bill alone as a one-sided legal document, not lease agreements which contain mutual legal contracts between landowners and tenants.[101] In v. 8 she finds two different social systems which are concretely classified by the definition of *halakah* in 1 Cor 5:10 and 7:31-34. Luke 16 is a chapter of *halakah* on the subject of money that is criticized by other interpretations of the Torah. For Schottroff the attitude of Christian communities toward money is to do their best to prevent hunger and extreme poverty for other members of the communities more than giving alms.[102]

Even though it is believed to be conducive to understanding the parable by reading it against the honour-shame background, shifting the focus from the steward to the master in the parable, on these grounds there is still reason to question it. For one thing, there is no evidence in the parable to support the fact that the master not only dismisses the steward to prevent further loss of his honour, but also praises the steward to retrieve his honour. Initially, the reason for the dismissal of the steward is plainly his squandering of his master's property, not the damage to his master's honour. The same can also be said of the master's praise.

98. Wright, "Parables on Poverty and Riches," 226, 229.
99. Ibid., 228.
100. Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 161.
101. Ibid., 159.
102. Ibid., 161.

Moreover, it is untenable that the steward has the restoration of his master's honour in view in reducing the debts of the debtors. That is why in his monologue we learn that the steward is reducing the debts for the safety of his future. In a similar vein, if so, why does vv. 8b-13 not understand the parable in the honour-shame background? The emphasis of vv. 8b-13 is on prudence, faithfulness and loyalty, not on the honour-shame motif.[103] It seems to focus presumably on the potential thing more than the explicit references in the parable on the whole.

Another thing to explore is the attempt to view the rich man in the parable as God. For Bailey, the God of mercy is linked to the mercy of the master that treated the accusation for his steward's initial wastefulness with a gracious disposition. The steward depends on the mercy of his master to settle his crisis and is praised by his master for his wisdom in acting to preserve himself in vv. 5-7 with confidence to the master's generosity and mercy.[104] However, as noted above, it is doubtful whether the dismissal is a gracious disposition because it put him at risk of his life. From a slightly different angle, Loader claims that the master typifies God who advocates Jesus' authority to forgive sins,[105] whereas Donahue argues that the master represents the response of God who grants time for response as an opportunity, by not punishing instantly.[106] These suggestions are untenable in view of the fact that the master immediately dismissed his steward.

The parable is a crisis parable and a "how much more" parable.[107] The audience is faced with the radical demands of the kingdom that is begun by Jesus' preaching and ministry. The concerns between a proper attitude to wealth and eschatological crisis indeed should not be separated, since the eschatological awareness influences how one sees material possessions. Just as the steward acted in the worldly crisis for his safety, how much more in eschatological crisis should Jesus' followers act for their safety? Prudence means both preparedness for one's safe future, with right awareness of a crisis and the proper use of wealth in view of the presence of the kingdom and of coming judgment, just as steward did in his crisis. Despite listening, engaging, debating and complaining about Jesus, the Pharisees as the rich man in the next parable do not realize the eschatological crisis has arisen from Jesus' preaching and

103. M. Dwaine Greene, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward As Question and Challenge," *ExpTim* 112 (2000), 82-87, here 84.
104. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 105-107.
105. Loader, "Unjust Steward," 528-32.
106. Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 168-69.
107. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 177-178; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 416; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*,131.

ministry. In addition, the correct use of worldly wealth takes on in particular almsgiving, which is also a main teaching in the parable that follows, which teaches mammon's powerful force with which it can enslave people, but also has a temporary power in this world. The parable not only functions as a challenge to evaluate correctly the nature of the present time and take necessary action, but also teaches the proper use and attitude toward material possessions.

8. The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (16: 19-31)

8-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

Inasmuch as the relation of the parable to the preceding parable and the saying in vv. 14-18 have already considered above, I will here deal only with the problem of the origin and the unity of the parable. Hugo Gressman contends that the parable has its origin in the Egyptian story of Setme.[1] Even though it is not clear whether its origin derives from the story of Setme and Si-Osiris, there are seven Jewish versions of the story, the earliest of which occurs in the Palestinian Talmud, the story of a rich tax collector named Bar Ma'yan and a poor Torah scholar in Ashkelon.[2] Along the same vein, R. F. Hock claims that there are important

1. "An Egyptian in Amente, the realm of the dead, was allowed to return to earth in order to deal with an Ethiopian magician who was proving too powerful for the magicians of Egypt. He was reincarnated as the miraculous child of a childless couple, Setme and his wife, and called Si-Osiris. When he reached the age of twelve he vanquished the Ethiopian magician and returned to Amente. But before this there was an occasion when father and son observed two funerals, one of a rich man buried in sumptuous clothing and with much mourning, the other of a poor man buried without ceremony or mourning. The father declared he would rather have the lot of the rich man than the pauper, but his son expressed the wish that his father's fate in Amente would be that of the pauper rather than that of the rich man. In order to justify his wish and demonstrate the reversal of fortunes in the afterlife, he took his father on a tour of the seven halls of Amente. The account of the first three halls is lost. In the fourth and fifth halls the dead were being punished. In the fifth hall was the rich man, with the pivot of the door of the hall fixed in his eye. In the sixth hall were gods and attendants, in the seventh a scene of judgment before Osiris. Si-Osiris explains to his father what they saw, and the fate of the three classes of the dead: those whose bad deeds outnumber their good deeds (like the pauper), those whose bad deeds outnumber their good deeds (like the rich man), and those whose good and bad deeds are equal." Richard Bauckham, "The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and The Parallels," *NTS* 37 (1991), 225-46, here 225-26. See also F.LI. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis: The Sethom of Herodotus and the Demotic Tales of Khamuas* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1900); Hugo Gressmann, *Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus. Eine literargeschichtliche Studie* (Abhandlungen der Königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1918), 3-89; K. Grobel, '"… Whose Name Was Neves,'" *NTS* 10 (1963-64), 373-82, here 376-78; Jeremias, *Parables*, 183; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 182; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 422.

2. "They die on the same day, but whereas the taxcollector is buried in style, the poor pious man is unmourned. A friend of his is troubled by the contrast, until in a dream he sees the poor man in paradise and the taxcollector tormented in hell. His punishment is tantalization: he continually tries to drink from a river but cannot. The friend of the poor man also sees a certain Miriam being punished in hell (according to one report she hangs by her breasts, but according to another the hinge of the gate rests in her ear: compare the punishment of the rich man in the Egyptian story). He learns that the poor man sinned once in his life, while the rich man performed one good deed in his life. The splendid funeral of the rich man was his reward for his one good deed, while the poor man's one sin was his reward for his dying neglected. The story illustrates the principle that the righteous are punished for their few sins in this world, so that in the next world the reward for their few good deeds, so that in the next world they may justly receive only punishment." Richard Bauckham, "The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and The Parallels," 227. See also Palestinian Talmud, y. *Sanh*. 6.23c; y. *Hag*. 77d; S. Lieberman, "On Sins and Their Punishment," in *Tests and Studies* (New York: Ktav, 1974), 33-48; M Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1983), 29-31, 78-82.

similarities between the Gallus and the Cataplus of Lucian[3] and the parable. Apart from the above examples, there are *Gilgamesh Epic*,[4] *1 Enoch*[5] and *Jannes and Jambres*[6]. However, as several recent studies have concluded,[7] there is no reason to insist on its dependency on any particular fixed story. The Gospel story uses a well-known folkloric motif that was shared by several cultures, as well as circulated all over the Hellenistic world, such as the reversal of fate of a rich man and a poor man after death and a dead person's return from the dead with a

3. "This dialogue opens with Charon, the ferryman in Hades, waiting for Hermes and the day's dead, among whom are poor Micyllus and the rich tyrant Megapenthes. Micyllus had been working on, as usual, a sandal when the fate Atropos had come for him, whereas Megapenthes, just as typically, had been at a banquet where he sipped a poisoned drink. On the way down to Hades, though, Megapenthes tries to run away from Hermes, and when that fails he tries to persuade the fate Clotho to let him go back to life in order to finish his house or to give his wife instructions about some buried treasure, or to complete a wall and docks and so forth. Clotho, however, refuses each request. After their ferryboat ride, Micyllus and Megapenthes appear before Rhadamanthus, the judge of the underworld. He judges each by inspecting the soul for any marks that result from doing wicked deeds. Micyllus's judgment is quick. His soul is pure, and so he is sent to the Isles of the Blessed, there to recline with the heroes. In the case of Megapenthes, however, the matter is very different. His soul is black and blue with stigmata. And after the testimony of the philosopher Cyniscus and the corroborating testimony of Megapenthes's bed and lamp, Rhadamanthus learns the reason for so many marks. Cyniscus charges him with having murdered countless people and confiscated their property. Moreover, with his wealth Megapenthes left no form of licentiousness untried. In particular Cyniscus charges him with sexual offenses: Megapenthes denies only the latter charges, but the lamp and bed quickly corroborate the philosopher. Consequently, all that Rhadamanthus has to do is decide on an appropriate punishment." Ronald F. Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus: Greco-Roman Background to Luke 16:19-31," *JBL* 106 (1987), 447-63, here 459-60. See also the works of Lucian of Samosata, *Dialogues of the Dead*, 7:406-8, 1:328-35 and 28:426-29. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 422.

4. See C.J. Gadd, "Epic of Gilgamesh, Tablet XII," *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale* XXX (1933), 127-43; Alexander. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1949), 93-101.

5. For especially 1 Enoch 22:1-13, see Outi Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus* (NovTSup 123. Leiden: Brill, 2007), 130-32. Cf. Sverre Aalen, "St Luke's Gospel and the Last Chapters of 1 Enoch," *NTS* 13 (1967), 1-13; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel according to Luke," *NTS* 25 (1978), 324-44; idem, "Revisiting the Rich and the Poor in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel According to Luke," 579-605, in *SBL Seminar Papers* 37. vol. 2. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

6. J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepighrapha*, vol 2, 437-42; idem, *The Pseudegrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (SCSS 7; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), 134; Albert Pietersma, *The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres the Magicians* (New York: Brill, 1994), 96-261.

7. R. Bauckham, "The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and The Parallels," 225; Frank W. Hughes, "The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric," in ed., Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (JSNTSup 90; England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 29-41; Michael J. Gilmour, "Hints of Homer in Luke 16:19-31," *Didaskalia* 10 (1999), 23-33, here 33; Outi Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 36-38; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 427. Similarly, C.H. Cave argues that Luke's story has no direct dependency on the Egyptian and the Jewish accounts, since the common motif among them is only a topos in oriental storytelling as the general theme. C.H. Cave, "Lazarus and the Lukan Deuteronomy," *NTS* 15 (1968), 319-25, here 323. Similarly also Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 157.

message for the living.[8]

On the one hand, there were also attempts to find biblical antecedents for our parable. Cave suggests Gen 15 as a relevant background to Luke's story. For him, just as Eliezer of Damascus is a gentile, so in Luke's story Lazarus represents gentiles, whereas the rich man is Abraham's child, that is, a Jew. Along this line, Luke's story conveys the instruction that if Abraham's child, viz, a Jew persists in their unrepentant state, there will be severe judgment on Israel.[9] On the other hand, R. Dunkerley and Donald J. Bretherton claim that the parable is based on the story of the raising of Lazarus in John 11, and that that historicizes the parable on the grounds that both contain the same name, i.e., Lazarus and resurrection.[10] However, the relevancy to the name between Eliezer and Lazarus is not clear. In addition, the name Lazarus at that time was not a particularly rare one, but was rather common.[11]

There are several arguments concerning the unity of the parable: In the first place, R. Bultmann claims that the two parts (vv. 19-26 and vv. 27-31)[12] in the parable are inconsistent with each other in that the parable has two separate points, viewing the whole story as a

8. Outi Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 38.

9. Cave, "Lazarus and the Lukan Deuteronomy," 323-25. Cf. V. Tanghe, "Abraham, son fils et son envoyé (Luc 16:19-31)," *RB* 91 (1984), 557-77. On the other hand, M.D. Goulder, argues that the parable is based on Isaiah 61 with the restoration of Israel that has already appeared in Jesus' inaugural sermon (4:18-21), and the reversal in the Beatitudes and Woes (6:21-26). According to his argument, Luke, in the parable, combines the prophetic reversal in Isaiah 61 with the alms-Mammon context in Matthew 6 and the fire-torment context in Matthew 18, on the basis of the hypothesis that Luke used Matthew. It is very questionable, however, as to whether Isaiah 61:1-7 has a reversal comparable to the parable, apart from Goulder's theory regarding Luke's strategy in using Matthew. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 634-37.

10. R. Dunkerley, "Lazarus," *NTS* 5 (1959), 321-27; Donald J. Bretherton, "Lazarus of Bethany: Resurrection or Resuscitations?" *ExpTim* 104 (1993), 169-73. Cf. Keith Pearce, "The Lucan Origins of the Raising of Lazarus," *ExpTim* 96 (1985), 359-61.

11. Marshall, *Luke*, 629; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus 2: Mentor, Message, and Miracles* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 822-31; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 206, n.95; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 427; Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 30. In the same vein, Derrett suggests that the parable has affinities with the midrashic tales that Eliezer lived on this earth in disguise reports back to Abraham on how his children observed the Torah, especially concerning the treatment of the poor and on hospitality to strangers. Derrett, "Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Saying," in *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), 78-99.

12. Even though Jülicher contends that the original story ends at v. 25 and v. 26 functions as an editorial bridge connecting the two sections, many scholars regard v. 26 as a part of the original story. Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 634; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1126-27; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 614-15; Crossan, *In Parables*, 65-66; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 146; Hultgren, *Parables*, 112. Donahue, in contrast, divides the parable into three parts, not two: vv. 19-21, vv. 22-26 and vv. 27-31,' whereas recent literary analyses, in quite a different view, divide the parable into three parts in preserving the unity of the dialogue: vv. 19-21, vv. 24-31 and vv. 24-31. See Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 170; Walter Vogels, "Having or Longing: A Semiotic Analysis of Luke 16:19-31," *ÉgIThéol* 20 (1989), 27-46, 29.

Jewish story on the grounds of Deut. 30:11-14[13], and Jewish thought that identifies a sinner with a rich man, and a pious man with a poor man. Having pointed out the similarities between Luke's story and the last chapters of *1 Enoch*, he contradicts Gressmann's theory that the first part (vv. 19-26), as discussed above, is derived from the Egyptian account of Setme, and that the latter part (vv. 27-31) is Jesus' secondary addition.[14] Jeremias considers vv. 19-26 as the original story and vv. 27-31 as Jesus' later addition to a traditional Jewish story.[15] Yet he supports the unity of the parable on the basis of the two historic presents in v. 23 and v. 29 with evidence of pre-Lukan tradition.[16] In the same vein, while D.L. Mealand sees the latter part as the early church's addition to a Jewish traditional story,[17] L. Schottroff and Q. Stegemann regard the latter part as Luke's addition to the parable of Jesus.[18] Another reason for the alleged disunity is the assumption that the latter seems to reflect a post-Easter situation. Crossan argues that vv. 27-31 cannot be taken as part of the original parable of Jesus, since "there are too many links between the discussion of the resurrection of the rich man in the parable and that concerning Jesus' own resurrection in Luke 24 to be coincidence,"[19] such as the theme of disbelief, the double mention of Moses and prophets, the mention of the resurrected one, and the use of "they will repent." He concludes that vv. 27-31 is most likely pre-Lukan and is a post-resurrectional application of the parable.[20] Scott, following Crossan, also claims that Luke not only appended vv. 27-31 to the parable to connect the parable with Jewish disbelief in Jesus' messiahship, but also rewrote the parable

13. "For this commandment which I command you this day is not too hard for you, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that you should say, 'Who will go up for us to heaven, and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?' Neither is it beyond the sea, that you should say, 'Who will go over the sea for us, and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?' But the word is very near you; it is in your mouth and in your heart, so that you can do it." (Deut. 30:11-14).

14. R. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 178, 196-97, 203. See also David Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1980), 39-49; John. Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels*, 150-51; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 170.

15. Jeremias, *Parables*, 186.

16. Ibid., 182-83. The reason for the above argument is that in the Luke's redactional pattern to his Markan source, he almost always abandons the historic present. Of Mark's ninety parallel passages, Luke has retained only one (Luke 8:49). There are the five historic presents in Lukan parables (13:8; 16:7, 23, 29; 19:22) which probably indicate pre-Lukan material.

17. Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation the Gospels*, 48.

18. L. Schottroff and Q. Stegemann, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor* (New York: Orbis, 1986), 25. She, though, in her recent work considers the unity of the parable, emphasizing on reading it in their literary context. See Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 166, 168.

19. Crossan, *In Parables*, 65.

20. Ibid., 65-66. He feels that vv. 27-32 allegorically hints at the Jewish refusal to accept either Moses or the prophets as witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus or to accept the risen Jesus himself. For him, the context in v. 31 in particular makes one think of Jesus, not the rich man.

to be consonant with his apologetic needs.[21]

The parable, as argued above, is not dependent only on the story of Setme or any other story, nor is it divided into two parts separated at v. 26, since at a literary level, it is in the middle of the dialogue between the rich man and Abraham, as well as of the answer to the question raised by the first part. If one binds part of the dialogue together in the parable, breaking after v. 23 at the beginning of the dialogue would be more proper rather than the division between vv. 26-27, given the verbal repetition of an address, of the imprecation, and of the request for Abraham in vv. 24-27 which are tied together.[22] Furthermore, the prevalence of the theme of "too late" throughout the parable gives the parable a tighter unity.[23] If the story ended at 26, the account would be left incomplete.[24]

8-2. The Analysis of the Parable

Luke begins with the opening formula ἀνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος that he uses, as has been pointed out before, to introduce several other parables in Luke, which is also uses in rabbinic parables as the Hebrew introductions. In addition, the parable, according to Blomberg's the outline of Luke's Central Sections, chiastically parallels the parable of the Rich Fool.[25] Unconvincing is, therefore, David Gooding's argument that the account is not parabolic in that the story contains a discussion of the world to come and the afterlife in some detail, and contains a named character which is an uncommon characteristic for parables.[26]

The rich man dresses himself with the most expensive garment to signify either royalty or

21. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 142-146.

22. Eugene S. Wehrli, "Luke 16:19-31," *Int* 31 (1977), 279-82; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 204. George W. Knight and Bailey also see v. 24 as part of the beginning of the dialogue. See George W. Knight, "Luke 16:19-31: The Rich Man and Lazarus," *RevExp* 94 (1997), 277-283, 280; Bailey, "The New Testament Job: The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," Theological Review 29 (2008), 12-30, 20-21.

23. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 204.

24. Vogels, "Having or Longing: A Semiotic Analysis of Luke 16:19-31," 29; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 204; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 184; Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 166, 168; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 428; Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, 19-21. Bailey, "The New Testament Job," 20-21.

25. Blomberg, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke's Central Section," in ed., R.T. France and D. Wenham, *Gospel Perspedctives III* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 217-61, here 240-43; idem, *Interpreting the Parables*, 204; Darrell L. Bock, "The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus and the Ethics of Jesus," *SJT* 40 (1997), 63-72, here 64-65; George W. Knight, "Luke 16:19-31: The Rich Man and Lazarus," *RevExp* 94 (1997), 277-283, 278.

26. David Gooding, *According to Luke* (Leichester: InterVarsity Press, 1987), 227; Millard Erickson, *Christian Theology*, vol. 2. (Grand Rapid: Baker Book House, 1984), 527.

wealth.[27] At that time, this imported linen which India's elite and certain Egyptian priests wore, was rare and very expensive, in addition, the use of purple dye was limited even among elites, because of the difficulty of obtaining the purple shellfish used to dye the material.[28] The rich man dressed with purple and fine linen threw a splendid feast every day that is reminiscent of guests participating in a celebration. Here, Bailey goes so far as to claim that he violates the Sabbath's observation and never gives his servants a day of rest.[29] However, the rich man is at no point portrayed as wicked or dishonorable, particularly in relation to acquiring his wealth.[30] In short, he is simply depicted as taking what is already his and spending it on his own pleasures.

The poor man is the only one named: 'Lazarus' means "the one whom God helps", as a shortened form of the Hebrew אלעזר.[31] Is this the man whom God helps? Rather, he seems to be abandoned by God. How in the world has God helped him?[32] Conceivably, if the audience in the parable was aware of the meaning of the name, it would probably have led the audience to expect an intervention. As the story proceeds, it will become clear. Lazarus, full of sores, was laid down at the rich man's gate by the community so that he could be helped by the rich man. Even though it is possible to imagine his physical condition encompassing several diseases such as being a paralytic, a blind man, except for a leper,[33] it is best to view him as one who is crippled or bedridden on account of chronic illness, in congruence with the usages

27. Cf. Luke 7:25. "What then did you go out to see? A man clothed in soft clothing? Behold, those who are gorgeously appareled and live in luxury are in kings' courts."

28. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 117-18; Marshall, *Luke*, 635; Bailey, "The New Testament Job: The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 22; Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 124-25.

29. Bailey, "The New Testament Job: The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 22.

30. See Dieter H. Reinstorf, "The rich, the poor, and the law," *HTS* 60 (2004), 329-48, 330-32; B.J. Malina and R.L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); B.J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993).

31. There are those who try to find the derivation of the name in Egyptian folk-tales, other folk-tales, Gen. 15:2-4 and Jon. 11, but none of them are convincing. see Grobel, '"… Whose Name Was Neves,'" 381; Bauckham, "The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and The Parallels," 224; Dunkerley, "Lazarus," 321-27; Derrett, "Fresh Light on St. Luke XVI. II. Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings," 371-72; Cave, "Lazarus and the Lukan Deuteronomy," 319-25.

32. Bailey, "The New Testament Job, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 22.

33. Manson's suggestion is rightly rejected by Marshall, who says that a leper would not beg everyday in public. See Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 298; Marshall, *Luke*, 635. For a paralytic, a lame and a blind man as Lazarus' physical condition, see Jeremias, *Parables*, 183; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 186; Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 125.

of the passive form (ἐβέβλητο) of βάλλω elsewhere (Matt 8:6, 14; 9:2; Mark 7:30; Rev 2:22).[34] Here the gate, like the great chasm functions as a division between two entirely different worlds, just as the place of begging and the place of celebrating, and in Hades and in Abraham's bosom. It seems excessive speculation, however, that the gate metaphor suggests, as Scott believes, a possibility that the rich man will become the poor man's patron in a limited-goods society in which the places of rich and poor are fixed.[35]

Lazarus longs to eat the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table. But the dogs came and licked his sores. Those scraps of bread were used to wipe guests' hands and then tossed under the table.[36] Although nowhere is there indication that he would be able to acquire the object of his desire, to some extent, it is likely that sometimes Lazarus would actually eat the rich man's crumbs.[37] It is not clear here whether the dogs are roaming street dogs or the rich man's, but in any case, dogs lick Lazarus' sores, thereby aggravating his pain and pitiful condition. Unlike Bailey's suggestion,[38] the dog's licking should not be thought as an act of sympathy, but rather as a very degrading act which renders him ritually impure.[39] By means of the gate, the story indeed pictures the stark contrast between inside and outside.

To be sure, their deaths are portrayed in reverse order to their lives so as to underline the reversal of their fate in the life to come.[40] The poor man finds himself in the bosom of Abraham, whereas the rich man finds himself in Hades, that is, the poor man died and was carried by the angels into the bosom of Abraham, but the rich man died *and* was buried, and he finds himself in torment in hell. That there is no direct mention of Lazarus' burial seems to

34. Jeremias, *Rediscovering the Parables* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 145; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1131; Green, *Luke*, 606; Hultgren, *Parables*, 112.

35. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 151.

36. Jeremias, *Parables*, 184; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 118; Green, *Luke*, 606; C.G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (2 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1927), 2:538; Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 126.

37. Hultgren, *Parables*, 116; Duane Warden, "The Rich Man and Lazarus: Poverty, Wealth, and Human Worth," *SCJ* 6 (2003), 81-93, 81.

38. Bailey regards the act of dogs' licking as an act which stands over against the rich man's act, citing the medical effects that the licking produces relief to his sores and easing his pain from Ibn al-Tayyib. Bailey, "The New Testament Job, The parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 23. For observation that roaming street dogs as unclean animals are a plague in the ancient world. See Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 118; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 252; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 151; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 139; Str-B 1:722.

39. Malina, *New Testament World*, 149-83; Outi Lehtipuu, "Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and The Poor Man in Luke 16:19-31," in ed., David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism* (Sheffield; Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 73-105, here 89; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 425.

40. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 203.

imply that he remained unburied,[41] and his ascension into heaven after death by angels is reminiscent of the taking up of Enoch to heaven by God (Gen 5:24), and the taking of Elijah to heaven in a whirlwind (2 Kings 2:11).[42] In Judaism, a lack of a decent burial or not being buried at all was scandalous and regarded as a sign of God's curse,[43] yet Lazarus' reception in Abraham's bosom overthrows such a thought.

The phrase ὁ κόλπον ᾽Αβραάμ is unknown in pre-Christian Jewish literature.[44] It, as Nolland suggests,[45] is likely to be a development of the Old Testament idea of sleeping with one's ancestors. The bosom, apart from being a euphemism for death, may represent either an honorary place for guests at a banquet,[46] or a close relational bond between Lazarus and Israel's chief patriarch.[47] Of the two, however, the former fits the story better. It is very likely that Luke designs his readers to have the eschatological banquet as well as honour and intimacy in view. The meaning of his name (Lazarus) as "one whom God helps," has, in the end, been fulfilled, along with a complete reversal of fate. "In Abraham's bosom" contrasts starkly with "in Hades", which represents generally the place of death. It is not clear, however, whether it presents an intermediate state or a final, eternal state of all.[48] Although there are

41. Plummer, *Gospel according to St. Luke*, 393; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1132; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 152; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 120.

42. For the ascension after his death, see Nolland, *Luke*, 829; Hultgren, *Parables*, 113.

43. Green, *Luke*, 607; Ferdinand O. Regalado, "The Jewish Background of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus," *Asia Journal of Theology* 6 (2002), 341-48, 342.

44. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1132.

45. Nolland, *Luke*, 829.

46. John 13:23. "One of his disciples, whom Jesus loved, was lying close to the breast of Jesus." See also Jeremias, *Rediscovering the Parables*, 146; Lehtipuu, "Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and The Poor Man in Luke 16:19-31," 92; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 202; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 121; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 188-89; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 425; Bailey, "The New Testament Job, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 24. Besides, having surveyed parallels in sepulchral epigrams of the *Greek Anthology*, Hock claims that the phrase indicates protection and care, not honour. Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus: Greco-Roman Background to Luke 16:19-31," 456.

47. John 1:18. "No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known." See Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 252. On the other hand, Regalado views the phrase as a common Jewish one which refers to paradise on the grounds of Matt 8:11. Regalado, "The Jewish Background of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus," 343.

48. For this discussion, see Richard, Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (NovTSup 93, Leiden: Brill, 1998), 81-96, 86-90; Karel Hanhart, *The Intermediate State in the New Testament* (Groningen: V.R.B., 1966), 198-99; A.J. Mattill, *Luke and the Last Things* (Dillsboro: Western North Carolina, 1979), 27; Blomberg, *Interpreting The Parables*, 206; Hultgren, *Parables*, 113; Regalado, "The Jewish Background of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus," 344-45; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 430-32; Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 126-128. For the relationship between Hades and Gehenna, see also W.J.P. Boyd, "Gehenna-According to J. Jeremias," in ed., E.A. Livingstone, *Studia Biblical 1978: II. Papers on the Gospels* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 9-12; J. Osei-Bonsu, "The Intermediate State in

parallel ideas in the parable in consonance with references to the intermediate state in contemporary Jewish literature, it is untenable that "Jesus speaks in this account of disembodied existence in a place and time that stands between this life and the next."[49] In order words, the parable is not designed to offer a precise schedule or details about what happens after death, but rather to provide instructions concerning the use of wealth, the sufficiency of Moses and the prophets, and repentance. If we are forced to teach about the afterworld from the parable, there is not much to say except that the afterworld certainly exists, and that life in the afterworld is unconditionally fixed, unchangeable.

Regarding the use of the word πάτερ, Forbes goes so far as to say that the rich man has thought over contrary to the teaching of John the Baptist, that a circumcised descendant of Abraham is not enough to be delivered from eternal punishment.[50] It is not, however, so much that when in trouble, he, as part of Abraham's family, deserves some help.[51] He appears to have accepted his fate, since he does not protest the judgment rendered on him. He requests just a little water to make his tongue cool. His request through Abraham seems that he still looks down on Lazarus as a servant to do his bidding rather than appealing to Abraham who is the model of hospitality (Gen. 18:1-15).[52] Lazarus is quiet while the rich man requests the water from him through Abraham, yet it is a mere excessive conjecture that Bailey finds the virtue of forgiveness in Lazarus' silence.[53]

Acknowledging his relationship to the rich man with the word τέκνον, Abraham uttered the classical cry of the prophets: "Remember!" 'in your life, you received your good things and Lazarus likewise evil things. Now he is comforted,[54] and you are in torment.' The question that arises instantly in one's mind concerning v. 25, is what is the basis of the judgment? Some commentators try to search for a tenable rationale in Egyptian, Jewish and Greco-Roman folk-tales that parallel the parable, in which the rich man finds himself in the

---

Luke-Acts," *IBS* 9 (1987), 115-30.

49. Joel B. Green, "Eschatology and the Nature of Humans," *Science & Christian Belief* 14 (2002), 33-50, 44-45.

50. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 191-92.

51. Bailey, "The New Testament Job, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 25.

52. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 153-54; Herzorg, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 123; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 142; Bailey, "The New Testament Job, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 25.

53. Bailey, "The New Testament Job, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 25.

54. Bailey contends that "now he is comforted" means that Lazarus' deepest wounds were just psychic anguish because of the rich man's neglect, not because of his hunger or his sores. Bailey, "The New Testament Job, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 27-28.

netherworld for his bad deeds which exceed his good deeds, whereas the poor man now enjoys bliss since his good deeds exceeded his bad deeds. For this reason, they conclude that the reversal of fate is based on immoral deeds and pious deeds in each case.[55] Yet no reason is given for any indication that the two men have been judged according to good and bad deeds from the parable, nor are the two men portrayed, in turn, as unjust and pious. Another view is that it is due to personal wealth over against service of God, that is to say, the rich man has spent excess resources for his own desires rather than redistributed it to those in need by almsgiving.[56] It is not clear in the parable, however, whether the rich man gives Lazarus charity, or whether the rich man would be involved with more alms than a piece of bread. On the other hand, Scott suggests that the rich man's chief fault is that he fails to pass through the gate in order to help Lazarus and establish a relationship and solidarity with Lazarus. The gate functions as a metaphor that discloses the ultimate depths of human existence.[57] In this respect, the main instruction of the parable is to encourage transgressing social barriers, with a willingness to develop meaningful relations outside one's social and economic class. It is no more than a forced reading in his theological paradigm, still less are there anywhere in the parable hints to support it. Others argue that if the rich man had given alms to the poor and tried to improve Lazarus' condition, he probably would not have fallen into Hades. They, in this view, conclude that the parable gives the audience a lesson in generous almsgiving and to caring for one's neighbour in need.[58] Of these views, the last one is the most convincing for the reversal of fate. The righteousness of Lazarus is implicit to some extent, in that the poor, Luke thinks, is identical with the righteous or those with who receive the grace of God.[59]

The rich man would win the readers' sympathy on account of his concern for the welfare of his five brothers, but other aspects of his request serve to alienate the readers from him,

---

55. Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus: Greco-Roman Background to Luke 16:19-31," 456-57; J. Gwyn Griffiths, "Cross-cultural Eschatology with Dives and Lazarus," *ExpTim* 105 (1993), 7-12; Jeremias, *Rediscovering the Parables*, 146.

56. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 147, 154-56.

57. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 150-51, 158-59; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 205, 213; Eugene S. Wehrli, "Luke 16:19-31," *Int* 31 (1977), 279.

58. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 256; Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*, 177; Piper, "Social Background and Thematic Structure in Luke 16," 1661; Green, *Luke*, 610; Derrett, "Fresh Light on St. Luke XVI. II. Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings," 373; Hultgren, *Parables*, 116; Lehtipuu, "Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and The Poor Man in Luke 16:19-31," 94-97; Regalado, "The Jewish Background of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus," 346; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 429-30; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 193, 195-97. Bailey, "The New Testament Job, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 28; Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 131.

59. See Luke 1:52-53; 4:18; 6:20; 7:22; 14:13, 21; 21:3.

since it seems that the rich man proceeds to ignore Lazarus, and treat him as a servant or simply an instrument to fulfill his own desires rather than acknowledging his position of honour at Abraham's bosom. The rich man in v. 30 is thoroughly convinced that if someone goes to them from the dead, they will repent, in contrast to Abraham's reference to Moses and the prophets in v. 29. It seems at the very least to imply not only that this revelation is insufficient for his brothers according to the rich man's experience, but also that they are not listening to Moses and the prophets. It is untenable that his brothers would not have heard Moses and the prophets at all. The concerns of Abraham here lie in how they are hearing them, in which case the meaning of "listening" is "obeying," not simply 'to listen'.

In keeping with Jesus' saying in Luke 16:16-18, in which Jesus underlines the continuity between the Jewish scriptures and his proclamation about God's kingdom in his ministry, the sufficiency of the Scriptures is underscored by the repetition of the expression "Moses and the prophets." Nothing is more important than listening to Moses and the prophets, so as not to fall into Hades suffering like the rich man. In Luke 24:27-32,[60] 44-47, when the Risen Christ expounds Scripture, the law of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms, this gives rise to true faith. Even though Scripture shows the ideal behaviour of justice and assistance for the poor, the rich man eventually failed to listen to Moses and the prophets, but rather lived selfishly caring for himself alone.

Luke's readers in v. 31 could see an allusion to the resurrection of Jesus, or the continued unbelief of the Jews, since the phrase τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ has reflected Christian language of the resurrection of Jesus.[61] At this point, the phrase raises the issue of the authenticity of this verse, since it appears to connote an early Christian interpolation designed to explain that people will not listen to the risen Jesus, as proofs of this "not listening" are showed in Acts.[62] In this case, the meaning is that "if persons are not converted to belief in Jesus as the Messiah on the basis of Moses and the prophets, neither will they be on the basis

60. Eugene S. Wehrli goes so far as to contend that the reader has incorrect understanding of the message of the parable, without given the culmination of Luke's Gospel in the Emmaus story (24:13-35). Eugene S. Wehrli, "Expository Articles: Luke 16:19-31," *Int* 31 (1977), 276-280.

61. See Luke 18:33 and 24:26. The majority of manuscripts read ἀναστῇ, but P75 reads ἐγερθῇ. See also Fitzymyer, *Luke*, 1128; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 172; Hultgren, *Parables*, 114; David B. Gowler, "At His Gate Lay a Poor Man: A Dialogic Reading of Luke 16:19-31," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 32 (2005), 249-65, here 257. But Blomberg argues that the word ἀναστῇ, here has general meaning or less theological meaning in comparison with the word ἐγερίρω used commonly for Jesus' resurrection. Blomberg, *Interpreting The Parables*, 207. On the other hand, Schottroff stands opposed to this view. See Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 166.

62. C.F. Evans, "Uncomfortable Words — V," *ExpTim* 81 (1969-70), 228-31, here 230-31; Crossan, *In Parables*, 66-67; Nolland, *Luke*, 826.

of the preaching of the resurrection of Jesus."[63] In contrast, the phrase could refer to Lazarus or another at Abraham's bosom, given the fact that Luke's readers would have been familiar with the thought of a messenger from the dead.[64] Irrespective of what side one takes, the parable has power. It is left open-ended. Did they begin to listen to Moses and the prophets and repent? There is still hope for the brothers. The open end functions as a rhetorical device for the audience to reconsider their lives.

8-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

Gowler analyzes the parable on the basis of Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogic reading that narrative, discourse, or utterance is created in literary, cultural, social, or historical environments because of the nature of language of *polyglossia* and *heteroglossia*.[65] First of all, Gowler argues that, when the good news of God is proclaimed, it elicits a conflict which reverberates throughout the narrative from the literary context of the parable, and lays the Pharisees at the centre of the conflict. For him, a comparison between the parable and Egyptian, Jewish and Hellenistic-Roman stories reveals that "the rich man be seen as wicked and deserving of such punishment, although his evil deeds are not delineated within the parable itself." Still more, it raises a question of how one breaks "the spiral of violence and the cycle of poverty created by such exploitation."[66] The answer, as Herzog contends[67] is "vertical generalized reciprocity,"[68] that is, a redistribution from the advantaged to the disadvantaged that expects nothing in return, in the light of the perspective of social analysis, as well as theological reflection of the parable. The rich man in the parable fails to operate from a stance of vertical generalized reciprocity as well as listen to Moses and the prophets.[69] He concludes that dialogic reading of Bakhtin "provides us with more receptive ears that can hear more clearly

63. Hultgren, *Parables*, 114-15. See also C.G. Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, 2:1006; J. Creed, *Luke*, 209; B.S. Easton, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (New York: Scribners, 1926), 254.

64. Marshall, *Luke*, 640-41; C.J.A. Hickling, "A Tract on Jesus and the Pharisees? A Conjecture on the Redaction of Luke 15 and 16," *HeyJ* 16 (1975), 253-65, here 257; C.W.F. Smith, *The Jesus of the Parables* (Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1975), 166; Blomberg, *Interpreting The Parables*, 207-208; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 152, n159.

65. While there is a tendency to unify the meaning of language within a single culture system, there, in the contrary, exists an operation against such a phenomenon, in which case *Polyglossia* means interacting between languages within a single cultural system. In the same vein, *Heteroglossia* describes the coexistence of distinct varieties within a single linguistic code as the multi-layered nature of language. Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed., Michael Holquist, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 291-92, 431.

66. Gowler, "At His Gate Lay a Poor Man: A Dialogic Reading of Luke 16:19-31," 251-260, especially 260.

67. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 114-130.

68. Gowler, "At His Gate Lay a Poor Man: A Dialogic Reading of Luke 16:19-31," 262.

69. Ibid., 260, 263.

the divergent and sometimes distant voices that reverberate throughout this text, including dialogic echoes of the voice of the historical Jesus."[70] It is not clear, however, whether the main point of the parable is merely the vertical generalized reciprocity, or whether its target is the breaking of the systems of oppression in first century as Herzog argument. In addition, it is doubtful that the rich man and Lazarus each represent two social classes, the wealthy urban elites and the desperate expendables.

On the other hand, having observed the parable, Bailey suggests five themes as the main points of the parable: Such as, "In the face of suffering the question is not why? But what now?" "Who is Lazarus, the one whom God helps?" "Compassion for the poor," "Theodicy," and "Social justice." His crucial question for the parable lies on "what is to be done with the grace and pain of life?", in which case the answer is that "Lazarus reprocesses his pain and his anger into grace."[71] Bailey views Lazarus' silence as a long forgotten aspect, on the grounds that although he is entitled to say what he wants as the guest of Abraham in the cultural world of the Middle East, he who received from the rich man has no vengeance, but only silence.[72] It is doubtful, however, whether his silence has such a meaning in the parable. In addition, he is apt to immoderately lay stress on Lazarus, conjecturing something from his act and attitude.

In the recent years, Ernest Van Eck holds that the parable is Jesus' poignant reprimand towards patrons in first-century Palestine, which was an advanced agrarian society, for a failure to play their role as patrons, thereby making the main gist that "when patrons who have in abundance do not pass through the gate to the poor, a society is created wherein a chasm so great is brought into existence between rich (the elite) and poor (the peasantry) that it cannot be crossed." When they, as patrons, do not fulfill their role, none of them come to part of the kingdom. For him, Abraham in the parable is quite an important character, whose role is to expose the severe extent of the indifference of the rich man on the earth, that is, just as the rich man did not do what he could, so Abraham as a representative of hospitality does not do what he could. Furthermore, he agrees with Oakman's view of Jesus' historical activity,[73] and goes so far as to claim that Jesus' historical activity, on the basis of the main point of the parable, was in reality "about politics and the restructuring of society, and not

70. Ibid., 264.

71. Bailey, "The New Testament Job, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies," 28-29; idem, *Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes* (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 2008), 394-369.

72. Ibid., 26.

73. D.E. Oakman, *Jesus and the Peasants* (Cascade Books, Eugene, 2008), 296.

about religion or theology."[74] Even though it is his social-scientific reading of the parable that gives us an insight into understanding the parable, it is wrong to view Jesus' historical activity merely in terms of politics and the restructuring of society. In addition, although from an emic perspective, he finds Abraham's unwillingness to help the one that needs help, as rhetorical strategy, but the parable, at no point, conveys Abraham's unwillingness to help. Instead, the parable accounts that Abraham simply rejects the rich man's demand on account of what he cannot do, given the great chasm fixed that none cross from one side to the other, not that he does not do what he can do.

The parable serves to warn the rich who use wealth only for themselves while neglecting the needs of the poor. The parable also addresses private charity in its modern form,[75] in that it teaches the correct use of one's own wealth in responsibility to God and other people. In this respect, the parable, as noted above, is coupled with the teaching of the preceding parable (Luke 16:1-13). On the other hand, seen in the perspective of Luke's Gospel that the poor functions as a symbol of the pious and those who receive God's mercy, the parable further serves to assure the poor that God is on the side of the poor by Lazarus being named and his reversal of the fate in the afterlife. At this point, the parable subverts conventional Jewish wisdom which viewed the rich as blessed by God and the poor as punished for their wickedness.[76] To be sure, Luke's account leads the reader to revalue their life and to act accordingly.

In the second part of the parable with μετανοήσουσιν in v. 30, explicit is, to some extent, the theme of repentance that here is represented as the proper use of possessions, and concern for the poor as one aspect of it. The reason why the rich man is suffering in Hades is that he fails to show concern for Lazarus in life. The rich man has recognized too late that Abraham is Lazarus's father as well as his. If his five brothers do not repent according to the teaching of Moses and the prophets, they may also suffer a similar fate. The audience, who mainly consisted of Pharisees and the disciples, are also challenged to reconsider their lives by the rhetorical device of the open end of the parable.[77]

---

74. Ernest Van Eck, "When Patrons are not Patrons: A Social-Scientific Reading of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-26)," *HTS Teologiese Studies* 65 (2009), 346-56.

75. Hultgren, *Parables*, 115; Stephen I. Wright, "Parables on Poverty and Riches," 238; Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, 156.

76. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 150; Blomberg, *Interpreting The Parables*, 206; Forbers, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 195. See also Gen. 24:35; Deut. 28:1-13; Job 42:10-17; Ps. 112:3; Eccl. 3:10-13.

77. Lehtipuu, "Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and The Poor Man in Luke 16:19-31," 100-104;

The parable also conveys the idea of sufficiency of the Scripture, thereby demonstrating the fact that Moses and the prophets have permanency and abiding validity in vv. 16-18. If one does not listen to Moses and the prophets, even though a messenger from the dead is sent to them, they at no point accept the advice from him, namely, even the spectacular vision from the dead will not move them to repent and obey.[78] As a result, now that God reveals himself and his will through Moses and the prophets, none of those who neglect it can legitimately protest their subsequent fate, as the rich man in the parable.[79] They must listen to Moses and the prophets which is sufficient to avoid the suffering in Hades.

Blomberg, *Interpreting The Parables*, 206; Forbers, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 196-97; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 433; Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 131-32. On the other hand, Stein proposes the need for repentance and stewardship of possessions as sub-themes in the first part of the parable, and the validity of the Old Testament as a sub-theme in the second part of the parable. Stein, *Luke*, 422.

78. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*, 156-59; Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 131-32.

79. Thorwald Lorenzen, "A Biblical Meditation on Luke 16:19-31," *ExpTim* 87 (1975), 39-43; Stein, *Luke*, 422; Blomberg, *Interpreting The Parables*, 206.

9. The Judge and the Widow (18: 1-8)

9-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

It is obvious that the parable have some parallels with Luke 11:5-8 in its content, form and verbal similarities,[1] though the context of the parable is quite different from that of the parable of the Friend at Midnight, in that the former parable in ch. 11 follows teaching on prayer, while eschatological teachings is preceded by the latter parable in ch. 18. Furthermore, the theme of prayer in the parable is continued in the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax-Collecter (18:9-14).

In regard to the background to the parable, it is argued that there are some points of affinity to Sir 35:14-25, in which God hears the cries of the orphan, the widow, and the pious who do not stop praying until justice is done, and dispenses retribution upon the heathen, that is, the oppressor, showing no patience with the wicked.[2] Snodgrass not only contends that on the basis of the similarity between the parable and Sir 35:14-25, the parable is derived from Sir 35:14-25, but even goes so far as to argue the unity of the parable that the two parts in the parable, vv. 2-5 and vv. 7-8, were originally one, since parallels of both exist in Sir 35:14-25 together.[3] Given the concern of the widow (Exod. 22:21-24)[4] and the expectation of justice (2 Chr 19:6-7)[5] in the Old Testament, it appears more likely that the parable relies on the Old

1. Hultgren suggests six similarities concerning the relation of this parable to the parable of the Friend at Midnight: "(1) it portrays a person in need going to another for assistance; (2) that person goes with one degree or another of impertinence; (3) the other person(the one being visited) becomes annoyed; (4) he does actually provide the assistance; (5) there is a linguistic similarity between 18:5 and 11:7; and (6) in each case the parable has to do with the theme of prayer." Hultgren, *Parables*, 253.

2. Sir. 35:14-25: "Do not offer him a bribe, for he will not accept it; and do not rely on a dishonest sacrifice; for the Lord is the Judge, and with him there is no partiality. He will not show partiality to the poor; but he will listen to the prayer of one who is wronged. He will not ignore the supplication of the orphan, or the widow when she pours out her complaint. Do not the tears of the widow run down her cheek as she cries out against the one who causes them to fall? The one whose service is pleasing to the Lord will be accepted, and his prayer will reach to the clouds. The prayer of the humble pierces the clouds, and it will not rest until it reaches its goal; it will not desist until the Most High responds and does justice for the righteous, and executes judgment. Indeed, the Lord will not delay, and like a warrior will not be patient until he crushes the loins of the unmerciful and repays vengeance on the nations; until he destroys the multitude of the insolent, and breaks the scepters of the unrighteous; until he repays mortals according to their deeds, and the works of all according to their thoughts; until he judges the case of his people and makes them rejoice in his mercy." For the same argument, see also Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 128; Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 659; Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*, 188 n. 3.

3. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 456.

4. See also Deut. 10:16-18; 14:28-29; 24:17-18; 26:12-13; 27:19; Isa. 1:16-17, 23; 10:1-2; Jer. 7:5-7; 22:3; Ezek. 22:6-7; Zech. 7:8-12; Pss. 68:5; 94:6; 146:9.

5. See Isa 5:7; Amos 2:6-7a; 5:10-12.

Testament rather than on Sir 35:14-25.[6]

With the reference to the coming of the Son of Man in 17:22 and 18:8b, which function rhetorically as an *inclusion*,[7] the parable is closely tied to Jesus' eschatological discourse in 17:22-37 where although his disciples will long to see one of the days of the Son of Man, they will not, and people going about their lives as in the days of Noah and Lot, will be caught unprepared. In the light of this view, it is most likely that Jesus' eschatological discourse began with the question of the Pharisees in 17:20 and ends with 18:8. If so, it is reasonable to interpret the parable in the context of the whole eschatological discourse, that is to say, that the disciples never give up while they are waiting for their vindication, in contrast to the people who did not prepare for the day, namely, the day of judgment, or the coming of Son of Man, because of their preoccupation with their lives.[8]

There is no consensus regarding the authenticity of the parable (18:1-8), even though the authenticity of the core parable (18:2-5) is largely accepted.[9] It seems clear that v. 1 is a Lukan introduction to the parable serving to help the reader understand the parable.[10] In

6. Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 190-92; idem, Lydia's *Impatient Sisters: A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 101; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 220-25; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 200.

7. V. 8 also forms an inclusion with v. 1. See Green, *Luke*, 637; Walter L. Liefeld, "Parables on Prayer (Luke 11:5-13; 18:1-14)," 252-54, in ed., R.N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapides: Eerdmans, 2000).

8. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*, 169; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 198; Liefeld, "Parables on Prayer (Luke 11:5-13; 18:1-14)," 252-54; Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 192-93; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 457; Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 142-43. On the other hand, Stephen Curkpatrick contends that the parable (vv. 2-5) and the parable-frame (vv. 1-8) each provide quite a different eschatology, thereby indicating the reality of the reign of God being present among the believing community, in the case of the former, and faithful perseverance until the coming of the Son of Man in case of the latter. In doing this, the widow's concern for justice in vv. 2-5 fades into future eschatology and the perseverance of the elect by Luke's framing of the parable. Stephen Curkpatrick, "Dissonance in Luke 18:1-8," *JBL* 121 (2002), 107-21, here 117-20.

9. Although Fitzmyer and Donahue view v. 6 raising attention to what the judge said as part of the parable in the sense that the parable centers on the conduct of the judge, not the importunate widow, most of interpreters consider vv. 2-5 as the core parable. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1176-77; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 181.

10. Jeremias, *Parables*, 156; D.R. Catchpole, "The Son of Man's Search for Faith (Lk 18:8b)," *NovT* 19 (1977), 81-104, here 90; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1176; Marshall, *Luke*, 671; Edwin D. Freed, "The Parable of the Judge and the Widow (Luke 18:1-8)," *NTS* 33 (1987), 38-60, 39-40; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 176; Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*, 187; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed*, 218; Francois Bovon, "Apocalyptic Traditions in the Lukan Special Material: Reading Luke 18:1-8," *HTR* 90 (1997), 383-91, 385; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 198; Hultgren, *Parables*, 253; Stein, *Luke*, 444; Barbara, E. Reid, "Beyond Petty Pursuits and Wearisome Widows: Three Lukan Parables," *Int* 56 (2002), 284-94, 290; Stephen Curkpatrick, "Dissonance in Luke 18:1-8," 107-21; idem, "A Parable Frame-up and Its Audacious

addition, such a formula also appears in Luke 19:11. It is tenable that the introduction contains the main point of the parable, in opposition to the argument that Luke misses and distorts the main point of the parable through the introduction.[11] On the one hand, many scholars[12] regard vv. 6-8a as a secondary application of the parable either by pre-Lukan tradition or Luke. Their arguments stem largely from the fact that the notions of vv. 6-8a are in an incorrigible dissonance with the core parable (vv. 2-5). On the other hand, it is argued that vv. 6-8a is defended as original to the parable by other scholars.[13] Here vv. 6-8a at least can be defended as original in that if the parable ends without this application, including v.1, the reader then is left with vagueness on what the parable means, and in that if the unjust judge as a rogue figure is used as an analogy to God, lest the audience misunderstands it, there is a need to explain it in detail, as here a *fortiori* argument.[14]

With respect to the authenticity of v. 8b, most of the commentaries agree that it was derived from pre-Lukan tradition. Notwithstanding the arguments of an overwhelming

---

Reframing," *NTS* 48 (2003), 22-38; Wendy Cotter, "The Parable of the Feisty Widow and the Threatened Judge (Luke 18:1-8)," *NTS* 51 (2005), 328-43, here 329; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 456.

11. Marshall, *Luke*, 670-71; Blomberg, *Parables*, 273; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 198-99. Against this argument, see especially Curkpatrick, "Dissonance in Luke 18:1-8," 107-108; idem, "A Parable Frame-up and Its Audacious Reframing," 22-23; Reid, "A Godly Widow Persistently Pursuing Justice: Luke 18:1-8," 290-291.

12. Linnemann and Freed in particular regard the whole story (vv. 1-8) as secondary. E. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus*, 187-88; Freed, "The Parable of the Judge and the Widow (Luke 18:1-8)," 38-60. For viewing vv. 6-8a as a secondary application of the parable, see also Bultmann, *History*, 175-76; Schweizer, *Luke*, 278; Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, 127; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 177, Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 661; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 635-36, 638-39; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive*, 220; R.M. Price, *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts: A Feminist-Critical Scrutiny* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 191-94; Bovon, "Apocalyptic Traditions in the Lukan Special Material: Reading Luke 18:1-8," 385-91; Barbara E. Reid, "A Godly Widow Persistently Pursuing Justice: Luke 18:1-8," *Biblical Research* 45 (2000), 25-33, 28; idem, "Beyond Petty Pursuits and Wearisome Widows: Three Lukan Parables," 290; Stephen Curkpatrick, "Dissonance in Luke 18:1-8," 107-108; idem, "A Parable Frame-up and Its Audacious Reframing," 22-23; Cotter, "The Parable of the Feisty Widow and the Threatened Judge (Luke 18:1-8)," 330.

13. Jeremias concludes that the story derived from Jesus of Nazareth on the grounds that vv. 6-8 have Aramaizing features that indicate pre-Lukan and Palestinian on linguistic grounds. Jeremias, *Parables*, 153-57. For the similar opinions, see W.G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1957), 59; Ellis, *Luke*, 213; Marshall, *Luke*, 670-71; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 129; F.W. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 294-95; Catchpole, "The Son of Man's Search for Faith," 81-104; J.M. Hicks, "The Parable of the Persistent Widow (Luke 18:1-8)," *ResQ* 33 (1991), 209-23, 210-12; Blomberg, "Interpreting the Parables of Jesus: Where Are and Where Do We Go from Here" *CBQ* 53 (1991), 50-78, 75; J. Lieu, *The Gospel of Luke* (Peterborough: Epworth, 1997), 138-40; T.K. Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 244 n. 175; F.S. Spencer, "Neglected Widow in Acts 6:1-7," *CBQ* 56 (1994), 715-33, here 724-25; Green, *Luke*, 636-43; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 199; Hultgren, *Parables*, 257-59; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 455-56.

14. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 199; Hultgren, *Parables*, 257-58; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 455-57.

majority, there are still those who try to defend the complete unity of the parable, including v. 8b.[15] Indeed, v. 8b, as Catchpole's argument,[16] seems to belong originally to the parable, since v. 8b is fit well not only for the parable, but for the preceding eschatological discourse (17:22-37). If the word πίστις means 'faithfulness', then v. 8b is all the more appropriate to the parable and its eschatological context.[17] Although it is in fact widely accepted that Luke added v. 8b as an independent saying of Jesus, it is reasonable to view v. 8 as its original part of in the unity of the parable.

9-2. The Analysis of the Parable

At the outset, the disciples are given a statement of the purpose of the parable in the introduction (v. 1) that it is necessary to always pray and not lose heart. Praying continuously and not giving up stands in stark contrast to the rabbinic injunction to limit prayer in order not to weary God.[18] Such an attitude of praying appears also at Lk. 21:36, Rom. 12:12 and 1 Thess. 5:17.

V. 2, in the first place, introduces a judge who neither fears God nor respects human beings. Not only does this description contrast with the injunction of King Jehoshaphat when he appointed judges in the land in all the fortified cities of Judah, city by city (2 Chron. 19:4-6),[19] but also such a portrait of him corresponds closely to that of King Jehoiakim by Josephus, "he was unjust and wicked by nature, and was neither reverent toward God nor kind to man."[20] According to the teaching of the Old Testament tradition, the audience probably expected a judge who fears God and respects human beings. In this respect, the appearance of a judge of dubious character would have surprised the hearers and caught their attention from the outset of the story, with curiosity for the narrative to proceed.

---

15. Jeremias, *Parables*, 153-57; G. Delling, "Das Gleichnis vom gottlosen Richter," *ZNW* 53 (1962), 1-25; Marshall, *Luke*, 670-71; Blomberg, *Parables*, 273; Catchpole, "The Son of Man's Search for Faith," 81-104.

16. Catchpole concludes that vv. 2-5 and 7-8 have a unity from the beginning and came from the historical Jesus. Catchpole, "The Son of Man's Search for Faith," 104.

17. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 457.

18. According to the Babylonian Talmud, it is generally encouraged to pray three times per day on the basis of the model of Daniel. In addition, in the case of the midrashim, an injunction to limit prayer is given to one in order not to weary God. See *b. Ber*. 31a; *Tanh. B* 10. 11; J.T. Townsend, *Midrash Tanhuma: Translated into English with Introduction, Indices, and Brief Notes (S. Buber Recension). I. Genesis* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1989).

19. King Jehoshaphat said to the judges, "Be careful about what you do, for you judge not for man but for the Lord, and he is with you in giving judgment." (2 Chron. 19:6).

20. Josephus, *Ant.* 10.83, μήτε πρὸς θεὸν ὅσιος μήτε πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιεικής; quoted from *Josephus*, trans. Henry St. John Thackeray et al., LCL, 10 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961-81), 6:202-3. See also Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Rom. Ant.* 10.10.7; Freed, "The Parable of the Judge and the Widow," 42.

The Old Testament taught the Israelite that fearing God and keeping the commandments make one pious (Lev 19:14, 32; Deut 4:10; 5:29; 6:13; 8:6; 10:12; 13:4; 14:23; 17:13; 19:20; 31:12). The just judge should base a judgment on the Torah, in fear of the Lord, since a righteous and wise judgment is directed by the Torah, which teaches how to fear God.[21] What is more, the just judge judges not on behalf of human beings, but on God's behalf. The verb ἐντρέπομαι here means that the judge lacked concern for others who came before him, still more, had contempt for them. This portrait of the judge is reiterated in the same terms in v. 4, and he is eventually given the title of "unrighteous judge" in v. 6.

The story introduces the widow who comes before the judge, without a description of her character, in contrast to the sketching out of the judge's character. In Old Testament, widows in the triadic formula "widows, orphans, and foreigners",[22] were objects of special care by God's commands. God protects them and executes justice for them (Exod. 22:21-24; Deut 10:17-18, 27:19; Ps. 68:5; 146:9; Isa. 1:17, 23; Mal. 3:5). In the spite of these commands from God, widows were still objects of oppression and exploitation. Luke shows special concern to widows in Luke-Acts (Lk. 2:37; 4:25-26; 7:12; 20:47; 21:2-3; Acts 6:1; 9:39, 41).[23] Widows were often left with no means of making a living or lost their livelihood altogether. If the husband left an estate, she could receive provision for her living through it, although she did not inherit the estate which her husband left.[24] If she returned to her family, she would not only have lost the right of provision for her living, but would also have to give back the money exchanged at the wedding. Widows and their children who had come to poverty were even sold occasionally as slaves for debt.[25] In view of the circumstances of widows, it is most likely that the widow's case had to do with money.[26]

---

21. Boven feels that the judge who neither fears God nor respects humans commits a violation of the double love command. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 15:1-19:27)*, 190.

22. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 181.

23. One might expect that widows are, of course, singled out as special concern by all the gospel writers. Yet that is not true. There is no such saying in Matthew, and in case of Mark, just two sayings (Mk. 12:40, 41-44).

24. Shemuel Safrai, "Home and Family: Religion in everyday life," *Jewish People in the 1the Century* (1976), 728-833, here 787-91. The widow, according to Safrai, could choose to remain in the house of her husband, but on the whole she would choose to return to her father's or brother's house because of kinship patterns.

25. G. Stählin, "χήρα," *TDNT*, IX, 440-465, here 441-48.

26. Plummer, *St. Luke*, 412; Jeremias, *Parables*, 153; Marshall, *Luke*, 672; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 133; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 202; Hultgren, *Parables*, 254; Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 191. Jeremias argues that the case seems to be a money matter: "a debt, a pledge, or a portion of an inheritance is being withheld from her," since a single judge could decide such a case. Still, according to Mishnah (*Sanh.* 1:1), cases concerning property require at least three judges. On the other hand, Herzog contends that the case may be either to claim her provision for living from the estate, which was left by her husband, or to reclaim her *ketubah*, that is to say, the amount of money her husband

On the other hand, Curkpatrick argues that widows are not only used here as examples of faith and strength, but also as a prophetic image of Yahweh's passion for justice. For him the descriptions of widows in the Gospel of Luke are primarily from the LXX, which is full of images of injustice and prophetic protest. He therefore argues that the parable is consonant with the prophetic quest for justice, and functions as a challenge against unjust practices in Luke's community.[27] This seems, however, to be going too far, so as to elicit and emboss the widow's prophetic voice for justice. Rather than draw its connections from the LXX tradition, it is in fact more common to find allusions to the parable in Sirach.[28]

In the Mediterranean world, women did not go to the public offices of the court, and such legal affairs were primarily performed by lawyers or some male relative of the woman.[29] It is surmised that the appearance of the woman in the court would evoke male attention. In any rate, it is more likely that there is no male relative to represent her in court.[30] Although Cotter tries to bring the widow's boldness to the fore by focusing on her frequent visits to the court in a public male domain, and her speaking in a commanding tone without respectful wording toward the judge,[31] viewed from a different angle, however, we should take into consideration the fact that her miserable living conditions could have caused such behaviour.

With respect to the judicial structure of ancient Judaism, Derrett argues that there were

---

pledged to her as an inheritance in the event of his death, according to the research of Jacob Neusner. See Herzog, *Parables as Subversive*, 223-24.

27. Curkpatrick, "A Parable Frame-up and Its Audacious Reframing," 24-26; Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*, 232, 243, 258; Freed, "The Parable of the Judge and the Widow," 38, 56; Nolland, *Luke*, 871.

28. See J.M. Creed, *The Gospel According to Saint Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1960), 222; Marshall, *Luke*, 673; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 636; Schweizer, *Luke*, 279; Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 219-20; Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 659-60; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 185: Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 269; Green, *Luke*, 638; J. Lieu, *The Gospel of Luke* (Peterborough: Epworth, 1997), 139; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 128; Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*,188 n. 3; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 456. But, certainly, Bock is against to these arguments. See also Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50, 9:51-24:53* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994/1996), 1445.

29. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 135; Raphael Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri: 332 B.C-640 A.D.* (Warszawa: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1955), 175-76; Cotter, "The Parable of the Feisty Widow and the Threatened Judge," 333-35; A.J. Marshall, "Ladies at Law: The Role of Women in the Roman Civil Courts," in ed., Carl Deroux, *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History V* (Brussels: Latomus. Revue D'Études Latines, 1989), 35-54.

30. P. Hiebert, "Widows," in ed., B.M. Metzger and M.D. Coogan, *Oxford Companion to the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 795-98, here 793; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 135; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive*, 232; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 202; Hultgren, *Parables*, 255; Mary W. Matthews, Carter Shelley, and Barbara Scheele, "Proclaiming the Parable of the Persistent Widow (Lk. 18:2-5)," in ed., Mary Ann Beavis, *Lost Coin: Parables of Women, Work and Wisdom* (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 46-70, 49.

31. Cotter, "The Parable of the Feisty Widow and the Threatened Judge," 332-36.

two court systems, συναγωγαί for religious matters, and ἐξουσίαι for worldly ones, and as opposed to Sherwin-White[32] views the judge in the parable as a Gentile judge.[33] The Mishnah proposes a tribunal of three judges to decide cases concerning property, but also suggests that every town with 120 or more men must establish a tribunal of seven judges.[34] It is doubtful whether in such an ideal jurisdiction, justice was dispensed. In contrast, the Talmud allows one qualified scholar to adjudicate money matters.[35] Furthermore, Josephus claims that in Galilee there were local courts composed of seven judges.[36] On the other hand, Herzog takes a pessimistic view of the judicial system of first-century Palestine, pointing out that judges of the court were staffed to serve the interests of their rulers, the ruling elite, and not to dispense impartial justice. Even he counters Derrett's claim that the customary Torah courts were appointed by local notabilities or men renowned for piety with keen and impartial minds, since the actual historical situation and society would be messier than the ideal which he is describing.[37] In any case, what is important here is that we have sketchy information about how the Jewish system of jurisprudence was composed of and how it disposed justice.

The widow's continual importunity met with the ongoing refusal of the judge. Yet, the audience is left without a concrete reason for the judge's refusal, though it is perhaps because the widow gave no bribes,[38] or an opponent of hers had an influential power over the judge.[39] The judge's thoughts are exposed to the hearer of the parable, as in other Lukan parables,[40] through an interior monologue: "though I neither fear God nor regard man, yet because this widow bothers me, I will vindicate her, or she will wear me out by her continual coming." The judge finally decided to give the widow vindication, simply because he wants to remove her constant pestering, and not because of a change of character. In reality, he betrays the fact that his character remains unchanged through one more repetition, "I neither fear God nor regard man." εἰς τέλος here is taken to be conveying the sense of *continually*,

32. A.N. Sherwin-White, *Rome Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 133-34, regards the judge in the parable as a Jewish judge.
33. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament Times* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), 180.
34. *m. Sanh.* 1.1; 3.1; H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (London: Oxford University Press, 1985), 385.
35. *b. Sanh.* 4b-5a; H. Cohen, "Bet Din and Judges," *Encyclopedia Judaica* 2, 721-23.
36. *J. W.* 2.569-71.
37. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive*, 224-27; Derrett, *Law in the New Testament Times*, 34-35.
38. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 306; Ben Witherington, "Jesus, the Savior of the Least, the Last, and the Lost," *Quarterly Review* (1995), 197-211, 203.
39. Jeremias, *Parables*, 153.
40. Cf. also 12:16-21, 42-46; 15:11-32; 16:1-8; 20:9-10. Philip Sellew, "Interior Monologue as a Narrative Device in the Parables of Luke," *JBL* 111 (1992), 247-48.

and that is also fit for understanding of ὑπωπιάζω.[41]

As for the meaning of the verb ὑπωπιάζω, the opinions are sharply divided into two views: That is, that the verb ὑπωπιάζω means that the widow will literally inflict actual physical assault on the judge, conveying the futility of violence in the work for justice by Jesus.[42] Or the verb is used metaphorically, since it does not seem feasible that the powerful judge would have been afraid of violence from a helpless and defenseless widow. In the case of the latter, there are indeed a number of suggestions, revealing a difference in outlook, such as, "wearing him out or annoying him greatly,"[43] "being given a headache,"[44] "blacken my face"[45] and the like. The verb, as Weiss proposed,[46] is a boxing term that means literally "to strike under the eye." However, it is likely that the verb is used metaphorically, meaning "wearing the judge out", although it is possible that the literal meaning of physical assault is used sarcastically or ironically. Nevertheless, there is great irony in the picture of a powerful judge fearing a helpless widow.

In the use of the title ὁ κύριος which may be Lukan,[47] Jesus says "hear what the unrighteous judge says." The title functions as a reminder to the audience of Jesus as an

41. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 136; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 638.

42. Barbara E. Reid, "Luke's Mixed Message for Women," *Chicago Studies* 38 (1999), 283-97, here 289-90; idem, "A Godly Widow Persistently Pursuing Justice: Luke 18:1-8," 29; idem, "Beyond Petty Pursuits and Wearisome Widows," 29; Mary W. Matthews, Carter Shelley, and Barbara Scheele, "Proclaiming the Parable of the Persistent Widow (Lk. 18:2-5)," 51; Cotter, "The Parable of the Feisty Widow and the Threatened Judge (Luke 18:1-8)," 338-41, contends that the verb must be translated literally, not as circumlocution, since in Aristophanes' *The Peace*, for instance among ancient sources, in Paul' use as well, the verbs had literal meanings, "swollen, Blackened eyes (*The Peace*)," "I punch my body (1 Cor 9:27)."

43. Jeremias, *Parables*, 154; Linnemann, *Parables*, 120; Feed, "Judge and the Widow," 50; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 185; Blomberg, *Parables*, 271; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 638; Hultgren, *Parables*, 256; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 458.

44. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 136.

45. Marshal, *Luke*, 673; Nolland, *Luke*, 868; Hicks, "The Parable of the Persistent Widow (Luke 18:1-8)," 217-18. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament Times*, 188-91, claims that the verb means giving dishonor to the judge in 'blacken my face'. But given his bad character drawn in vv. 2 and 4, it is unlikely that the verb indicates a loss of his reputation.

46. K. Weiss, "ὑπωπιάζω," *TDNT*, VIII, 590-91. Since then, most of scholars follow Weiss' claim that it is used metaphorically in ancient sources.

47. Freed claims that what introduces ὁ κύριος into the narrative is characteristic of Luke in his two volumes, with traces of various sources employed by Luke. Freed, "The Parable of the Judge and the Widow," 50. See also Marshall, *Luke*, 673; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1179; Stein, *Luke*, 445; Green, *Luke*, 641; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 204; Hultgren, *Parables*, 256. On the other hand, having mentioned the fact that εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος is an indication of development, retelling the story and first interpretation, Bovon even goes so far as to contend that this first interpretation gets near to the original meaning of the parable, since the focus, as opposed to the later reading, is wholly on the judge. Boven, "Apocalyptic Traditions in the Lukan Special Material: Reading Luke 18:1-8," 388-89.

authoritative teacher. The adjective ἀδικίας here appears in the same form in Luke's portrait of the unjust steward in 16:8, in which case the reason for naming ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας is a suitable description of the judge's character in v. 2 and v. 4, and underlines his selfish reasons for giving the widow vindication: Getting rid of her constant pestering, not a concern for justice.

By means of *a fortiori* argument, Jesus emphasizes that if an unjust judge will finally grant justice[48] to a widow, how much more will God grant justice to his people who cry to him day and night. The double analogy he develops exists in an argument from the lesser to the greater, in which case the unjust judge and the widow correspond to God and God's elect, respectively.[49]

V. 7b is *a crux interpretum.* Scholars read it in many ways: As a question, a statement, a concessive clause and a relative clause.[50] Moreover, does the word μακροθυμεῖν mean "to be patient or longsuffering", or "to delay or tarry", or both? Most of scholars view v. 7b as a concessive clause, seeing μακροθυμεῖν as the sense of delay, in that case, this presents the time that God takes in answering the crying out of his elect.[51] To put it another way, will not God vindicate his elect, even if he keeps them waiting for him?, or the elect cry out to God night and day, but he puts their patience to the test by not answering them immediately.[52] Another alternative is to take v. 7b as a question expecting a negative answer, with

48. The use of ἐκδικέω or ἐκδίκησις in the legal judgment carries the thought of "vindicate" or "procure justice" rather than "avenge" in both the Hellenistic world for administrative justice, and the papyri and the LXX, since there is no mention of the opponents of the elect. See Marshall, *Luke*, 673-74; Green, *Luke*, 641 n. 97; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 205; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 458.

49. Even though Green claims that only the analogy between the judge and God appears in an argument from lesser to greater, the analogy between the widow and God's elect occurs at the same time in *a fortiori* argument. Green, *Luke*, 643.

50. See a comparison of translations:

KJV: "though he bear long with them?"
RSV: "and delay long over them?"
NEB: "while he listens patiently to them?"
NAB: "Will he delay long over them?"
NIV: "Will he keep putting them off?"
NRSV: "Will he delay long in helping them?"

51. Jeremias, *Parables*, 154-55; Marshall, *Luke*, 675; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 639; Hicks, "The Parable of the Persistent Widow," 219-21; Stein, *Luke*, 446, n. 270; Hultgran, *The Parables of Jesus*, 256, in that case, have two different answers, namely, yes, God will vindicate his elect, and no, God will delay over them. In the similar vein, Fitzmyer also reads v. 7b in the sense of "delay," but he makes it a separate sentence with a question. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1180. See also, Freed, "The Parable of the Judge and the Widow," 53-54; Hendriksen, *Luke*, 817-19.

52. Marshall, *Luke*, 675; Jeremias, *Parables*, 155.

μακροθυμεῖν in the sense of "have patience," viewing the reference to ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς as rendering of the oppressors of the elect.[53] The meaning of v. 7 then is that God will not tarry in punishing the oppressors. In the case of the first option, it is an unsuitable understanding of v. 7b, since the same meaning appears repeatedly in v. 8a with ἐν τάχει. In respect to the second approach, no mark is given to indicate the oppressors in the parable. On the other hand, Snodgrass argues that v. 7b, as a statement, emphasizes God's care for his people, with the assertion that God will indeed have patience. In other words, the intent is "Will not God surely vindicate his elect who cry to him day and night [given that] he is mercifully patient with them?"[54] It is, as in Max Rogland's lexical observation,[55] probably desirable to retain the sense of "being patient," rather than that of a temporal "delay" in interpreting v. 7b.[56]

Jesus calls the attention of the audience by means of λέγω ὑμῖν so as to underscore the fact that God will vindicate his people quickly. What in v. 8a is at stake, seems to be not so much the meaning of ἐν τάχει, whether it means quickly or suddenly, as the difference between a human standpoint and God's perspective, seen in the apparent contradiction with reality. Given the foregoing eschatological teaching in 17:26-37, it is also possible to allow for "suddenly" as the sense of ἐν τάχει, whereas in comparison with the judge's delay in granting justice to the widow, the sense of "quickly" is indeed more appropriate than that of "suddenly."[57] Depending on the focus of the petition of the elect, it will be determined by whether the time of the vindication is an historical action or an eschatological one. Bailey claims that "God will vindicate His Son who also prays to Him day and night, but that vindication will be seen in resurrection and will come by way of a cross."[58] There is,

53. Godet, *Luke*, 2:202; C.E.B. Cranfield, "The Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts," *SJT* 16 (1963), 297-301, here 300.

54. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 459, elicits the meaning of μακροθυμεῖν from LXX that carries God's mercy in repressing his wrath, when God in particular deals with his people. See also Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 206. For a similar view, see Catchpole, "The Son of Man's Search for Faith," 92-98; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 139; Nolland, *Luke*, 870, argues that God has patience with his elect by repressing his anger, with the sense of longsuffering on the basis of God's character, thereby allowing them to approach him in prayer. On the other hand, Schottroff feels that "God abandons divine wrath over human injustice; that is God's patience." Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 194.

55. Max Roglan, "μακροθυμεῖν in Ben Sira 35:19 and Luke 18:7: A Lexicographical Note," *NovT* 51 (2009), 296-301, after a parallel investigation with Sira 35:19, concludes that in the semantics of the verb itself, the verb takes "the typical meaning of indicating a disposition of "being patient" or "longsuffering" with someone else," not a meaning of "to tarry or delay" which is to be attributed to the literary context.

56. For other options apart from these, see Liefeld, "Parables on Prayer," 258. He holds that v. 7b is a question and v. 8 is the answer to the question in v. 7, namely, "Will God delay doing anything for a long time?" (v. 7), "No, God will act quickly" (v. 8a).

57. Marshall, *Luke*, 674, has both in view.

58. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 140.

however, no evidence to support his contention in the parable. The nagging problem with reference to v. 8a, is that God does not always grant justice to his people quickly in history. The answer to the question is in general explained as a difference in perspectives that there is delay from a human perspective, but not from God's. One the other hand, Kilgallen proposes that the contrast between untiring prayer (v. 1) and prayer swiftly answered (vv. 6-8a) can be explained in two different situations: The situation which is a long wait for the final judgment, and in the quick end to a particular persecution.[59] It is doubtful, however, whether the parable draws such situations.

Jesus in v. 8b returns to the theme of the coming of the Son of man in 17:22-37. "Nevertheless, when the Son of man comes, will he find faith on earth?" The question is, as a whole, pessimistic in the reference to the result. It is difficult to determine the precise meaning of τὴν πίστιν which appears with the definite article. Apart from here, πίστιν throughout the teaching of Jesus stands for the fundamental and continuing attitude required of man within his relationship with God. Yet, here it expresses confidence in God's vindication, and persistence in prayer in the face of injustice. This warning, by means of the phrase, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς becomes applicable to all, until the coming of the Son of Man.[60]

9-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

Scott also strives to relate the parable to the metaphor of the kingdom, in that just as the widow's continual coming with shamelessness brings vindication, so the kingdom keeps coming irrespective of honour or justice. As a result of which, Luke's interpretation (v. 1, 6-8) limits the parable to an example of prayer. For him, Luke seems to distort the meaning of the parable. Only her continued wearing down of the judge is a metaphor for the kingdom.[61] However, it may also link the widow's continual coming, to patience in prayer as it relates to a metaphor for the kingdom. But in the strict sense of the word, there is nothing explicit in the parable to connect it as metaphor for the kingdom.

Herzog feels that the parable is designed to betray a contradiction in the justice system between the Torah ideal and its contemporary willful misinterpretation, to help the ruling-class elite. In view of the contemporary system as a whole, the widow's struggle, at first

59. Kilgallen, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 146-47, assumes that the background of the parable resided in "persecution of various sorts, of the followers of Jesus, of the chosen in the light of vv. 7-8a and its language of election, and the emphasis on justice-injustice." Cf. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 209; Liefeld, "Parables on Prayer," 257.

60. Green, *Luke*, 643.

61. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 187.

glance, appears pessimistic, but in the end she triumphs. Now that she realizes that there is no point in appealing to the judge's honour and his compassion, she decides to test the limits of his expediency. The widow refuses to accept her predestined role in the unreasonable social system, and breaks social barriers and crosses forbidden social and gender boundaries. The result of her shameless behaviour is finally a just verdict, namely, justice.[62]

In a similar vein, Cotter argues that the parable is a burlesque of the whole justice system, but also gives the readers a prophetic insight through its mockery of the justice system. The boldness of the widow in the parable is expressed in her frequent visits in the public male domain of the courts, and her command to the judge without any title of respect for him. At the same time it indicates an outrageous refusal to conform to the social scripts defined by the elites. Only such boldness carries a possible threat to the elites, and strongly shakes the system. The commentaries (v. 1 and 6-8), however, strive to move the feisty widow back into the conventional role of a meek woman in consonance with society's conventions.[63] Even though Herzog and Cotter's social analysis gives an insight into understanding the parable, it does not seem to be a proper understanding of the parable, since they excessively ignore the context surrounding the parable.

Curkpatrick contends that there is dissonance between the parable (vv. 2-5) and its frame (vv. 1, 6-8) due to the framing of the parable, not a problem with the sources. For him, while the parable (vv. 2-5) is about "justice," the framed parable (vv. 1-8) is about "prayer," "perseverance," and "vindication." The frame is also formed as an allegory, move of the central character of the parable and *a minori ad maius* argument. Since the interpretive frame has eclipsed the central issue in the parable, i.e. "justice," he seeks to build up a more adequate frame for the parable within the gospel, consistent with the rhetorical and theological impetus of that gospel, that is, within the theological impetus of Luke's widow tradition, and in the textures of reversal in the Magnificat.[64] It is doubtful, however, whether such an attempt can solve the problem of dissonance between the parable and its frame. In addition, such an attempt might distort the intention of the writer of the Gospel.

The parable not only makes two main points from one of the characters in the story, that is, the certainty of God's hearing prayer and persistence in prayer, but also tightly

62. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive*, 215-32, especially 224, 230.
63. Cotter, "The Parable of the Feisty Widow and the Threatened Judge," 328-43, here 332-36, 342-43.
64. Curkpatrick, "Dissonance in Luke 18:1-8," 107-21; idem, "A Parable Frame-up and Its Audacious Reframing," 22-38.

interweaves the two points in the application (v. 1 and vv. 6-8).[65] The first point drawn from the character of the judge, after the telling of the parable, appears in *a fortiori* argument, that if an unjust judge will finally grant the request of a widow, how much more will God vindicate his people who cry to him day and night? There is at the same time a contrast between the judge and God, the contrast in which God, as opposed to the judge, is mercifully patient with the requests of the people, but also will vindicate quickly, unlike the judge's delay. The second point, persistence in prayer, is derived from the widow who kept coming to the judge saying, "vindicate me against my adversary" (v. 3, 5b, 7a and 1). It is entirely based on confidence to be vindicated by God (vv. 7-8a), and goes further to the faith (v. 8b) to always pray and not lose heart, until the coming of the Son of the Man. The evidence of faithfulness and alertness is seen in prayer itself, which reveals constant fellowship with God. The matter of how we remain faithful until the coming of the Son of the Man, is certainly persistence in prayer.[66]

65. Blomberg, *Parables*, 273; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 208-210.

66. E. Glenn Hinson, "Persistence in Prayer in Luke-Acts," *RevExp* 104 (2007), 721-36.

10. The Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18: 9-14)

10-1. The Literary Context of the Parable

The parable is linked to the foregoing parable (Luke 18:1-8) by the common theme of prayer and the use of the δίκαιος word group which appears in vv. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 14.[1] As for the common theme, both accounts basically deal with the attitudes the disciples of Jesus should have in praying, not simply prayer, but importunity and humility in praying, although the Pharisee and the Tax Collector can refer to any teaching, apart form that of prayer. In view of the contrast of characters in a parable, the parable has an affinity with the parable of the Prodigal Son in that there is a contrast between the desperate and humble confession of the prodigal and the distancing and disdain of the elder brother. On the same line, the parable can be also related to the parable of the Good Samaritan in its contrast of the Samaritan to the priest and the Levite as well as in a chiastic arrangement of Luke's central section.[2]

Apart from v. 9 and v. 14b, the authenticity of the parable (vv. 10-14a) has largely been accepted by scholars,[3] although there is a different opinion with reference to v. 14a. On the other hand, with respect to the authenticity of v. 14b, the opinions are primarily divided into two arguments, contentions that v. 14b is from Jesus from the beginning,[4] or that, as a

1. For example, see ἐκδίκησιν, ἐκδικήσω, ἐκδίκησιν ("grant justice" or "vindicate") in 18:3, 5, 7, 8, ἀντιδίκου ("opponent") in 18:3, ἀδικίας, ἄδικοι ("unjust") in 18:6, 11, δίκαιοι ("just") in 18:10, and δεδικαιωμένος ("having been justified") in 18:14. Stephanie Harrison, "The Case of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector: Justification and Social Location in Luke's Gospel," *CurTM* 32 (2005), 99-111, especially 100, n. 2; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 466; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 211.

2. Blomberg, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke's Central Section," 240-44.

3. Jeremias, *Parables*, 140; Crossan, *In Parables*, 68-69; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 145; Marshall, *Luke*, 678; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1183-84; Scott, *Hear Then a Parable*, 93-98; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 256-58; F. Gerald Downing, "The Ambiguity of The Pharisee and the Toll collector (Luke 18:9-14) in the Greco-Roman World of Late Antiquity," *CBQ* 54 (1992), 80-99; Nolland, *Luke*, 874; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 173-93; Michael Farris, "A Tale of Two Taxations (Luke 18:10-14b): The Parable of the Pharisee and the Toll Collector," in ed., V. George Shillington, *Jesus and His Parables: Interpreting the Parables of Jesus Today* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 23-33; Hultgren, *Parables*, 125; Forbers, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 211; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 470-71; Robert Doran, "The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: An Agonistic Story," *CBQ* 69 (2007), 259-70, here 261-65. John J. Kilgallen, "The Importance of the Redactor in Luke 18,9-14," *Bib* 79 (1998), 69-75, especially 69; idem, "The Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18:9-14): The Point?," *ExpTim* 114 (2003), 157-59; idem, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 149.

4. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 258-59, who view v. 14b as an original part of the parable on the grounds that v. 14b does provide an appropriate conclusion as some kind of explanation for a radical verdict in v. 14a. See also Marshall, *Luke*, 681; Bock, *Luke*, 1459-60; Plummer, *Luke*, 420; Ellis, *Luke*, 216; Kilgallen, "The Importance of the Redactor in Luke 18,9-14," 71.

floating saying of Jesus, it comes from Luke or his source.[5] Recently, Timothy A. Friedrichsen, following Herzog's and Nolland's contention,[6] rules out λέγω ὑμῖν in v. 14a from the original structure of the parable, taking it for a Lukan insertion to underline the conclusion to the parable. He argues that παρ᾽ ἐκεῖνον is Luke's excursus to v. 14a, since it is well in keeping with Luke's redactional introduction (v. 9) which takes on the common bias against Pharisees.[7] However, such a reading is not correct on account of the excision of the comparative aspect of the story that is expected to come through because it is part of the parable from the outset.

10-2. The Analysis of the Parable

As with the preceding parable, this parable begins with a statement of the purpose of the parable in the introduction, thereby giving more focuses on the Pharisee who soon comes on the stage. In addition, lest one falls into an interpretative confusion, it functions as an interpretive setting to catch the precise meaning of the parable to follow. In this respect, it seems apparent that v. 9, as most scholars argue,[8] comes from Luke. At this stage, the reader of Luke's Gospel, as opposed to the original audience of Jesus, would have accumulated

5. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1183; Soctt, *Hear Then a Parable*, 93; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 155; Nolland, *Luke*, 875, 878; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 175; Farris, "Tale of Two Taxations," 23 n. 1; Craig A. Evans, "The Pharisee and the Publican: Luke 18:9-14 and Deuteronomy 26," in ed., C.A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, *The Gosples and the Scriptures of Israel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 342-55; Walter L. Liefeld, "Parables on Prayer (Luke 11:5-10; 18:1-8; 18:9-14)," in ed., Richard N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 240-62, here 259; Downing, "The Ambiguity of The Pharisee and the Toll collector (Luke 18:9-14) in the Greco-Roman World of Late Antiquity," 80, 86, 96-97, even suggests that the parable ended with v. 13, viewing both characters in parable as negative figure. But without it, the parable would fail to make sense in point. For a similar view, see Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*, 211, 234-35.

6. See, Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 175. Nolland, *Luke*, 878, enumerates Lukan parable's feature from his parable source as follows: 11:8; 13:3, 5; 15:7, 10; 18:8 and 18:14.

7. Timothy A. Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable (Luke 18:10-14a)," *JBL* 124 (2005), 89-119.

8. Plummer, *Luke*, 416; Ellis, *Luke*, 214; Crossan, *In Parables*, 68; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 144; Marshall, *Luke*, 678; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1183; Scott, *Hear Then a Parable*, 93; Downing, "The Ambiguity of The Pharisee and the Toll collector (Luke 18:9-14) in the Greco-Roman World of Late Antiquity," 80; Nolland, *Luke*, 875; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 175; Farris, "A Tale of Two Taxations (Luke 18:10-14b): The Parable of the Pharisee and the Toll Collector," 23 n. 1; Hultgren, *Parables*, 120; Forbers, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 212; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 470-71; Doran, "The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: An Agonistic Story," 261-65. Kilgallen, "The Importance of the Redactor in Luke 18:9-14," 71; idem, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 149. Unlike this, there are also those who see v. 9 as pre-Lukan tradition. See Jeremias, *Parables*, 93; Linnemann, *Parable*s, 64; Bultmann, *The History of the Syoptic Tradition*, 178 n. 2.

more negative images regarding the Pharisees because of Luke's negative portrayals thus far.[9] The usages of the word δίκαιος in the first century at least include relational fidelity, forensic justification, and restoration of right relationship.[10] Here it should be taken in the sense of a lifestyle acceptable before God.[11]

V. 9 has normally been seen as Jesus' attack on the type of character in Pharisaism that stands for exclusivism and self-centredness.[12] The challenge to the above tradition of interpretation rises strongly with Schottroff who argues that such an interpretation is profoundly rooted in so-called *ecclesiological* Christian notions of Pharisaism and Judaism.[13] Yet it seems safe to say that the "some" in v. 9 is applicable not only to Pharisees, but also the audience of Jesus, including his disciples and the readers of Luke.[14]

The reader is left with no information as to whether the setting is of public worship or of private prayer. In relation to the setting of prayer, many scholars put forward that of public worship,[15] the setting which is linked to either the morning[16] or evening sacrifice[17] in that Luke mentions the daily sacrifice in several other contexts,[18] and in that ἱλάσθητι μοι in v. 13 has sacrificial implications. If this is the case, it, as will be discussed later, would indeed serve to stress the tax-collector's plea for atonement.[19]

According to recent research on the Pharisees in the light of three ancient sources, that is,

---

9. For negative descriptions of Pharisees in Luke's Gospel so far, see 5:30; 6:2, 7; 7:30, 39; 11:37-46, 53-54; 15:1-2; 16:14-15. See also Forbers, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 212.

10. A. Katherine Grieb, *The Story of Romans: A Narrative Defense of God's Righteousness* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 21-25.

11. Marshall, *Luke*, 679.

12. Ibid., 677-78.

13. Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 8-11.

14. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1185-86; Nolland, *Luke*, 875; Green, *Luke*, 644; Hultgren, *Parables*, 120; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 470; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 103-104.

15. Jeremias, *Parables*, 140; Scott, *Hear Then a Parable*, 94; Herozog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 178; Farris, "Tale of Two Taxations," 31; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 105; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 473. On the other hand, Hedrick presumes that the two prayers went up to temple to pray between the sacrifices. Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*, 214.

16. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 146.

17. Hultgren, *Parables*, 178; Dennis Hamm, "The Tamid Service in Luke-Acts: The Cultic Background behind Luke's Theology of Worship (Luke 1:5-25; 18:9-14; 24:50-53; Acts 3:1; 10:3, 30)," *CBQ* 65 (2003), 215-31.

18. Luke 1:5-23; Luke 24:50-53; Acts 3:1. See also Hamm, "The Tamid Service in Luke-Acts: The Cultic Background behind Luke's Theology of Worship," 215-31.

19. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 473; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 213.

Josephus, the NT and rabbinic literature,[20] Pharisees believed "the influence of divine activity on human life, the joint effect of human freedom and fate, and reward and punishment in the afterlife"[21] on the grounds of eschatology, divine providence and human responsibility, in which case their point of view was not only quite at odds with traditional Jewish teachings and attitudes, but also quite different from it. They indeed showed a vastly interest in tithing, ritual purity, and Sabbath observance, having less interest in civil laws and ritual regulations for the Temple worship. Pharisees also had distinctive interpretations concerning these matters and tried to facilitate their observance and substantiate its validity against challenges by other institutions of society, and even sought to reform groups, including the priests, Qumran community, and Jesus and his early followers.

At the very least it seems clear that Luke in particular holds a less hostile attitude toward the Pharisees both in the gospel and in Acts than Mark and Matthew, although Luke's description of the Pharisees raises some suspicion that he overemphasizes a positive relationship between the Pharisees and the early followers of Jesus as theological concerns.[22]

---

20. For more detail, see J.A. Ziesler, "Luke and the Pharisees," *NTS* 25 (1979), 146-57; Joseph B. Tyson, "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts," *NTS* 30 (1984), 574-83; J.T. Sanders, "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts," 141-88; R.L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBL MS, 33, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987), 84-106; John T. Carroll, "Luke's Portrayal of the Pharisees," *CBQ* 50 (1988), 604-21; Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1988); idem, "Pharisees," *ABD*, vol. 5, 289-303; E.P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishna* (London: SCM Press, 1990), 97-254; idem, *Judaism: Practice & Belief 63 BCE-66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 380-451; Jacob Neusner, *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1971); idem, "The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before A.D. 70: The Problem of Oral Transmission," ed., Jacob Neusner, in *Origins of Judaism: The Pharisees and Other Sects* (vol. 2.; New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1990), 155-72; idem, "Mr. Sanders' Pharisees and Mine," *SJT* 44 (1991), 73-95; idem, "The Mishna in Philosophical Context and Out of Canonical Bounds," *JBL* 112 (1993), 291-304; Mark Allan Powell, "The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary-Critical Study," *JBL* 109 (1990), 93-110; R.F. O'Toole, "Reflections on Luke's Treatment of Jews in Luke-Acts," *Bib* 74 (1993), 529-55; Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees* (SPB 39; Leiden: Brill, 1991); J.D. Kingsbury, "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts," ed., F. Van Segbroeck, in *The Four Gospels 1992: Restschrift Frans Neirynck* (vol. 2, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1497-1512; Craig A. Evans, "Mishna and Messiah 'In Contest': Some Comments on Jacob Neusner's Proposals," *JBL* 112 (1993), 267-89; Robert C. Tannehill, "Should We Love Simon the Pharisee? Hermeneutical Reflections on the Pharisees in Luke," *CurTM* 21 (1994), 424-33; Günter Stemberger, *Jewish Contemporaries of Jesus: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995); Joseph Sievers, "Who Were the Pharisees?" in ed., James H. Charlesworth and Loren L. Johns, *Hillel and Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 137-55; John P. Meier, "The Quest for the Historical Pharisee: A Review Essay on Roland Deines, Die Pharisäer," *CBQ* 61 (1999),713-22; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*; vol. 3, *Companions and Competitors* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 289-388; J. Patrick Mullen, *Dining with Pharisees* (Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2004), 39-77; Amy-Jill Levine, "Luke's Pharisees," in ed., Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2007), 113-30.

21. Saldarini, "Pharisees," 296.

22. Ziesler, "Luke and the Pharisees," 146-57: J.T. Sanders, "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts," 149-54; Saldarini, "Pharisees," 296-97; Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*; vol. 3, *Companions and*

Although there is little consensus among scholars about the social stratification of the Pharisees, it seems most likely that the Pharisees were generally composed of the retainer class and lay persons, not the wealthiest members of society or the priestly aristocracy.[23] At any rate, Pharisees seems to have been held in high regard among people at the time of Jesus, for their tithing, ritual purity, and Sabbath observance,[24] although there is very little negative reference to Pharisees concerning their proud and self-righteous attitude both in the Gospels and in traditional Jewish literature.[25] In this regard, it should be considered that the parable would have startled Jesus' audience who had respected the Pharisees, unlike Luke's readers who would have quite negative imagery toward the Pharisees through the preceding portrayals.

On the other hand, tax collectors in general is composed of three distinct groups, as follows: those who paid the state in advance the sum to be collected for the coming year, so as to purchase the right to collect specific taxes, supervisory officials like Zacchaeus who had the opportunity for personal gain, and their employees who were staffed at toll booths or tax offices to collect such taxes.[26] Even though it is most likely that the tax collector in the parable would be an employee of a chief tax collector, yet it does not have to be spelled out whether the tax collector in the parable is a "toll collector" who collected tolls, tariffs, imposts and customs as indirect taxes,[27] or a "tax collector" who collected tolls, market duties, and all kinds of local taxes (sales, income, property, and inheritance).[28]

Tax collectors in turn are reduced to beggars, thieves and robbers in Roman and Hellenistic literature,[29] and to sinners, immoral people and Gentiles in the NT,[30] but also

---

Competitors, 297; Hultgren, *Parables*, 121; Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 8-11. They stood on the grounds that Pharisees held great regard among of people at the time of Jesus from extra-bible sources is contradictory to the biased point of view that seems alluded both in the parable and in other NT texts regarding Pharisees' portrayal.

23. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*; vol. 3, *Companions and Competitors*, 297; Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 246-67.

24. According to Josephus, the Pharisees received great regard among the masses of people. See Josephus, *Ant*. 13.297-98; 18.15; *J.W.* 1.110; 2.162.

25. See G.F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (3 vols.; New York: Schocken Books, 1971), 2:190-94.

26. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 188; John R. Donahue, "Tax Collector," *ABD*, vol. 6, 337-38.

27. Donahue, "Tax Collectors and Sinners: An Attempt at Identification," *CBQ* 33 (1971), 39-61, 48; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 469-70; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 173, 187-88; Farris, "Tale of Two Taxations," 23, 25, 29.

28. Scott, *Hear Then a Parable*, 93; Hultgren, *Parables*, 121.

29. Cicero, *De office*. 15-51; Diogenes Cynicus, *Ep*. 36.2; Lucan, *Pseudolog*. 30; Dio Chrysostom, *Orat*. 14.14; O. Michel, "τελώνμς," *TDNT*, VIII, 88-105.

30. Mark 2:15; Matt 5:46; 9:10; 11:19; 18:17; 21:31; Luke 7:34; 15:2.

they are portrayed as robbers, murderers and sinners in the rabbinic writings.[31] It is because tax collectors defrauded people on behalf of the chief tax collectors whom they served, and associate with Gentiles as occasionally being employees of gentile rulers. Moreover, their vocation is taken to rob the Temple of its dues, viz, tithes and temple taxation.[32] For these reasons, they were classified with a group of people who were hated and despised by all Jews, still more, were deprived of civic rights and not allowed to be a judge or a witness in a court of law.[33] Even though the appearance of the tax collector in the temple to pray would have astonished Jesus' audience who had detested and despised them, unlike this, Luke's readers would have taken quite positive imagery toward them, because of the preceding portrayals, especially in Jesus' association with tax collectors (Luke 5:30; 15:1).[34] Tax collectors throughout Luke's Gospel play a role as "models of prayer, repentance, conversion and belief in Jesus,"[35] because of the contrasting between tax collectors and Pharisees. On the literary level, Luke's readers would have taken quite a different stance of both characters than did Jesus' audience.

There is some ambiguity as to how to read ὁ Φαρισαῖος σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα προσηύχετο, on account of variants in the textual tradition, namely, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα,[36] ταῦτα πρὸς ἑαυτὸν,[37] ταῦτα,[38]

31. *m. Tohar.* 7.6; *m. Baba. Qamma*. 10.1-2; *m. Nedarim*. 3.4.

32. Donahue, "Tax Collector," *ABD*, vol. 6, 337-38; idem, "Tax Collectors and Sinners: An Attempt at Identification," *CBQ* 33 (1971), 39-61; W.O. Walker, "Jesus and the Tax Collectors," *JBL* 97 (1978), 221-38; P. Perkins, "Taxes in the New Testament," *JRE* 12 (1984), 182-200; A.M. Okorie, "The Characterization of the Tax Collectors in the Gospel of Luke," *CurTM* 22 (1995), 27-32; Hyam Maccogy, *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and Its Place in Judaism* (Cambridge University Press, 1999); idem, "How Unclean Were Tax-Collectors?" *BTB* 31 (2001), 60-63.

33. *m. Baba. Qamma*. 10.1-2; *m. Nedarim.* 3.4; *b. Sanh.* 25b. Although there is an argument that everything tax collector touched becomes ritually unclean on the basis of *m. Tohar.* 7.6 and *m. Hagigah* 3.6, it is fairly turned out by Maccoby that disapproval of tax-collector was due to a moral problem rather than ritual purity, correcting the misinterpretation of Mishnah passage. See *m. Tohoroth* 7.6 and *m. Hagigah* 3.6. "If taxgatherers entered a house all that is within it becomes unclean; even if a gentile was with them, they may be believed if they say 'We did not enter,' but (if a gentile was with them) they may not be believed entered a house only that part is unclean that was trodden by the feet of the thieves" (*m. Tohoroth* 7.6). "If tax collectors entered a house (so too if thieves restored stolen vessels) they may be deemed trustworthy if they say 'We have not touched" (*m. Hagigah* 3.6). Maccogy, "How Unclean Were Tax-Collectors?", 60.

34. The above instance' else, tax collectors were baptized by John (Luke 3:12-13; 7:29), one of the Twelve, Matthew is a tax collector (Luke 6:15), and "the lost" in Luke 15:3-32 seems to intimate tax collects along with sinners in Luke 15:1-2.

35. Okorie, "The Characterization of the Tax Collectors in the Gospel of Luke," 32; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 213. Okorie concludes that the contrasting characterization between tax collectors and Pharisees gives insights into our understanding with the abundant graciousness of the gospel and its power to transform people's lives.

36. Nestle-Aland 26th and 27th, A, K, W, X, Δ, Π, 063 f^{13}, 28, 33^{vid}, 565, 700, 1009, 1010, 1079, 1195, 1216,

πρὸς ἑαυτὸν,[39] καθ' ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα.[40] Given the manuscript evidence, of all five possible readings ταῦτα πρὸς ἑαυτὸν is stronger than the others. The main problem of interpretation here lies on a determination as to whether the prepositional phrase, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν is connected with προσηύχετο (the Pharisee's praying), or with σταθεὶς (the Pharisee's standing), but also as to whether πρὸς ἑαυτὸν means to be "to himself," or "about himself," or "by himself." It is argued that the prepositional phrase can be considered to mean that the Pharisee prayed "these things to himself,"[41] or "these things silently,"[42] linking it to the Pharisee's praying. Such contentions do seem absurd, however, in that people in antiquity were accustomed to praying aloud in general.[43] On the other hand, Hultgren claims that it would mean that the Pharisee "prayed these things concerning himself," connecting the prepositional phrase with the Pharisee's praying on the ground of textual criticism by Matthew Black.[44] However, his suggestion, understanding the πρός as a πρός of reference, is rejected in the sense that the πρός at no point has such a meaning in the LXX or the NT, instead the πρός refers to the person addressed. Nor are all his examples a close parallel to v. 11 in the parable.[45] The better reading, all things considered, is that having stood by himself, he was praying these things, connecting πρὸς ἑαυτὸν with the Pharisee's standing. This reading, as praying apart from other people, fits certainly with not only the Lukan introduction, but a stream throughout the story.[46]

The Pharisee in the first place thanks God for what he does not do, putting the tax

---

1230, 1242, 1253, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2148, 2174, Byz, Lect, it^{a}, syr$^{c, s, p, h}$. See Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967); Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament* (3d ed., London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1971).

37. Nestle-Aland 25th, Westcott-Hort text (1881), P^{75}, ℵ^{c}, B (L αὐτόν), T, Θ, Ψ, f^{1}, 579, 892, 1241, it$^{aur, e}$, vg, syr^{pal}, cop^{bo}, arm, Origen, Cyprian.

38. ℵ^{o}, ι^{1761}, it$^{b, c, f, ff2, I, l, q, r1}$, cop$^{sa, ach}$, eth, geo^{1}, Diatessaron$^{n, t}$, 844^{o}, (it), as.

39. sy^{s}; the entire phrase is omitted by 1071.

40. D, it^{d}, geo^{2}, 2542.

41. Creed, *Luke*, 224.

42. B. Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, 177.

43. Marshall, *Luke*, 679; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 149; Nolland, *Luke*, 876; Hultgren, *Parables*, 119; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 213; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 470; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 96.

44. Hultgren, *Parables*, 119; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1186; Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 103.

45. See Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 470, n. 164.

46. Jeremias, *Parables*, 140; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 148; Scott, *Hear Then a Parable*, 94; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 470; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 96.

collector on a par with swindlers, rogues, and adulterers by means of the contemptuous word, οὗτος ὁ τελώνης,[47] and he enumerates what he does do, that is, fasting and tithing. He fasts twice a week, and he gives tithes of all that he gets. The fasting was prescribed only on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29-34; 23:27-32; Num 29:7), and a day of national repentance (Zech. 7:3, 5; 8:19), though it is not plain to what extent a day of national repentance was kept. The Pharisees regularly fasted on Mondays and Thursdays, twice a week, in conformity with the disciplined piety practice of his group.[48] In addition, fasting was regarded not only as a virtuous and meritorious act for the purpose of penance, mourning, and remorse, but also as preparation for service, communion with God, and the Messiah.[49] On the other hand, tithing was required on agricultural products (Deut. 14:22-27; 24:22-23). According to Mishnah,[50] Scribes used to debate on whether produce of the farm and garden was applied in tithing, some scribes contended that all kinds of produce, namely, mint and dill and cumin, were tithed (Matt 23:23; Luke 11:42). Wider tithing thus appears to have been practiced at Jesus' time, though it is uncertain that whether tithing of all kinds of produce was strictly observed in first-century Judaism. At any rate, here it is important to note that the Pharisee's fasting and tithing went further and beyond the demands of the law.

Concerning the Pharisee's fasting and tithing, there are some distinctive arguments. Friedrichsen feels that his fasting and tithing should be taken as meritorious deeds for the sins of Israel, not as an act of repentance for himself, or for the sake of others who did not tithe or could not, not for the Pharisee's own benefit.[51] In a similar view, Evans holds that the Pharisee in the parable is observing the teaching of the law, showing verbal and thematic congruence between the parable and Deuteronomy 26.[52] Yet they are simply making too

47. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1187; Forbers, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 214; Hultgren, *Parables*, 123; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 109.

48. Did. 8.1; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1187; Nolland, *Luke*, 876; Bock, *Luke*, 1463; Forbers, *The God of Old*, 214; Hultgren, *Parables*, 123; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 110. Cf. Str-B, II, 241-44; IV, 77-114; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ(175 BC-AD 135)*, II (ed., and rev. G. Vermes *et al*.; T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1987), 483-84.

49. Nolland, *Luke*, 876; Hultgren, *Parables*, 126; Green, *Luke*, 647; Farris, "Tale of Two Taxations," 28; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 110.

50. *m. Ma'as*. 1.1-5.8; *m. Šeb*. 9.1.

51. Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 111.

52. See Craig A. Evans, "The Pharisee and the Publican: Luke 18:9-14 and Deuteronomy 26," 342-55; Fred Holmgren, "The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: Luke 18:9-14 and Deuteronomy 26:1-15," *Int* 48 (1994), 252-

much out of too little evidence. On the other hand, some scholars believe that the Pharisee's prayer is typical of the Pharisaical attitude, mentioning Jewish literature as parallels to the prayer, 1QH 15:34, *t. Ber*. 6.18, *b. Ber*. 28b.[53] From this view, they point out that Jesus here is openly reproaching the Pharisaical idea of religious piety.[54] As for this, as opposed to the above contention, there is another proposal offered by Downing and Dorn that view the Pharisee's prayer as a caricature, not as straightforward assessments, thereby bringing a smile at his own overconfidence about his righteous behaviour.[55] However, such views, as have been discussed above, are intensely at issue.[56]

Even though some scholars, in some way, seek to salvage the Pharisee from attempting to be morally superior, viewing his prayer as a pure expression of thanks,[57] it never conceals the fact that he is comparing others according to his standards, and he, in fact, despises those who did not achieve the law's demands, in particular the tax collector here.[58]

On the contrary, the tax collector is praying "standing far off," "not even lifting up his

---

61.

53. "[I give you thanks,] Lord, because you did not make my lot (גורלי) fall in the congregation of deceit, nor have you placed my allotted territory (חוקי) in the council of hypocrites, but you have called me to your kindness (לחסדיכה), to your forgiveness (לסליחותיכה) you have brought me, and in the abundance of your compassion." (1QH 15:34); "R. Judah say, "A man must recite three benedictions every day: 'Blessed be You, Lord, who did not make me a gentile,' 'Blessed be You, Lord, who did not make me uneducated.' 'Blessed be You, Lord, who did not make me a woman.'" (*t. Ber.* 6:18); On his leaving [the Beth ha-Midrash], what does he say? "I give thanks to You, Lord my God, that You set my portion (חלקי) with those who sit in the Beth ha-Midrash and You have not set my portion with those who sit in street corners, for I rise early and they rise early, but I rise early for words of Torah and they rise early for frivolous talk; I labor and they labor, but I labor and receive a reward and they labor and do not receive a reward; I run and they run, but I run to the life of the future world and they run to the pit of destruction." (*b. Ber.* 28b). Florentino García Martínez and Eiberg J.C. Tigchelaar, (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997-98), 1. 181.

54. Marshall, *Luke*, 677-79; Hendriksen, *Luke*, 818-20; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 150-52; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1184-85; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 215. Doran, "The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: An Agonistic Story," 266-68, objects that these parallels are really comparable, since their focus is not on a moral achievement like the Pharisee, but a moral luck or a situation where God has placed them.

55. Doran, "The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: An Agonistic Story," 267, 270; Downing, "The Ambiguity of The Pharisee and the Toll collector (Luke 18:9-14) in the Greco-Roman World of Late Antiquity," 84. Schottroff also makes it clear that the Pharisee's prayer is, in fact, a deliberate caricature, confronting the listening community with the power of sin. See Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 11, 13.

56. See Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 471-72.

57. See Borsch, *Many Things*, 26-27; Scott, *Hear Then the Parables*, 95-96; Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*, 231.

58. Jeremias, *Parables*, 142-43; Creed, *Luke*, 224; Linnemann, *Parables*, 58-60; J.W. Holleran, "The Saint and the Scoundrel," *BibTod* 25 (1987), 375-79; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 643; Nolland, *Luke*, 876-77; Kilgallen, "The Importance of the Redactor in Luke 18:9-14," 69-75; idem, "The Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18:9-14): The Point?," 159; idem, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 152-53; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 216; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 471-72.

eyes to heaven,"[59] "beating his breast,"[60] and "saying, 'God, be merciful to me a sinner.'" He is praying standing at a distance from "the holy place, the Pharisee or others at prayer,"[61] since he perceives himself as sinner within his relationship to God, unlike the Pharisee who was aware of himself in a comparison to others. It is a sign of shame based on awareness of guilt that he did not dare to raise his eyes toward heaven. Moreover, beating his breast which presents one's deepest intentions and is the place of evil intentions is also an expression of extreme anguish or contrition.[62] The tax collector, as opposed to the Pharisee's prayer, implores God for mercy, recognizing that he is a sinner by means of the definite article, τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ, and reflecting his hopeless and feeble condition. The aorist passive imperative, ἱλάσκομαι, in v. 13b normally has either the sense of "propitiate" or that of "expiation," with cultic resonance, as in the language to refer to the purpose of the daily Tamid in Exod 30:16.[63] In the case of LXX,[64] it has too the meaning of being merciful or gracious. It is most likely that the original audience would have expected "Be propitiated to me" with sacrificial overtones rather than "Be merciful to me" in that his prayer took place in the Temple where atonement was made by a sacrifice.[65]

The perfect passive participle δεδικαιωμένος indicates that the tax collector is "in the state of having been justified by God, that is, God has justified him, declared him to be in right relationship with himself."[66] Even though some attempt to search for the Pauline doctrine of justification in v. 14,[67] it fails to make sense enough to espouse it, since in v. 14,

59. Ps. 123:1; Ezra 9:6; 1 Esd. 4:58; *1 Enoch* 13:5; Mk 6:41; 7:34; John 11:41; 17:1; 1Tim 2:8.

60. Cf. Josephus, *Ant*. 7.10.5; Homer, *Iliad* 18:30-31; *Eccl. Rab*. 7.2. Bailey refers that beating one's chest was commonly only performed by women in the Middle East. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 153.

61. Hultgren, *Parables*, 123.

62. Jeremias, *Parables*, 141; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 153; Marshall, *Luke*, 680; Nolland, *Luke*, 877; Green, *Luke*, 649; Scott, *Hear Then a Parable*, 96; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 188; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 217; Hultgren, *Parables*, 124; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 112-13; Kilgrllen, *Twenty Parables of Jesus*, 153-54.

63. Hamm, "The Tamid Service in Luke-Acts: The Cultic Background behind Luke's Theology of Worship (Luke 1:5-25; 18:9-14; 24:50-53; Acts 3:1; 10:3, 30)," 224; Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 154; Marshall, *Luke*, 680; Scott, *Hear Then a Parable*, 96; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 218; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 114.

64. 4 Kgdms 24:4; Lam. 3:42; Dan. 9:19.

65. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 154; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 189; Hultgren, *Parables*, 124; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 472-73; Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 114.

66. Hultgren, *Parables*, 124.

67. F.F. Bruce, "Justification by Faith in the Non-Pauline Writings of the New Testament," *EvQ* 24 (1952), 66-77, here 66-69; Jeremias, *Parables*, 141; Ellis, *Luke*, 214; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1184-85;

there is no explicit reference to the role of faith as in the Pauline epistles. As for παρ᾽ ἐκεῖνον, there is a question as to whether it indicates "rather than," exclusively or "more than" comparatively. Doran claims that if one reads δεδικαιωμένος as "having been pronounced δίκαιος," it is possible to compare who is more upright or who is more observant of their duty toward God.[68] In this context, it is desirable, however, that God justified the Tax collector rather than the Pharisee, that is, God did not justify the Pharisee.[69]

On the other hand, Scott contends that the original audience would not have agreed with Jesus' pronouncement, since there is no sign of true repentance as mention of restitution or restoration of the amount he had deceived others. He argues that the story overthrows the metaphorical structure that views the temple as the kingdom of God, because the audience's expectations of what ought to happen in the temple area are shattered.[70] Although Jesus' pronouncement seemingly seems to be absurd, Jesus in no way is denying the need for compensation or a change of lifestyle,[71] whereas, as far as repentance is concerned, Jesus' attitude is indeed consistent in the sense that there is no condition or prerequisite for God's initial acceptance (Luke 5:18-26; 15:11-32; 19:1-10. Cf. 6:20-21; 7:36-50; 16:19-31).[72] In addition, there is no indictment of the Temple in the parable, nor any negative expression or attitude toward the Temple.

Even though many scholars, as have been pointed out above, are inclined to cast doubt on authenticity of v. 14b, it is convincing that v. 14b came from Jesus from the outset, as a proverb which would have been uttered many times, in many circumstances by Jesus, for v. 14b is fitting not only for the parable, but also for the entire Gospels' teaching which evokes humility before God. The readers, as a matter of fact, cannot obviously learn why the tax collector is justified unless they take v. 14b as original with the parable.[73] The phrase is an exact parallel to 14:11 where "for everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who

---

Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus*, 241.

68. Doran, "The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: An Agonistic Story," 262. See also Linnemann, *Parables*, 62, 144 n. 11; Nolland, *Luke*, 878-79. On the other hand, J.B. Cortés, through text-criticism, proposes that ἢ γάρ ἐκεῖνος, instead of παρ᾽ ἐκεῖνον is a more proper reading, insisting that the phrase can be read exclusively rather than comparatively. Cortés, "The Greek Text of Luke 18:14a: A Contribution to the Method of Reasoned Eclecticism," *CBQ* 46 (1984), 255-273, here 262-63, 269-70.

69. Kilgallen, "The Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18:9-14): The Point?" *ExpTim* 114 (2003), 157-59, here 158.

70. Scott, *Hear Then a Parable*, 95-97.

71. Repentance is typically regarded as a turning away from sinful ways and back toward God.

72. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 219.

73. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 472.

humbles himself will be exalted"[74] also occurs.

10-3. The Interpretation of the Parable

Having rejected the traditional view of the parable that what the tax collector is justified for is his humble and penitent attitude, Harrison claims that justification in Luke has to do with social location, in other words, the tax collector remains justified because he stands in a marginal position of society without mercy from others and recognizes his own need before God, whereas the Pharisee leaves unjustified, since he occupies a central position within society with power, wealth, and status to show mercy to others, but he is not doing it, nor is he perceiving his own need before God. For Harrison, justification in Luke is divided into two different things for two different groups of people. One thing is that "for those with power, wealth, or status, justification involves repentance, or a turning back to God's ways of mercy," and the other thing is that "for those without power, wealth, or status, justification is part of God's mercy being shown to them because humans are not doing it," that is, "for this group, acknowledging or accepting God is enough."[75] It is not correct, however, that for Luke, justification, repentance, and humility mean two different things for two different groups, in connection with social location.

Viewing the parable as one of Luke's example stories, Friedrichsen contends that the parable functions as a defense and plea for Jesus' ministry of preaching and healing in that Jesus' pronouncement in the parable violates the rules related to their religious judgments, like the kingdom, so that the Pharisee's fasting and tithing are connected with the atonement of the tax collector, or the "Pharisee's fasting and tithing might benefit them in their inability to do either."[76] In order to demonstrate this, he even rules out παρ᾽ ἐκεῖνον in v. 14a from the text, regarding it as Luke's redaction in keeping with v. 9.[77] However, if this is the case, the comparative meaning which has been expected from the outset is eliminated from the story. In addition, it is not clear whether the Pharisee had any vicarious purpose and meaning in view in fasting and tithing, although the fasting and tithing which go beyond the law could have a hint as a vicarious act for the sins and obligations of Israel, not for himself in Exod.

74. The saying is also parallel to Matt 23:12 where "and whoever exalts himself shall be humbled; and whoever humbles himself shall be exalted."

75. Harrison, "The Case of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector: Justification and Social Location in Luke's Gospel," 99-111, especially, 99-100, 105, 111.

76. Friedrichsen, "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable," 118.

77. Ibid., 102-103, 116.

30:16.

Doran in the first place strives to prove that Jesus is also within the Jewish tradition that no one is without sin, still more to save the Pharisees from a bias that they are bad characters, so as to bring to light the fact that the parable is a caricature of a Pharisee. He, on the grounds of these, reaches a conclusion that the parable as a caricature of a Pharisee is the critique against overconfidence in one's own behaviour as righteous, in which case the main point of the parable may well fit nicely not only with the message in what follows, but also with the general theme throughout Luke that one should have no trust in self but rely on God's mercy and grace.[78] Still, no reason in the parable is given for a caricature, although Jewish writings have been less enthusiastic about the negative portrait of Pharisaism implied in the parable.

Above all, the parable directly instructs on both the manner and content of prayer which occur in comparison between the Pharisee's and the tax collector's prayer. While the Pharisee depends on self-justification, the tax collector entrusts himself to the mercy and grace of God, with straightforward confession. It should go without saying that in relation to v. 14b, a proud prayer, self-exaltation as a self-contradictory endeavor cannot be justified, whereas self-humility as an essential aspect of a true prayer is justified by God. The tax collector's prayer which casts himself wholly onto God's mercy is also congruent with Jesus' teaching on forgiveness and mercy elsewhere (Matt 5:3-7, 18:21-35; Luke 6:20-21; 7:36-50).

The parable also provides an instruction about justification that there is no justification before God without love of one's neighbour, that is to say, as long as one despises one's neighbour, and that there is justification before God within the humble admission of sins and the plea for forgiveness, with fully relying on God's mercy.[79] The Pauline concept regarding justification which contrasts between Law and grace should not be taken here as that of justification, although, as has been noted above, the Pauline doctrine of justification could have its roots here. The parable has christological implications in that Jesus makes a divine pronouncement with reference to judgment, and what is more, in so doing, the story in fact

78. Doran, "The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: An Agonistic Story," 268-70. With respect to a caricature, Downing, as have briefly been noted above, takes both prayers for caricatures that the hearers avoid both, with the tax collector exposing a lack of confidence in God. In a similar vein, Hedrick views two prayers as negative characters in that the tax collector in particular asks mercy without restoration or restitution. See Downing, "The Ambiguity of 'The Pharisee and the Toll-Collector' (Luke 18:9-14) in the Greco-Roman World of Late Antiquity," 89, 98; Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*, 227-35; Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 11, 13; David A. Neale, *None but the Sinners; Religious Categories in the Gospel of Luke* (JSNTSup, 58; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 167-68.

79. The passive verbs in v. 14 as divine passives indicate God as main body of doing the act ("justified," "humbled," "exalted").

subverts the expectation of the audience and yields the reversal theme along with v. 14b. Besides, Jesus' concern for the marginalized here could be a defense against his actions which associate with sinners and tax collectors.

Part III

The Lukan Parables' Contribution to the Purpose of Luke's Gospel

Having analyzed the main Lukan parables in the travel narrative, I will now seek a unifying motif in them, and examine the role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of Luke's Gospel. Firstly, I will pay further attention to the theological themes of the Lukan parables (chapter 5) and examine the Lukan parables in the travel narrative (chapter 6), inasmuch as it contributes to our primary interest of discovering a unifying motif in the Lukan parables. The theological themes reveal the major concerns of this Evangelist. Moreover, by exploring the travel narrative I also hope to disclose the relationship that the Lukan parables have with the Journey, and the role they play in the central section. From the results of chapters 5 and 6, I will more clearly build a unifying motif of the Lukan parables (chapter 7). Finally, in chapter 8, I will explore the role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of Luke's Gospel by asking the question why Luke incorporated so much parabolic material in his Gospel that the other synoptic writers did not, and therefore discover what they contribute to his overall purpose.

Chapter 5
The Theological Themes of The Lukan Parables

Thus far we have analyzed the major Lukan parables in the travel narrative, and now I will examine theological themes that emerge from the various Lukan parables. Of the various theological themes of the Lukan parables,[1] I have chosen four main theological themes that occur repeatedly in the Lukan parables: The marginalized, wealth and possessions, prayer, and conversion. As I examine them, I hope that the main concern of Luke will, to some extent, be revealed. Furthermore, I will show how these four theological themes correlate with the

1. J.R. Donahue divides the Lukan parables in the travel narrative into five theological themes: (1) The importance of 'doing' (Luke 10:25-37) and 'hearing' (Luke 10:38-42) the word of God as the way of discipleship, and therefore function as Luke's theological program in the travel narrative. (2) Concern for outcasts and those on the margin of society (Luke 14:16-24). (3) A "Gospel within a Gospel," in which Luke underlines the gratuity and unmerited quality of God's favour (Luke 15:1-32). (4) Teaching on the danger of wealth and the proper use of possessions (Luke 12:13-21; 16:1-13; 16:14-31). (5) A strong emphasis on prayer (Luke 11:5-8; 18:1-8; 18:9-14). Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 126-93; idem, "The Parables of Luke," 283-88. In a similar vein, G.W. Forbes groups the Lukan parables into six theological themes: (1) The Poor and the Marginalized (14:15-24; 16:19-31; 18:9-14). (2) Wealth and Possessions (Luke 10:25-37; 12:13-21; 14:15-24; 15:11-24; 16:1-9, 19-31). (3) The Theme of Conflict and Rejection (Luke 13:6-9; 10:25-37; 14:15-24; 15:4-7, 25-32; 16:19-31; 18:9-14). (4) Repentance (Luke 13:6-9; 14:15-24; 15:4-10, 11-24; 16:1-13, 19-31; 18:9-14). (5) Prayer (Luke 11:5-8; 18:1-8). (6) Reversal (Luke 10:25-37; 14:15-24; 15:11-24; 16:27-31; 18:9-14). Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 225-48. R.N. Longenecker suggests eight major topics for the theological themes of the Lukan parables: "(1) Loving and helping others (The good Samaritan, 10:25-37), (2) prayer (The persistent friend, 1:5-13; The persistent widow, 18:1-8), (3) Possessions and true riches (The rich fool, 12:13-34; The rich man and Lazarus, 16:19-31), (4) Service to God (The unproductive fig tree, 13:1-9; A proper attitude in serving God, 17:7-10; The ten minas/pounds, 19:11-27 [cf. Matt 25:14-30]), (5) The importance of the response of God (The great supper, 14:15-24 [cf. Matt 22:1-14]; The rich man and Lazarus, 16:19-31 [see also 3 above]), (6) God's love for the lost (The lost sheep, 15:1-7 [cf. Matt 18:12-14]; The lost coin, 15:8-10; the prodigal son, 15:11-32), (7) Humility (The Pharisee and the tex collector, 18:9-14; And the "parable" in 14:7-14, which is without imagery), and (8) Shrewdness in one's affairs (the shrewd manager, 16:1-12)." See R.N. Longenecker, (ed.), "Taking Up the Cross Daily: Discipleship in Luke-Acts," in *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pushlishing Co, 1996), 50-76, here 66-67. For pedagogical purposes and a more detailed analysis, Longenecker, in a later work that he edits, groups the Lukan parables under the caption, 'Parables of the Christian Life,' which includes particular subjects as follows: Parables on God's Love and Forgiveness (Luke 15:1-32), Parables on Poverty and Riches (Luke 12:13-21; 16:1-13; 16:19-31), Parables on Prayer (Luke 11:5-13; 18:1-14), Strange Neighbours and Risky Care (Matthew 18:21-35; Luke 14:7-14; Luke 10:25-37), and "Everyone Who Hears These Words of Mine": Parables on Discipleship (Luke 6:47-49; Luke 14:28-33; Luke 17:7-10; Matthew 20:1-16). R.N. Longenecker, *The Challenge of Jesus Parables*. In contrast, having mentioned that the categories into which the parables are placed never totally suffice, K. Snodgrass divides the Lukan parables in the travel narrative into five categories: (1) Parables of Lostness (Luke 15:1-32), (2) Parables specifically about Israel (Luke 13:6-9; Luke 14:15-24), (3) Parables about Discipleship (Luke 10:25-37), (4) Parables about Money (Luke 12:16-21; 16:1-13; 16:19-31), and (5) Parables concerning God and Prayer (Luke 11:5-8; 18:1-8; 18:9-14). See Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. All things considered, the four theological themes of the Lukan parables which I take up, are in accordance with the common themes that are considered by these scholars.

major themes of Luke's theology since they are shaped by this theology. Having analysed and interpreted the Lukan parables in the preceding chapter, I will now briefly deal with the four theological themes that occur in the Lukan parables, and then give more space to showing how the four theological themes of the Lukan parables fit into major themes of Luke's theology. I, through this chapter, expect that the theological themes presented will offer a clue in discovering possible unifying motifs.

1. The Marginalized

The Lukan Parables are privy to the marginalized who include sinners, women, Gentiles, children, the sick and the like.

God's concern for the poor is definitively expressed in the Lukan parables, such as the Great Feast (14:15-24) and the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19-31). In the Great Feast, The host finally orders his servants to bring in the poor, the crippled, the blind and the lame in v. 21b, thereby revealing the heart of God towards the marginalized, which includes those normally excluded both by social status and ritual law. God actively seeks out to gather the poor in the Great Feast. This can also be seen in Abraham's reply to the rich man in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, with the reversal of fate in afterlife. It conveys poignantly to the audience not only the importance of taking care of the poor, but also God's concern for them, to the audience. We can therefore say confidently that this is what the good news to the poor means.[2] Furthermore, the following four parables implicitly convey concern for the marginalized: The gentiles in 'The Good Samaritan' (10:25-37), the sinners in 'The Parables of The Lost' (15:1-32), women in 'The Judge and The Widow' (18:1-8), and those despised religiously and socially in 'The Pharisee and The Tax-Collector' (18:9-14). In the light of this observation, it seems plausible to suggest that 'The Marginalized' is one of the major theological themes which occur repeatedly throughout the Lukan parables. In what follows, I will show how this theological theme fits with the major themes of Luke's theology.

One of the most remarkable aspects of Luke's major concerns in the Third Gospel is also that of the poor.[3] Here, I will confine my study of the marginalized only to the theme of the

2. Craig S. de Vos, "The Meaning of 'Good News to the Poor' in Luke's Gospel: The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich-Man as a Test Case," in ed., A.C. Hagedorn, Z.A. Crook and Eric Stewart, *In Other Words* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007), 67-86, here 82, argues that the reversal of their social condition here incorporates the poor who "lacked an effective kinship network to support them" in misfortune and destitution "into a kinship network (with Abraham, Jesus and his followers) that everything else flows from that." No reason is given, however, for the reversal of their social condition as a kinship network in the parable.

3. For this theme, see I.Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian & Theologian* (Devon: The Paternoster Press, 1970);

Joachim Jeremais, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus*, vol. 1 (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1971); T. Hoyt, 'The Poor in Luke-Acts,' (PhD dissertation, Duke University, 1975); L.T. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 39, Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1977); idem, *Sharing Possessions: Mandate and Symbol of Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981); J. Dupont, "The Poor and Poverty in the Gospels and Acts," in *Gospel Poverty: Essays in Biblical Theology* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1977), 25-52; R.J. Karris, "Poor and Rich: The Lukan Sitz im Leben," in ed., C.H. Talbert, *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, 112-25; D.L. Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1980); Walter E. Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1981); David P. Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts* (SNTU, 6; Linz: A. Fuchs, 1982); R.F. O'Toole, *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts*, GNS 9 (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1984), 129-35; Gary T. Meadors, "The "Poor" In The Beatitudes of Matthew and Luke," *Grace Theological Journal* 6.2 (1985), 305-14; L. Schottroff and W. Stegemann, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor* (New York: Orbis Books, 1986); Philip Francis Esler, *Community and gospel in Luke-Acts: The social and political motivation of Lucan theology*, 164-200; J.S. Pobee, *Who Are the Poor? The Beatitudes as a Call to Community*, RBS 32 (Geneva: WCC, 1987); T.E. Schmidt, *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels*, JSNTSS 15(Sheffield: JSOT, 1987), 135-62; Carlos Abesamis, "Good News to the Poor," *Concilium* 198 (1988), 26-27; T. D'Sa, "The Salvation of the Rich in the Gospel of Luke," *Vidyajyoti* 52 (1988), 170-80; M.V. Abraham, "Good News to the Poor in Luke's Gospel," *Bible Bhashyam* 14 (1988), 65-77; Christian L. Mhagama, "God does the Unexpected: Luke 1:38-55," *International Review of Mission* 77 (1988), 208-12, here 210; W. Heard, "Luke's Attitude toward the Rich and the Poor," *TJ* 9 (1988), 47-80; J. L. González, *Faith and Wealth: A History of Early Christian Ideas on the Origin, Significance, and Use of Money* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990), 78-86; Halvor Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts," in ed., Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 257-258; idem, "The Social Context of Luke's Community," *Int* 48 (1994), 379-389; Jane Schaberg, "Luke," in ed., Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe, *The Women's Bible Commentary* (Westminster: John Knox Press, 1992), 257-92; P.H. Davids, "Poverty and Wealth," in ed., J.B. Green and S. McKnight, *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity, 1992), 701-10; Mel Shoemaker, "Good News to the Poor in Luke's Gospel," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 27 (1992), 181-205; J. David Pleins and Thomas D. Hanks, "Poor, Poverty." *ABD*, 5, 403-424; Mary Ann Beavis, "Expecting Nothing in Return: Luke's Picture of the Marginalized," *Int* 48 (1994), 357-68; Michael Prior, *Jesus: The Liberator: Nazareth Liberation Theology (Luke 4:16-30)* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Rosemary Radford Ruether, "The Crisis of Liberation Theology: Does God Opt for the Poor?" in ed., Douglas John Hall & Rosemary Radford Ruether, *God and the Nations* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 93-104; M.L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Samuel Pagán, "Poor and Poverty: Social Distance and Bible Translation," *Semeia* 76 (1996), 69-79; S. John Roth, *The Blind, the Lame and the Poor: Character Types in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); J. Jeyaseelan Kanagaraj, "Good News to the Poor in the New Testament," in ed., Sebastian C.H. Kim and Krickwin C. Marak, *Good News to the Poor: The Challenge to the Church* (ISPCK, 1998), 40; P. Hertig, "The Jubilee Mission of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke: Reversals of Fortunes," *Missiology: An International Review* 26 (1998), 167-79; Patrick J. Hartin, "Poor," in ed., David Noel Freedman, Allen C. Myers and Astrid B. Beck, *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000),1070-71; A.S. Moreau, "Poor, Poverty." in ed., Walter A. Elwell, *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), 932-33; Casey, Shaun, John Crossin, Eric H. Crump, A. Katherine Grieb, Beverly Mitchell, and Ann K. Riggs, *Love for the Poor and the Church's Witness to It*. For the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA (Friendship Press, 2005); Frank, Thielman, *Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 135-49; John T. Squires, "The Gospel according to Luke," in ed., Stephen C. Barton, *The Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 158-81, especially 171-78; Eben Scheffler, "Compassionate action: living according to Luke's gospel," in ed., Jan G. van der Watt, *Identity, Ethics, and Ethos in the New Testament* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2006),77-106; Gert J. Steyn, "Driven by conviction and attitude! Ethics in the Acts of the Apostles," in ed., Jan G. van der Watt, *Identity, Ethics, and Ethos in the New Testament* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2006), 135-63; Richard A. Burridge, *Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007),

poor. In fact, the theme is more prominent in the Gospel of Luke than in Matthew and Mark.[4] Even though it appears that his concern for the poor is reduced in Acts, the theme is virtually continued throughout Acts.[5] The theme begins with the Magnificat, "he has put down the mighty from their thrones, and exalted those of low degree (ταπεινοί); he has filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he has sent empty away." In Mary's canticle, God's mercy to his people is represented in the light of the exalting of the lowly and the hungry, and humbling rulers and the rich. The term ταπεινός not only parallels πτωχός, but also carries the meaning of lowliness, insignificance, weakness, reduction, and poorness.[6] She, in this canticle is also singing that God's covenant with Israel has been kept through Jesus, the one to be born. The theme is also connected with the humble birth of Jesus in a stable (2:7), the visitation of shepherds (2:8-20) and the offering of the poor in the time of purification of Mary, Jesus' mother (2:24). As the ministry of Jesus unfolds, it will become progressively more obvious that the poor is one of Luke's main concerns.

The term πτωχός occurs fundamentally in three main texts in the Gospel of Luke: 4:18, 6:20 and 7:22.[7] Firstly, in Jesus' inaugural sermon at Nazareth (4:18-19), he announces the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy in his ministry: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach *good news to the poor*. He has sent me to proclaim *release to*

260-74; Samantha R. Brewer, "Wealth and Poverty in Luke's Gospel and Acts: A Challenge to the Christian Church," *Encounter: Journal for Pentecostal Ministry* 6 (2009), 1-27.

4. Against the argument that, unlike the Synoptic, the Gospel of John shows no interest in the poor, Motyer contends that John has great concern for the marginalized, particularly in the story of Nathanael (1:47), Nicodemus (3:1, 10), the Samaritan woman (4:6-7) and the Herodian official (4:46), as well as in 13:29 and 12:8. He also tries to confirm that this traditional focus on Christology as a doctrine is not suitable to appreciate the real dynamic of John's Gospel, through the John's deep concern about social reconciliation. Motyer, "Jesus and the Marginalised in the Fourth Gospel," 70-89. Notwithstanding, it is generally recognized that the Gospel of John has little interest in the poor in comparison with Luke's great concern for the poor. For more on this theme, see Frederick Herzog, *Liberation Theology: Liberation in the Light of the Fourth Gospel* (New Yor: Seabury, 1972); José Miranda, *Being and the Messiah: The Message of St. John* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1977); Samuel Rayan, "Jesus and the Poor in the Fourth Gospel," *Biblebhashyam* 4 (1978), 213-28; David Rensberger, *Overcoming the World: Politics and Community in the Gospel of John* (London: SPCK, 1989); Robert J. Karris, *Jesus and the Marginalized in John's Gospel* (Collegeville: Michael Glazier, 1990).

5. On the contrary, Schottroff and Stegemann argue, that in Acts, the absence of destitution is due to Luke's idealized portrayal of the early Christian community. In this regard, they assert that in the Lukan community there are no poor, noting the substitution of the word ἐνδεής (needy) in Acts for the word πτωχός (the poor). L. Schottroff and W. Stegemann, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor*, 111.

6. E. Bammel, "πτωχός," *TDNT*, VI, 902, 905-7, even claims that without regard for the poor in Luke as a whole, "Luke neither thinks from the standpoint of the poor nor really seeks to address them."

7. Apart from the above occasions, the term πτωχός also appears in 14:13, 21, 16:20, 22, 18:22, 19:18, 21:3. See Joel B. Green, "Good News to Whom? Jesus and the "Poor" in the Gospel of Luke," in ed., J. B. Green and M. Turner, *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994), 59-74, here 61.

the captives and recovering of *sight to the blind,* to set at *liberty those who are oppressed* to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." Luke, as Fitzmyer has contended, has deliberately put Jesus' programmatic announcement in the Nazareth synagogue at the beginning of his public ministry to condense the entire ministry of Jesus and the reaction to it.[8] Luke here makes it clear that the main recipients of the Gospel are indeed the poor.[9] The theme is continued in Luke's Beatitudes (6:20-26): "*Blessed are you poor,* for yours is the kingdom of God. *Blessed are you that hunger now,* for you shall be satisfied." The sermon on the Plain is naturally linked to Jesus' programmatic statement in the Nazareth synagogue. In addition, the term πτωχός here has the same meaning as in 4:18.[10] After the Beatitudes, the theme appears again in the response to John the Baptist's question of Jesus' identity (7:22): "Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, *the poor have good news* preached to them." The Lukan Jesus here confirms that Isaiah's prophecy is being fulfilled in his ministry, in particular, on account of the fact that the poor have good news preached to them. Apart from the above cases, 14:12-14 can be added to God's concern to the poor: "He said also to the man who had invited him, 'When you give a dinner or a banquet, do not invite your friends or your brothers or your kinsmen or rich neighbours, lest they also invite you in return, and you be repaid. But when you give a feast, invite *the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind,* and you will be blessed, because they cannot repay you. You will be repaid at the resurrection of the just'" (Lk. 14:12-14). Jesus' encouragement to invite the poor comes as quite a shock in that the admonition of Jesus challenges drastically to modify their conventional social values and behaviour in a Hellenistic context on the base of the value of reciprocity to acquire their honour and standing.[11] At any rate, Jesus broke the social boundaries to ensure that all people and especially the poor, had access to God and received honour from him.[12]

---

8. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 361. See also Beavis, "Expecting Nothing in Return: Luke's Picture of the Marginalized," 357-68, here 359.

9. C.M. Tuckett, *Luke* (NTG; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 96. Shoemaker, "Good News to the Poor in Luke's Gospel," 182, 188, 193, who follows Ernst Bammel, seeks to assert that Luke primarily addresses the rich, including the wise, the influential and those of noble birth, rather than the poor. However, there are, as Esler has pointed out, a lot of evidence to support the fact that Luke indeed addresses the poor, apart from the fact that the Lukan community basically includes the poor. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political motivations of Lucan Theology*, 185.

10. Heard, "Luke's Attitude toward the Rich and the Poor," 47-80, especially 54-55; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 629.

11. See Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political motivations of Lucan Theology*, 194-95; H. Moxnes, "The Social Context of Luke's Community," *Int* 48 (1994), 379-89, here 386-87.

12. Green, *Luke*, 552-54.

From the above observations, we come to confront a fundamental question of the identity of the poor in Luke: Who are the poor? Though it is a very complex issue among scholars, the poor in Luke-Acts can have several meanings: Those who are simply economically poor;[13] those who lack health, freedom, dignity, honour, and social status, as well as the necessities of life;[14] or even the victims of the oppressions and exploitations which arise socially, politically, economically and religiously;[15] and the righteous within Israel who by no means compromised the Torah, but who continuously remained faithful and suffered as a result, in the light of the Old Testament concerning the poor.[16] Apart from the above proposed solutions, there is also an attempt to see "the rich and the poor" as bearing symbolic and metaphorical meaning in the sense that the poor in Luke-Acts are open to the message of Jesus, whereas the rich reject the message.[17] I believe that the reasons why Luke

13. The large majority of those who study the poor in Luke have only the economically destitute in mind. See Pobee, *Who Are the Poor? The Beatitudes as a Call to Community*, 18; Bammel, "πτωχός," *TDNT*, VI, 888-94; Schottroff and Stegemann, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor*, 16; Karris, "Poor and Rich: The Lukan Sitz im Leben," 112-13; Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*, 43; Moreau, "Poor, Poverty." 932; D.S. Amalorpavadass, "The Poor with no Voice and no Power," *Concilium* 146 (1981), 51-52; Prior, *Jesus: The Liberator: Nazareth Liberation Theology*, 164, 172-73; Thielman, *Theology of the New Testament*, 136-37; Scheffler, "Compassionate action: living according to Luke's gospel," 90-91; Burridge, *Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics*, 261.

14. B.J. Malina, "Interpreting the Bible with Anthropology: The Case of the Poor and the Rich," *Listening: Journal of Religion and Culture* 21 (1986), 148-59, especially 156; idem, "Wealth and Poverty in the New Testament and Its World," *Int* 41 (1987), 354-67, here 356, claims that poverty, on the basis of kinship institutions, involves the inadequacy of life without honour, personal inability to participate in the activities of the community, and the inability to sustain self-respect as defined by community social standards. See also Moxnes, "The Social Context of Luke's Community," 386-87; Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values in the Mediterranean World," in ed., Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 25-65; Hanks, "Poor, Poverty." 415; Hartin, "Poor," 1070-71; Green, "Good News to Whom? Jesus and the "Poor" in the Gospel of Luke," 60-65, 69; Pagán, "Poor and Poverty: Social Distance and Bible Translation," 75, feels that one must take into consideration not only the economic reality, but also his or her social status, since the poor refer to those who are unable to maintain their inherited honourable standing in society owing to misfortune or the injustices of other people.

15. Kanagaraj, "Good News to the Poor in the New Testament," 40; Douglas E. Oakman, "The Countryside in Luke-Acts," in ed., Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 151-79, here 164; Ruether, "The Crisis of Liberation Theology: Does God Opt for the Poor?" 94-95, argues that "God opts for the poor, not because the poor are 'good,' much less because poverty is good, but because the poor are victims of injustice and God is a God of justice."

16. Marshall, *Luke*, 84; G. Osborne, "Luke: Theologian of Social Concern," *TJ* 7 (1978), 135-48, here 136; Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*, 35-43; Heard, "Luke's Attitude Toward the Rich and the Poor," 47-58; Meadors, "The "Poor" In The Beatitudes of Matthew and Luke," 314, even goes further into the assertion that the term πτωχός symbolically represents merely religious attitude, not social concern.

17. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 132-71, especially 140; idem, *Sharing Possessions: Mandate and Symbol of Faith*, 13-29, even goes so far as to suggest that possessions function as a cipher for one's attitude to God and Jesus. However, his argument seems absurd and overstated, since Luke indeed has great concern for the economically poor.

preferentially opts for the poor lie both in his christological purposes as Savior, and compassion for the poor who are physically miserable, economically oppressed and exploited in their society. All things considered, it can safely be said that the identity of the poor must be viewed from two sides: Socioeconomic and religious.

In conclusion, the theme of the marginalized, as one of the major theological themes of the Lukan parables, fits with his concern for outcasts and those on the margin of society in Luke's theology which runs through Luke-Acts.

2. Wealth and Possessions

It is all the more obvious that four parables in the Travel Narrative (12:13-21; 14:15-24; 16:1-13, 19-31) are explicitly of wealth and possessions, since these parables are immediately accompanied by teaching on the same theme in their context.[1] Covetousness of possessions (12:13-15) and anxiety about life (12:22-34) surround the parable of the Rich Fool. The parable of the Great Feast is instantly followed by the teaching of Jesus that "when you give a feast, invite *the poor*, the maimed, the lame, the blind" (14:7-14). In the same vein, the parable of the Unjust Steward has the instruction that "you cannot serve God and mammon" (10-13) as its conclusion, whereas the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus has, as its introduction, the lesson about "the Pharisees, who were lovers of money" (14-18). As a result, all these parables serve to stress the theme of wealth and possessions in Luke as a warning of dependence on, and indulgence in, wealth without recognizing God's ownership to possessions,[2] and caring for the poor, and using one's possessions sensibly, wisely and generously. The Good Samaritan (10:25-37) and the Prodigal son (15:11-32) also implicitly carry teaching of the right use of possessions respectively either positively or negatively. On the other hand, in the attitude to wealth and possessions, a nameless ruler (18:18-30) stands in a sharp contrast to Zacchaeus the tax-collector (19:1-10). In this case, a change of attitude to possessions plainly functions as a sign of repentance. Apart from the above parables, if we cast the net wider, we can see more examples of the teaching of possessions in Lukan parables than there is thought to be, since almost every situation in life involves economic resources (7:40-43; 12:57-59; 14:28-30; 18:1-7).[3] However, it is appropriate to not enumerate more examples at this stage. All things considered, it becomes clear that 'Wealth and Possessions' is one of the major theological themes that occur throughout the Lukan parables. In what follows, I will show how this theological theme is in line with the major themes of Luke's theology.

Having seen that the theme of wealth and possessions which is one of the predominant themes in Luke's Gospel is closely connected with what we have examined thus far, the

1. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 229-30.

2. In handling one's own possessions, it may be a starting point to recognize, above all, that all possessions came from God.

3. Nolland, "The Role of Money and Possessions in the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32)," 192-93, rules out the parable of the Prodigal Son from this category of parables about the use of money or possessions in Lukan parables, and allocates only three parables (12:16-21; 14:12-14; 16:19-21), as opposed to Holgate, to the category. See also Holgate, *Prodigality, Liberality and Meanness in the Parable of the Prodigal Son: A Greco-Roman Perspective on Luke 15:11-32*, 69-88.

marginalized, it is natural that here we, as the proper procedure, take up the theme of wealth and possessions. It has been argued that Luke's concern for wealth and possessions is self-evident in the light of the different layers of tradition in Luke.[4] In the first place, compared to Mark's and Matthew's material, Luke's material lays special emphasis on the theme. In Lk 5:11, Peter and his companions respectively left everything, whereas in Mark's parallel, the word for "everything" is absent, and instead they left their nets and their father respectively (Mk 1:20). In the same way, Luke, in the story of the call of Levi, adds to Mark the mention that Levi left everything and followed Jesus (Lk 5:28 cf. Mk 2:17). Similarly, in the story of the rich young ruler, Luke has also added the word "all" to Mark, namely, "sell *all* that you own" (Lk 18:22 cf. Mk 10:21). In the sending out of the twelve, Luke, in contrast to Mark (Mk 6:8), records that the disciples have virtually no possessions at all (Lk 9:3). The prime reason for this seems to be an emphasis on full dependence on God, not on the material possessions. The emphasis on wealth in the Luke's Beatitude, in contrast to Matthew's version (esp. Mt 5:3), is all the stronger because of diametrical contrasts between the poor and the rich, through blessing and woe (Lk 6:20, 24). To sum up, it is tenable to say that such redactional changes point to Luke's concern to accentuate the theme.[5] In addition, we can also ascertain his great concern for wealth and possessions from material unique to Luke's Gospel (1:47-55; 3:10-14; 6:24-26, 34-35, 38; 12:13-21; 14:12-14, 33; 16:1-9, 14; 19-31; 19:1-10).

We can say that Luke's concern for this is virtually consistent throughout Acts in various forms. First of all, the early Christian community is introduced as a model in an attitude to wealth and possessions, in the sense that they held not only everything in common, but used it for the common good (2:43-47; 4:32-35). In Acts 10:2, Cornelius who feared God with all his household, "gave alms liberally to the people." Tabitha in Joppa "was full of good works and acts of charity" (9:36). Paul said that he came to Jerusalem "to bring to my nation alms

4. D.L. Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation in the Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1980), 12-37; Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, 164-69; Schmidt, *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels*, 166-67; G. Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 288; John Gillman, Possessions and the Life of Faith: A Reading of Luke-Acts (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 15; Tuckett, *Luke*, 96-99; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 230.

5. Against the contention that redactional changes in Luke's Gospel generally present Luke's concern to wealth and possessions, Mealand, from a different angle, argues that Luke does not accentuate this theme, but, in contrast to Mark and Matthew who softened the tradition, was simply loyal to tradition. For him this is largely because there is no consistent tendency to grow the severity of Mark and Matthew to the theme. Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation in the Gospels*, 16-20. See also, Schmidt, *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels*, 166-67; Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*, 288.

and offerings" when he defended himself before Felix (24:17, cf. 11:28-30; 12:25). In addition, Paul admonished the elders of the church in Ephesus using a saying of Jesus that "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (20:35). On the one hand, the Ethiopian eunuch (8:25-40) and Cornelius and Lydia (16:14-15) serve as good examples, in that they were not blinded by their wealth and possessions to the all-important message about Jesus. On the other hand, the caution of covetousness appears in the story of Ananias and Sapphira (5:1-11) and the reprimand of Peter that "Your silver perish with you, because you thought you could obtain the gift of God with money!" (8:20). In this way, Luke in Acts, also shows great concern for wealth and possessions, supplying a number of examples of a proper or an improper use of possessions, and attitude toward wealth.

In discussing wealth and possessions in Luke's Gospel, one finds a tension between two calls to renunciation and almsgiving. Even though Lukan scholars strive to explain the reasons for these two different perspectives, there still seems to be no consensus. Some associate total renunciation with only a select few: ecclesiastical leaders and itinerant preachers,[6] the disciples in the Third Gospel (the Twelve),[7] and wandering prophets.[8]

6. H.J. Degenhardt, *Lukas Evangelist der Armen: Besitz und Besitzverzicht in den lukanischen Schriften* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1965), 36-41, 215-22. He claims that Luke seeks to apply Jesus' basic attitude of wealth as a major hindrance to gaining spiritual salvation to members of his community, especially church leaders. In making a sharp distinction between μαθητής and λαός, it seems absurd, however, to see the word μαθητής in Luke's Gospel as a small group, since there are some texts to indicate that the word μαθητής is a bigger group (6:13; 5:30; 19:37), and especially Acts where μαθητής in most contexts (Acts 4:32; 6:2, 7; 9:26; 11:26; 14:21-22) is virtually equivalent to "believer" or "church member."

7. L. Schottroff and W. Stegemann, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor*, 69-77; W.E. Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*, 101. Schottroff and Stegemann basically believe that a demand on a total renunciation of possessions is not merely applicable exclusively to the disciples in Luke's Gospel, but cannot be reiterated in Luke's time, because of a phenomenon of the past. For them a request for a complete renunciation only has the function of criticism toward the rich in Luke's time. Furthermore, they go so far as to argue that there were no destitute in Luke's community as an ideal Christian community on the basis of distinction of almsgiving between insides and outsiders of the Christian community. It is unreasonable, however, for them to assert no destitute persons in Luke's community, as almsgiving is probably applicable to the poor in Luke's community frequently appears in texts of Acts (3:2, 3,10; 9:36; 10:2, 4, 31; 24:17).

8. J. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission* (OBT, 17; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 93-94; K.-J. Kim, *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology* (JSNTSup 155; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 100-110. Koenig holds that, after distinguishing between residential disciples and wandering prophets, a complete renunciation of possessions is demanded solely of wandering prophets, whereas residential disciples are liable to supporting the ministry of the itinerant prophets with hospitality of their possessions as well as participating in the mission of the house churches. On the other hand, accepting Koenig's view that while itinerant disciples are requested to forsake their total possessions and residential disciples are free from the demand, Kim has the master-slave motif in mind rather than that of discipleship in discussing wealth and possessions in Luke. For him, a steward as a slave must confess that all things, including his or her own things, belong to God, and still more must bear the responsibility of the wealth entrusted by God, thereby giving an account of his or her management of that wealth

Others link complete renunciation of all possessions to an extreme situation,[9] or a situation of persecution,[10] or the apostolic era.[11] Apart from the above standpoints, there are attempts to see it as an ideal, stressing the need for radical change[12] and a complete trust in God,[13] or an indicative of the need for total commitment.[14]

On the other hand, the scholar's stance of almsgiving can be divided into some types, according to the following questions: What is the rationale for almsgiving in Luke? Does almsgiving in Luke have the potential to challenge or subvert the social order? In the first place, whether the reason for giving alms lies in an improvement of the conditions of the poor, or the spiritual health and eternal destiny of possessors, almsgiving is one of the main interests in Luke. Justo Gonzalez claims that Jesus' and the disciples' ministry is based on a desire to improve the conditions of the poor, taking an example of the community in Acts where people abandon their own possessions, not for the sake of renunciation, but for the sake of those in need.[15] Pilgrim also argues that the good news to the poor, which is

---

at the eschaton.

9. Karris, "Poor and Rich: The Lukan *Sitz-im-Leben*," in ed., C.H. Talbert, *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, 112-25, here 121-23; Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*, 115-17.

10. W. Schmithals, "Lukas-Evangelist der Armen," *ThViat* 12 (1975), 153-67. Having presumed that Christians were persecuted by the Roman Empire with property confiscation, banishment from their home and family, and facing the death penalty, Schmithals argues that if Christians were faced with a cruel choice between renunciation of their possessions and apostasy, they were strongly urged to renounce their possessions by Luke. On the contrary, Christians who did not face such a choice were demanded to give alms generously to believers under persecution, and renunciation of their possessions. There are, however, still some lingering doubts as to whether there is this kind of persecution in Jesus' time and in Luke's time.

11. T.E. Phillips, *Reading Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001), 286; idem, "Reading Recent Readings of Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke and Acts," *CBR* 1.2 (2003), 231-269, here 251-53. Phillips' point of view concerning wealth and possessions in Luke is based overall on John's admonition toward crowds, tax collectors and soldiers (3:10-14). He takes that for economic norms of the Third Gospel and Acts, and marks the apostolic times off from post-apostolic times, after setting the apostolic conference of Acts 15 as a datum point of division. On these bases, he feels that the reader who lives in post-apostolic times no longer needed to have the strict requests regarding wealth and possessions in view, since the apostolic times that requests for its stringent economic demands is past. From now on, the reader, he claims, should follow Paul who stands in post-apostolic times.

12. B.E. Beck, *Christian Character in the Gospel of Luke* (London: Epworth Press, 1989), 52; W. Heard, "Luke's Attitude toward the Rich and the Poor," *TJ* 9 (1988), 47-80, here 73; P. Liu, "Did the Lucan Jesus Desire Voluntary Poverty of His Followers?," *EvQ* 64(1992), 291-317, here 300-17.

13. Schmidt, *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels*, 161-62, argues that the main problem with wealth in Luke's Gospel is the religious threat that objects to trust in God. This pattern of hostility toward wealth, he holds, is also found in the Hebrew and Jewish traditions as well as in the Synoptic Gospels. For Schmidt, the emphasis of possessions in Luke's Gospel is primarily on dispossession, not concern for the poor, since there is little evidence of sympathy for the poor in the Third Gospel.

14. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 232.

15. J. Gonzalez, *Faith and Wealth: A History of Early Christian Ideas on the Origin, Significance, and Use of Money* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990), 82.

conceived in a social and economic sense, presents physical, social and economic liberation, though he does somewhat touch on the need of the spiritual dimension.[16] Seccombe insists that Luke shows very little concern for the literally poor, as "there is nothing socio-economic or socio-religious about Luke's use of poor" terminology. For him, the poor in Luke is not the destitute at the margins of society, but just Israel which has great need of salvation. The rich must give alms to avoid the great power of material things that binds them to earthly things and prevents them from entering into the kingdom.[17]

With respect to the question as to whether almsgiving in Luke have the potential to challenge or subvert the social order, Douglas Oakman argues that Luke's authorial audience, in effect, has no expection for dramatic social reconstruction, since Luke makes them more aware of a discriminating use of the radical Jesus tradition. For him elites are not asked to abandon their property, nor are they forced to participate in reforming society at large. In this respect, Oakman believes that the audience in Luke would have taken the social system of those days for granted.[18] On the contrary, Moxnes contends that limitless almsgiving, or giving without expecting something in return in Luke, does indeed have potential power to subvert the patronage system in ancient Greco-Roman society. As a consequence, giving without expecting a return of any kind, creates the relationship of families or friends, instead of reciprocity of the patronage system, which worked to sustain the power and privilege of the elite.[19] Green also argues that sharing with someone, without the expectation of return, incorporates them in kinship. Still more, it strikes at the root of the patron-client relationship in antiquity.[20]

Aside from the above, there are scholars who attempt to a symbolic reading, which posits

16. Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor*, 82-84. For the same view, see R. Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1978), 20-24; Geillman, *Possessions and the Life of Faith*, 45-48.

17. Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*, 19, 21-43, 95.

18. D.E. Oakman, "The Countryside in Luke-Act," in ed., Jerome Neyrey, *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, 176-78. See also Phillips, *Reading Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*, 180-81; Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor*, 143-46.

19. H. Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*, 157, 165, idem, "The Social Context of Luke's Community," 386. See Kim, *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology*, 281-83; Gillman, *Possessions and the Life of Faith*, 114.

20. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* (NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 113-17, especially 114; idem, "Wealthy… Who? Me?: Surprising Perspectives on Faith and Wealth from Luke-Acts," *The Living Pulpit* April-June (2003), 18-19, suggests that Luke would have conceived an ideal in his community which consists of egalitarianism and mutuality through an economic sharing. He also notes that Acts 4:32-35 is reminiscent of Deuteronomy 15:4: "there will be no poor among you," as a privilege of God's people of the Exodus.

a symbolic function for possessions. L.T. Johnson feels that Luke's use of the motif of possessions works as a symbolic function to strengthen his literary pattern of the people and the prophet, who consists of Jesus and the apostles. For him a man's attitude towards possessions expresses his interior disposition. In other words, possessions function negatively as a sign of alienation when people reject the prophet, whereas possessions function positively as a sign of conversion when they accept him.[21] From a different angle, D.B. Kraybill and D.M. Sweetland introduce a sociological perspective into their study of possessions in Luke-Acts from V. Turner's conception of "structure" and "anti-structure", so as to understand the symbolic functions of possessions. They hold that in Luke-Acts, while the rich stood within the existing social structures at that time, that is, the old hierarchical social system in opposition to the new community being created by Jesus, the poor stood outside of the existing social structures in expectation of a new community. At this point, the use of possessions comes to symbolize one's relationship to existing social structures.[22]

At this point in time, it is worth dealing with J.L. Resseguie's and J. A. Metzger's work as a recent study on wealth and possessions. Having dealt with the metaphorical meaning of dropsy as overwrought consumerism, Resseguie holds that in 12:13-21 and 16:19-31, Luke addresses the danger of immoderate accumulation and consumption respectively, whereas the story of Zacchaeus and the Rich Ruler, in turn, show "a way out of the peril of plenty and the consuming power of plenty." On the other hand, the parable of the Unjust Steward (in 16:1-8a) and the accompanying sayings (16:8b-13), he argues, carry the ruling power of wealth, namely, "either a person controls wealth or wealth controls the person." He concludes that Luke indeed provides a way to avoid the vicious cycle of plenty and consumption through the Unjust Steward and Zacchaeus. That is, the enslaving power of mammon and hyperconsumerism are broken when the Unjust Steward makes friends as material possessions, and when Zacchaeus divests and gives his wealth to the poor.[23]

Employing principally reader-response criticism, Metzger tries to analyze four parables

---

21. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 144, 148. For him the radical dispossession is not a lifestyle to be imitated, but just a symbol having a literary function. For a good summary on his point of view, see also Donahue, "Two Decades of Research on the Rich and the Poor in Luke-Acts," in ed., D.A. Knight and P.J. Paris, *Justice and the Holy: Essays in Honor of Walter Harrelson* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 129-144, here 137-38; Phillips, "Reading Recent Readings of Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke and Acts," 256-58.

22. D.B. Kraybill and D.M. Sweetland, "Possessions in Luke-Acts: A Sociological Perspective," *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 10 (1983), 215-39, here 232-34.

23. J.L. Resseguie, *Spiritual Landscape: Images of the Spiritual Life in the Gospel of Luke* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004), 101-114.

related to wealth and possessions in Luke (12:13–21; 15:11–32; 16:1–13; 16:19–31), since these four parables share wealthy persons as characters, settings, and a common motif. He adds Jesus' encounters with the anonymous Jewish ruler (18:18-25) and Zacchaeus the tax collector (19:1-10), so as to determine whether these parables provide a consistent perspective which matches with the overall perspective of the travel narrative on wealth and possessions. He views the wealthy landowner, and the father and his two sons as challenging overconsumption, whereas he sees the unjust steward, and the rich man and Lazarus as criticizing wealth as such, not merely overconsumption. While in his encounter with the ruler, Jesus shows that personal wealth has no place in his vision of the kingdom, and in his encounter with Zacchaeus, that he is prepared to enlist those who are rich in order to "assume the initiative in redistributing land and resources and furthering his ministry on behalf of the poor." As a consequence, the latter two parables and two encounters indicate either explicitly or implicitly that "by eliminating wealth, the material source of overconsumption is removed as well," that is, "the demise of mammon releases the land's resources from the firm grip of a few and enables all to find what they need." Metzger comes to conclusion that his reading will appeal to other readers who are concerned about overconsumption in the United States and who wish to enlist the Gospel of Luke "as a conversation partner with the hope that it would prove to be an insightful and challenging interlocutor, perhaps offering a vision for society that is more just and humane." He raises, however, many interpretive problems, not only owing to him stressing ambiguity in the meaning of parables and texts, but also due to him premising inconsistence between Luke's Gospel and the narrative.[24]

From the survey of wealth and possessions in Luke's Gospel and Acts, we can take up some general conclusions: First, it is assumed that Luke's community at least embraced both wealthy and poor members together, but Luke primarily addressed the wealthy rather than the poor. Along this line, Luke indeed cautions the rich about the dangers of material possessions, and urges the rich to use their possessions wisely, such as giving generously alms to those in need. In a sense, Luke's admonition and warning chiefly toward the rich are thought to be inevitable, since the poor are in the condition of enervation which prevents them from doing anything for themselves, but also for others. Second, Luke, as we have seen, nowhere shows contempt toward the rich, nor praises for the poor. Rather, Luke's criticism of the rich, contain a challenge and the possibility of salvation, in that it may give rise to repentance on the part of the rich. At the same time, they are urged to be generous with their material

24. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*, especially 25-61, 169, 180-84.

possessions and give alms to the poor, although they are not required to forsake everything. Luke never made a comment to the effect that poverty as such, as Cynic philosopher's practices, is an ideal, nor did Luke promote poverty as an ascetic ideal.[25] Rather, the poor are indeed fed and filled in a practical manner by Jesus and the early church. Finally, such teaching about wealth and possessions, to some extent, would implicitly have functioned as a harsh criticism and challenge against the social system of reciprocity of the time. Given the fact that at that time wealth was intricately woven with standing, power and social privilege, to share their wealth with someone without any expectation of return would have been a radical challenge to sharing their social privileges with the poor, shaking the roots of the social system.

The conclusion, therefore, is that the theme of wealth and possessions is one of the major theological themes of the Lukan parables, and is in congruence with the theme of wealth and possessions of Luke's theology.

25. For an ascetic view concerning wealth and possessions, see S.R. Garrett, "Beloved Physician of the Soul? Luke as Advocate for Ascetic Practice," in ed., L.E. Vaage and V.L. Wimbush, *Asceticism and the New Testament* (London: Routledge, 1999), 71-96.

3. Prayer

It should go without saying that the three parables (11:5-8; 18:1-8, 9-14) in Luke are what Jesus' teaching on prayer is all about. Jesus in the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8) teaches in effect, the certainty of a prayer response on the basis of the character of God. The parable begins with the petitioner's viewpoint, which includes the boldness of the petitioner in the face of opposition, and ends with the sleeper's standpoint, which is compared to God willingly granting the request. That is, the point of view of the parable shifts naturally to the attitude of prayer toward the character of God. The Judge and the Widow (18:1-8) makes two main points from one of the characters in the story: That is, the certainty of God hearing prayer in comparison with the character of the judge and persistence in prayer from the widow. The two points are tightly interwoven in the application (v. 1 and vv. 6-8). The matter of how we remain faithful until the coming of the Son of the Man depends on persistence in prayer in the certainty of God's hearing prayer, namely, faith in God.[1] Needless to say, persistence in prayer is a sign of faithfulness. The Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14) instructs directly on both the manner and content of prayer which occur in the comparison between the Pharisee's and the tax collector's prayer. While the Pharisee depends on self-justification, the tax collector entrusts himself to the mercy and grace of God, with straightforward confession. Crucial in prayer is the relationship between the attitude of the one praying and the efficacy of the prayer. The humility before God certainly calls forth God's compassion and restoration. God is indeed open and receptive to the sincere prayer of his people. Taking all that into consideration, it becomes clear that 'Prayer' is also one of the major theological themes that occur repeatedly in the Lukan parables in the travel narrative. In what follows, I will show how this theological theme is in accordance with the theme of prayer in Luke's theology.

That Luke has a special interest in prayer can be explained from the following observations: First, unlike the other Gospels, Luke begins with prayer and ends with prayer.[2] On the one hand, Luke at the outset introduces the people and Zechariah at prayer in the temple at the hour of incense (1:10, 13), including three canticles in Luke's Infancy Narrative (1:46-55; 1:68-70; 2:29-32). On the other hand, he brings the Gospel to a close with Jesus'

1. Marshall, "Jesus-Example and Teacher of Prayer in the Synoptic Gospels," in ed., Richard N. Longenecker, *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Edermans Publishing, 2001), 122.

2. Craig G. Bartholomew and Robby Holt, "Prayer in/and the Drama of Redemption in Luke: Prayer and Exegetical Performance," in ed., Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, Anthony C. Thiselton, *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2005), 350-75, here 354.

blessing prayer of the disciples before his ascension (24:51-53). Second, among the synoptic parallels Luke alone mentions prayer (3:21; 6:12; 9:18, 28) or lays special emphasis on prayer (11:1; 19:46).[3] At each of these places that mention of prayer is not absent in the synoptic parallels, Luke virtually makes reference to prayer: "Now when all the people were baptized, and when Jesus also had been baptized and *was praying*, the heaven was opened" (3:21), "In these days he went out to the mountain *to pray*; and all night he continued in prayer to God" (6:12), "Now it happened that as he *was praying* alone the disciples were with him; and he asked them, 'Who do the people say that I am?'" (9:18), and "Now about eight days after these sayings he took with him Peter and John and James, and went up on the mountain *to pray*" (9:28). The other side of the coin is that Luke sets 11:1 in the situation of an answer to the disciples' specific request of prayer, unlike its setting in the diverse themes in Matthew 6:5-15, and that he chooses "*will be* a house of prayer" (19:46) rather than "*will be called* a house of prayer" (Mk. 11:17). As a result, putting special stress on prayer makes it all the more striking. Finally, Luke has three parables related to prayer unique to the Gospel: The Friend at Midnight (11:5-8), the Judge and the Widow (18:1-8), and the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14).

The theme of prayer is also continued in Acts with a special emphasis on practice. In keeping with Jesus' model and teaching on prayer, the early church in Acts actually proceeds to pray as a fundamental part of Christian life (1:14; 2:42). The apostles regularly seem to attend the temple at the hours of prayer (3:1), as well as being more aware of prayer as apostolic priority (6:2-4). Stephen's prayer (7:59-60) is reminiscent of Jesus' prayer on the cross (Lk. 23:34, 46). Fervent prayer enables the prayers to receive the promised Spirit (4:24-31) and be rescued from jail (12:5, 12; 16:25). Besides these, prayer is performed in the commissioning of Matthias as the replacement of Judas (1:24-25), seven deacons (6:6), Saul and Barnabas (13:3), and elders in the churches of South Galatia (14:23). Taken together, Luke's special concern to prayer can be seen throughout Luke-Acts.[4]

The prayer of Jesus in Luke's Gospel can be divided into two categories, such as "Jesus at

3. S. John Roth, "Jesus the Pray-er," *CurTM* 33 (2006), 488-500, especially, 488-89; M.M.B. Turner, "Prayer in the Gospels and Acts," in ed., D. A. Carson, *Teach us to Pray: Prayer in the Bible and the World* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: The Paternoster Press and Baker Book House, 1990), 58-83, here 58-59; Lindell O. Harris, "Prayer in the Gospel of Luke," *SJT* 10 (1967), 59-69, here 59.

4. Marshall, "Jesus–Example and Teacher of Prayer in the Synoptic Gospel," 113-31, especially 115-16, also contends that Luke was not only aware of the significance of prayer, but also emphasized prayer in Jesus' ministry and teaching on the grounds that Luke had his editorial insertions into his Marcan source material (3:21; 6:12; 9:28f.; 22:32, 44; 23:34, 46), and unique material to Luke (1:10; 11:1, 5-8; 18:1-14; 24:30) as well.

prayer" (3:21; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18; 9:28-29; 11:1; 22:32, 39-46; 23:34, 46) and "his teaching on prayer" (11:2-4, 5-8, 9-13; 10:21-24; 18:1-8, 9-14; 21:36). Depending on whether or not the prayer of Jesus gives content to the prayer, his prayer may fall into two groups[5]: prayer passages with its content (3:21; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18; 9:28-29; 11:1), and no content to the prayer (22:32, 39-46; 23:34, 46). Apart from the prayer of Jesus in Luke's Gospel, what is so noteworthy are the Canticles of Luke's infancy narrative (1:46-55; 68-79; 2:29-32) that have largely been neglected as the theme of prayer in Luke-Acts. It is generally recognized that the Canticles of Luke's infancy narrative are traditional hymns adapted by Luke. According to Stephen Farris, the Lucan canticles can be seen as part of Israel's history, since the canticles bear the common features of words and reasons for praise that exist in canonical psalms and the extra-biblical psalmody.[6] To put it more accurately, Mary's *Magnificat* reminds us of Hannah's song of 1 Sam. 2:1-10, Leah's rejoicing of Gen. 29:32, and Ps. 111:9.[7] In the same vein, Zechariah's *Benedictus* seems to be based on Ps 105:8-9, 106:10, 45, and 111:9, on the other breath, Simeon's *Nunc Dimmittis* bears a striking resemblance to Isa. 40:5, 42:6, and 52:10. Furthermore, all Lucan canticles also have certain similarities to *Psalms of Solomon* 10:4, the Dead Sea Scrolls, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and the fifteenth benediction of the *Shemoneh Esreh* in the writings of Second Temples Judaism.[8] Taking all that into consideration, we can say that the hymn comes from a Jewish Christian source. Luke not merely adapts the traditional hymns for the Canticles, but also puts it in the pattern of prophecy and fulfillment as proclamation from prophecy, not proof from prophecy.[9] Luke, in

5. R.J. Karris, *Prayer and the New Testament* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2000), 40-81, sorts prayer of Jesus in Luke's Gospel according to whether prayer passages of Jesus give content to the prayer or not.

6. Stephen C. Farris, "The Canticles of Luke's Infancy Narrative: The Appropriation of a Biblical Tradition," in ed., Richard N. Longenecker, *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Edermans Publishing, 2001), 91-112, especially 103. For more on the Canticles of Luke's Infancy Narrative, see Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976); Stephen C. Farris, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985); Mark Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narratives as Christology in Luke 1-2* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993); Samuel E. Balentine, *Prayer in the Hebrew Bible: The Drama of Divine-Human Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); Karris, *Prayer and the New Testament*, 40-81.

7. This canticle, of course, may remind us of the song of Moses in Exod. 15:1-15, the song of Miriam in Exod. 15:21, the song of Deborah in Judg. 5:1-31 and many others. Cf. Green, *Luke*, 101.

8. Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 358-60, 386-89, and 458; Farris, "The Canticles of Luke's Infancy Narrative: The Appropriation of a Biblical Tradition," 105-108.

9. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*, 55-90, here 57, 88-89, claims that in keeping with Haggadah which bears the exposition of events, Luke his infancy narrative engages

the Canticles, proclaims the fulfillment of God's purpose for his people through Jesus, the promised Messiah.

Mary's Song is composed of personal thanksgiving (1:46-50) and eschatological hope (1:51-55), moving from the personal to the corporate. God has shown mercy to Mary, and will undoubtedly bring his mercy to his faithful people as well. In this canticle, Mary clearly conveys her confidence, faith, and joy in the fulfillment of God's promises to the reader. Zechariah's Song can be divided into two parts: Benediction (1:68-75) that praises the coming of the Davidic ruler bringing deliverance, and Prophecy (1:76-79) that draws out the work of John in relationship to Jesus. The salvation that was promised to Abraham and to the nations comes to pass through the Davidic Messiah who gives light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, and guides our feet into the way of peace. Two images of salvation, namely, the one social and political, and the other spiritual, are interwoven to carry salvation's vivid description. Simeon in his canticle believes it is God's salvation that he has seen Jesus. The emphasis of Simeon's Song is on the universality of the salvation that comes in Jesus, with "the Isaianic vision of the advent of God's consolation and the mission of the Servant in Isaiah 40-66."[10] Jesus' mission, as the narrative unfolds further (2:34-35), will meet opposition. Taken together, all three canticles declare that God is saving his people in and through Jesus, according to his plan and promise.

Even though there is much to say about Jesus' prayer, it is not easy to single out common features from Jesus' prayer and to tie them all together in a unifying theme. However, working towards finding overarching themes common to Jesus' prayer is believed to be conducive to understanding the Lukan theology of prayer. First of all, what Luke suggests as one of the principle themes to Jesus' prayer is that Jesus' prayer-life is a role model for believers. It is a widely accepted truth that Jesus was a man of prayer.[11] For Jesus, prayer is a repeated habit (5:16). He prays at the crucial moment (6:12; 9:18, 29; 22-39-46), as well as at almost any time, place (3:21; 5:16; 6:12; 9:28-29; 22:39; 23:34, 46) and on every occasion, that is, in gratitude (10:21), at meals (9:16; 22:19; 24:30), and in the Ascension (24:50-51). The early Christian community in Acts prays as Jesus prayed, namely, "prayer at the selection and commissioning of leadership (1:24-25; 6:6; 13:3; 14:23), in the face of persecution and

in proclamation from prophecy without showing specific passages grounded in Old Testament texts, rather than proof from prophecy with explicit citation for apology.

10. Green, *Luke*, 144; Bock, *Luke*, 245.

11. For more detail on this contention, especially see Roth, "Jesus the Pray-er," *CurTM*, 493, 498-500; L.O. Harris, "Prayer in the Gospel of Luke," 60, 69; E. Glenn Hinson, "Persistence in Prayer in Luke-Acts," *RevExp* 104 (2007), 721-36, here 725-27.

hardship (4:24-31; 7:59-60; 12:5, 12; 16:25), in moments of missional Innovation (9:10-12; 10:3-4, 9-16; 30-31; 11:5; 22:17-21), and for salvation (8:15; 9:14, 21, 40; 16:25-34; 28:8)."[12] Jesus' prayer is therefore the believer's model.

Secondly, for Luke the main point of Jesus' teaching on prayer lies in the practice of persistence in prayer. Needless to say, there are of course various lessons of Jesus' prayer throughout Luke and Acts, such as praying with assurance, praying with sincereness, praying in humility, praying into harmony with God's will, and the like. Nothing is, however, among all these lessons as important as the practice of persistence in prayer. This key theme is demonstrated not only by Jesus' prayer throughout the Gospel (especially 22:39-46), but also by Lukan parables (11:5-8; 18:1-8). In Acts, the practice of persistence in prayer is highlighted in the early community (1:14; 2:42, 46; 6:4), Peter (9:39-43; 10:9-16) and Paul (13:2-3; 14:23; 16:25; 20:36; 21:5; 28:8). Consequently, the practice of persistence in prayer is a matter of remaining faithful, and at the same time, has to do with convictions and commitments about God.[13]

Third, Jesus' prayer-life and teaching on prayer have Christological significance. Jesus' prayer appears to be a means of God's revelation of the Son. At prayer (10:21-22; 22:42; 23:34, 46), Jesus addresses God as πάτερ, evincing his special relationship of sonship to God. Jesus even teaches the disciples about what they call God father (11:1-13). Jesus in prayer on the mountain, where the event of the transfiguration took place, (9:28-36) exposes his own glory to his disciples, as a voice came out of the cloud, saying, "This is my Son, my Chosen; listen to him!" Moreover, Jesus as the only intercessor, prays for the sake of his followers (10:21-24; 22:31-32).[14] In the stoning of Stephen in Acts (7:59-60), prayer is addressed to

12. J.B. Green, "Persevering Together in Prayer: The Significance of Prayer in the Acts of the Apostles," in ed., Richard N. Longenecker, *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Edermans Publishing, 2001), 183-202, here 189-95. On the other hand, Ludger Feldkämper, *Der betende Jesus als Heilsmittler nach Lukas* (Bonn: Steyler, 1978), 306-32, lists the nine parallels between Luke's Gospel and Acts: "1) Jesus' prayer at baptism (Luke3:21-22) and the church's prayer at its various inaugurations (Acts 1:14; 2:1ff.; 4:31; 8:15; 10-11). 2) Jesus' prayer and his powerful working in word and deed (Luke 5:16; 6:12) and Acts 3:1-4:31. 3) Jesus' prayer before choosing the Twelve (Luke 6:12) and Acts 1:15-26; 6:1-6. 4) Jesus' prayer and his acceptance of suffering (Luke 9:18ff., 28ff.) and Acts 9:11ff. 5) Jesus' cry of jubilation (Luke 10:21-22) and Acts 2:1-13; 10:44-48; 19:1-7. 6) Jesus' prayer and instruction to his disciples on prayer (Luke 11:1-13) and Acts 4:29-31; 5:12. 7) Jesus' prayer for Peter (Luke 22:32) and the church's prayer for him in Acts 12:1-17. 8) Jesus' prayer on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:42) and Acts 21:14. 9) Jesus' prayer on the cross (Luke 23:34, 36) and Stephen's prayer in Acts 7:59-60." As far as the above nine parallels are concerned, I am indebted to R.J. Karris' translation. See Karris, *Prayer and the New Testament*, 76.

13. Green, "Persevering Together in Prayer: The Significance of Prayer in the Acts of the Apostles," 184, 200-201.

14. Besides the above examples, Crump, as evidence for Jesus' intercessory prayer on earth and at heaven,

the Lord Jesus. Jesus' prayer in Luke and Acts has in this way, Christological significance.

Finally, Luke shows that prayer is not only one of the means through which God reveals his will to his people, but also a way by which God guides the course of the history of salvation. Since O.G. Harris' contention that is based thoroughly on Conzelmann's view of redemptive history and Luke's historicizing in the face of a delayed parousia,[15] it has been widely recognized that prayer is a means by which God guides the history of salvation. It should go without saying that as I have pointed out above, there is no place that teaches this so plainly as the canticles: Mary's Magnificat (1:46-55), Zechariah's Benedictus (1: 68-79) and Nunc Dimittis (2:29-32). Furthermore, the following cases cogently bolster the fact that prayer is intimately concerned with decisive and important moments in the progress of the salvation history: the baptism of Jesus (3:21-22), the selection of the Apostles (6:12-16), Peter's confession and the first Jesus' suffering prediction (9:18-22), the event of transfiguration of Jesus (9:28-36), the return of the seventy missionaries (10:21-22), the prayer at the Mount of Olives (22:39-46), the early Christian community' prayer (1:14), Pentecost (2:1-4), at the selection, appointment and commission for leadership (1:24-25; 6:6; 13:3; 14:23), and at the guidance for the missionary work (9:10-12; 10:3-4, 9-16; 30-31; 11:5; 22:17-21). Jesus' disciples and followers, thus, seek to know the purpose and plan of God and to commit themselves to its service in and through prayer.

It is necessary here to refer to the recent controversies surrounding prayer in Luke and Acts. Steven F. Plymale is typical among scholars[16] arguing the fact that prayer is a means by which God guides the history of salvation on the grounds of Conzelmann's view of redemptive history. He contends that "prayer is God's way of guiding and implementing the accomplishment of his will," adding the age of completion as a fourth dimension of

---

enumerates more instances as follows: praying for the disciples in the midst of the transfiguration (9:18-17; 9:28-36), praying for the repentance and conversion of the thief (23:40-42) and the centurion (23:47-48), praying in Jesus' breaking of the bread in Emmaus (24:30-31), and praying for Stephen in Acts (7:55-56). However, it is not convincing because of being based only on his conjecture. See D.M. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts* (WUNT 2/49. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992), 21-34, 42-48, 89-96, 98-108, 178-203.

15. O.G. Harris, 'Prayer in Luke-Acts: A Study in the Theology of Luke,' (PhD dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966), 209, 222, 239. In contrast, Crump partly agrees with Harris' view, but his opinion on a salvation historical purpose in Luke's presentation of prayer is rather different. He claims that "prayer is one of the channels for the realization of God's will among his people, but he is not limited to it," in other words, prayer is a way that God's people are aligning themselves with his plan of salvation, not a means of accomplishing salvation. See Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts*, 126.

16. See Harris, 'Prayer in Luke-Acts: A Study in the Theology of Luke'; P.T. O'Brien, "Prayer in Luke-Acts," *TynBul* 24 (1973), 111-127; Stephen S. Smalley, "Spirit, Kingdom and Prayer in Luke-Acts," *Novum Testament* 15 (1973), 59-71; Turner, "Prayer in the Gospels and Acts," 58-83.

redemptive history.[17] According to him, Jesus indeed taught his followers to pray for the Kingdom to come its fullness (11:1), as well as to escape the tribulations and to stand before the judge, the Son of man (21:36). He is convinced that not only Jesus himself, but also Stephen entered the fourth stage of redemptive history.[18] Even though Plymale seems to explain in success the relationship between prayer and the history of salvation in Luke and Acts, I am disappointed at his selection of texts for studying this theme in part. He uses only eleven specific prayer texts. This theme should be treated with more comprehensive texts, so as to be given a more accurate perspective about prayer in Luke and Acts.

D.M. Crump's aim is to show the Christological significance of Jesus' prayer-life in Luke and Acts. He states that Jesus, who can carry the will of God through his prayers, is the only intercessor and perfectly knows the mind of God, and perfectly prays according to the Father's will. For him, Jesus with the exalted status as heavenly intercessor, prays for his disciples, followers and their mission (9:18-17, 28-36; 10:21-24; 23:34, 46, 40-42; 23:47-48; 24:30-31), as well as continuing to pray for his followers in heaven as heavenly intercessor (22:31-32; Acts 7:55-56). Jesus' prayer as heavenly intercessor enables his followers to perceive his identity and understand his message, arguing that for Luke, prayer is a means with which one can find God's will rather than guiding the course of his redemptive history. If Jesus' followers are not prayed for by Jesus, they are doomed to failure, like Judas. That is, everything is thoroughly rooted in Jesus' intercession. In conclusion, He contends that Luke thus seeks to elucidate why and how Jesus' prayer can be concerned with the church today.[19] I agree in principle, but when it comes to examples of Jesus' intercessory prayer, my view, as I have pointed out in the footnote above, is rather different. It is most unlikely that seven texts are applicable to the case of Jesus' intercessory prayer: praying at the transfiguration (9:18-17; 9:28-36), praying for the repentance and conversion of the thief (23:40-42) and the centurion (23:47-48), praying in Jesus' breaking of the bread in Emmaus (24:30-31), and praying for Stephen in Acts (7:55-56). However, he deserves to receive a favourable evaluation because he goes further in the Christological significance of Jesus' prayer-life in Luke and Acts beyond the role of Jesus in God's revelation, to the role of Jesus as an intercessor at prayer.

R.J. Karris basically has Luke as a narrative theologian of prayer in view. For him Luke

17. Steven F. Plymale, *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts* (AUS, 7.118; New York: Peter Lang, 1991); idem, "Luke's Theology of Prayer," in ed., David J. Lull, *Society of Biblical Literature: 1990 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990), 529-551, here 540.

18. Steven F. Plymale, *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*, 114 and "Luke's Theology of Prayer," 549-550.

19. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts*, 21-34, 42-48, 89-96, 98-108, 178-203, 241.

tells stories and composes prayers out of traditional materials, like Josephus,[20] and tries to show how they are consonant with God's plan. He insists that the canticles, which are traditional hymns adapted by Luke, convey Luke's theology that God's promises to his people are fulfilled in Jesus, the Messiah and Son of God. In the same vein, Karris seeks to demonstrate how Luke composes the prayer in Acts 4:24-30 from traditional materials, and accords it with his theology of the history of salvation in parallel with Josephus's work, *Jewish Antiquities 4:40-51*. He claims that the contentions of Harris and Crump have validity, when the content-less prayer passages of Jesus (3:12; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18; 9:28-29: 11:1) are associated with Lukan theological themes. In other words, Jesus and his followers come to know God's will and plan through prayer. The community of disciples in Acts follows Jesus teaching on prayer (10:21-24; 11:1-13; 18:1-14), and it is demonstrated, as I have mentioned above, in the nine parallels which Feldkämper has detected.[21] He comes to the conclusion that Luke as a narrative theologian of prayer does not force teaching about prayer on us, nor does he recounts prayer in some abstract way, but rather he leads naturally to act according to the examples that have already been shown through the case of Mary, Jesus, the early church, and Paul in prayer.[22] He concentrates on how Luke adapts traditional hymns and prayers in his Gospel and Acts so as to assist his theology rather than on what Luke strives to say about prayer of Jesus and the early community.

Joel B. Green claims that Jesus at prayer experiences and solidifies his relationship with God, calling God Father (10:21-22; 22:41-45; 23:34, 46), and at the same time Jesus not only recognizes and accepts the will of God (22:39-46; 6:12-20; 3:21), but also Jesus is strengthened for his ministry in prayer (3:21; 22:43). In addition, Jesus at prayer reveals his identity and God's purpose within Jesus to others (9:28-29; 23:34, 46; 9:18-20; 24:30-31).[23] Jesus' instruction on prayer, he feels, centers on the faithfulness of God (18:1-8; 11:5-8. cf., 12:30; 12:2-4, 14-21, 32-34) in relationship between Father and his children (11:2, 13; 6:36; 12:30, 32). As a result, for him, Jesus' prayer practice occurs out of "one's innermost beliefs."[24] On the other hand, having demonstrated the continuity of prayer in Acts with

20. Josephus in *Jewish Antiquities 4:40-51* holds that Moses has done all things in accordance with God's will and divine providence, which is a reworking of Numbers 16. The prayer section in *Jewish Antiquities 4:40-51* was composed from traditional materials and was reworked on behalf of his theological and political agenda as well.

21. Karris, *Prayer and the New Testament*, 76.

22. Ibid., 40-81.

23. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 58-60.

24. Green, "Persevering Together in Prayer: The Significance of Prayer in the Acts of the Apostles," 197.

Jesus, he categorizes prayer in the early church into four groups in order to analyze it. Subsequently, he argues that prayer in Acts is also a practice with a belief in Jesus, thereby enabling Jesus' disciples to know the purpose of God and to commit to its service. His conclusion to be drawn here is that "prayer is fundamentally a matter of recognizing to whom one is praying."[25] It turns out that the underlying idea of prayer in Luke and Acts is a practice with belief of God as the faithful Father. His contention is properly oriented toward the significance of a practice in prayer.

The conclusion, therefore, can be briefly stated as follows: The theme of prayer is one of the major theological themes of the Lukan parables, and is in congruence with the theme of prayer of Luke's theology which runs through Luke-Acts.

25. Ibid., 201. Apart from these arguments, for the relationship between prayer in Luke and biblical hermeneutics, see Craig G. Bartholomew and Robby Holt, "Prayer in/and the Drama of Redemption in Luke," 350-75, who insist that prayer is mandatory to the interpretation of Scripture, since prayer in Luke is an indispensable way to seize and live within the drama of redemption. On the other hand, Geir Otto Holmas, "'My house shall be a house of prayer': Regarding the Temple as a Place of Prayer in Acts within the Context of Luke's Apologetical Objective," *JSNT* 27 (2005), 393-416, holds that the narrative presentation of the temple as place of prayer in Acts is a part of the apologetical strategy so as to define the Christian church against Judaism. Luke portrays, he argues, the temple as place of prayer in both the continuity as the place of worship and prayer with the expectation of salvation and the discontinuity as the focal point for Jerusalem's rejection of the Messiah.

4. Conversion

Of the parables that we have examined, eight parables are concerned with conversion, either explicitly or implicitly. Conversion is explicit in the Barren Fig Tree (13:6-9; cf. 13:1-5) where the period of grace is said to be limited. In the parable there are three main points that correspond to each other: The figs that the farmer expects correspond to the fruit as God's people. The cutting down of the tree without fruit according to the commandment of the farmer corresponds to judgment, and finally a potential additional year by suggestion of the vinedresser, corresponds to mercy. The parable is clearly a warning of imminent judgment and a merciful call for the repentance of Israel offered for a short while. All three parables of the Lost in Luke 15:1-32 plainly convey images of conversion. The shepherd and the woman in Luke 15:4-10 seek out the sheep and the coin that has been lost, appear to represent divine initiative. The great joy of salvation which is delineated in finding the lost as one sinner who repents (15:7, 10) is celebrated. The younger son's confession and return in Luke 15:11-24 are sincere acts of repentance, even though there is doubt among scholars as to whether the confession of the younger son is authentic. Given the context of forgiveness and salvation in the father's proclamation in v. 24 and 32, the imagery of the celebration may well convey the messianic banquet. On the whole, the three parables teach that if God rejoices at the return of sinners, how much more should God's people jump with joy over the return of a sinner? The parable of the Rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31) is not designed to offer details or a precise schedule about what happens after death, but rather to provide instructions concerning the use of wealth, the sufficiency of Moses and the prophets, and repentance. In the second part of the parable with μετανοήσουσιν in v. 30, it is to some extent explicit that the theme of repentance here is represented as the proper use of possessions, and concern for the poor, as one aspect of it.[1] We can also view the Great Feast (14:15-24) and the parable of the Unjust Steward (16:1-13) as the parables of conversion which implicitly carry images of conversion, in the sense that they respectively convey the need of human response and for urgent decision in the face of eschatological crisis. The parable of the Unjust Steward plays a role as a positive instance, especially concerning the proper use of unrighteous money in the light of the eschatological perspective. Lastly, in the Pharisee and Tax Collector (18:9-14), it plays a role as models of prayer, repentance, conversion and belief in Jesus, through the contrast between tax collectors and Pharisees. Justification before God is pertinently expressed by a repentant heart of straightforward confession, entrusting himself to the mercy and grace of

1. Stein, *Luke*, 422.

God, not by external piety like the confession of the Pharisee that "I thank thee that I am not like other men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even like this tax collector. I fast twice a week, I give tithes of all that I get (vv. 11-12)." What emerges from this brief discussion is that 'Conversion' is one of the major theological themes which occur repeatedly in the Lukan parables in the travel narrative. In what follows, I will show how this theological theme is in accordance with the theme of conversion of Luke's theology.

At the outset of the discussion of conversion in Luke, it is imperative to tackle repentance versus conversion. That is, "repentance" which would be expected of the Jewish people as already believers in God, and "conversion" which would be expected of Gentiles. However, this distinction is unsustainable from the text of Luke-Acts, particularly in Acts. This is largely because the repentance that leads to life is also given to the Gentiles (Acts 11:18), and a continuous need for conversion is also applicable to the Jews (Acts 14:15; 26:17-18).[2]

In spite of E.P. Sanders' argument that repentance is not a significant theme in the historical Jesus' teaching[3], it has largely been recognized that conversion is not only one of the pivotal themes of Jesus' teaching, but a major theme in Luke as well. It has been confirmed that conversion is a significant theme in Luke's theology through the occurrence of the conversion term more often than in any other synoptic gospels,[4] the intentional editing of

2. Joel B. Green, "Doing Repentance: The Formation of Disciples in the Acts of the Apostles," *Ex auditu* 18 (2002), 1-23, here 6-7; J.H. Wright, "Implications of Conversion in the Old Testament and the New," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 28 (2004), 14-19; Andrew F. Walls, "Converts or Proselytes? The Crisis over Conversion in the Early Church," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 29 (2004), 2-6. In early Christian literature, the emphasis on repentance, in contrast to Luke, describes discussions about Christians who sinned after conversion as penitence with weeping, praying, fasting, confessing one's sins, begging for forgiveness and the like. See *Shepherd of Hemas*, Ignatius (*Phil*. 8.1; *Smyrn*. 9.1), Clement (*1 Clem*. 7.4-7; 57.1; *2 Clem*. 8.1-2; 9.7-9) and the *Didache* (15.3). See also J.N. Bailey, 'Repentance in Luke-Acts,' (PhD dissertation, The University of Notre Dame, 1993), 289.

3. E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 106-113, contradicts the position that repentance is a main theme in the Jesus' teaching on the basis of the meager occurrences of μετάνοια and μετανοέω in Mark and Matthew in comparison with Luke's frequency. For criticisms of Sanders, see D.C. Allison, "Jesus and the Covenant: A Response to E.P. Sanders," *JSNT* 29 (1987), 57-78; B.D. Chilton, "Jesus and the Repentance of E.P. Sanders," *TynBul* 39 (1988), 1-18; N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 246-58.

4. Even though, of course, it needs to consider both conceptional and terminal aspects of repentance, here, statistical analysis of conversion related terms will lead to clear grasp on Luke's interest and emphasis in conversion. In the New Testament μετανοέω occurs 34 times of which 14 are in the Gospel of Luke (9 times) and Acts (5 times) compared to 5 times in Matthew and 2 in Mark, and μετάνοια is used 22 times of which 11 appear in the Gospel of Luke (5 times) and Acts (6 times), compared to 2 times in Matthew and just 1 time in Mark. On the other hand, in the case of επιστρέφω, it is used 36 times in the New Testament of which 18 exist in the Gospel of Luke (7 times) and Acts (11 times) compared to 4 times in Matthew and 4 times in Mark. See J. Navone, *Themes of St. Luke* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1970), 38-46; Ronald D. Witherup, *Conversion in the New Testament* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1994), 18-19; Fernando Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*,18; Gregory E. Sterling, "Turning to God: Conversion

sources regarding conversion texts,[5] distinctive conversion texts unique to Luke,[6] and the interrelation of conversion as a topic with others in the gospel.[7] Even though Luke has a special interest in conversion, his concept of conversion, as will be confirmed below, at no point differs from the idea of conversion in the New Testament outside of Luke-Acts.

It is widely thought that conversion language in the New Testament, μετάνοια, μετανοέω, stems from the Old Testament notion of conversion, שוּב, "to turn, to turn back" which is used in both its literal and figurative senses, although שוּב is translated as ἐπιστρέφω, "to turn, be converted," in the LXX, instead of μετανοέω which translates the Hebrew נחם, "to regret something, to alter one's purpose out of pity."[8] In the New Testament, the basic meaning of μετάνοια for conversion represents a change of mind, a change of direction, or an act of repentance. The term ἐπιστρέφω in the New Testament denotes turning away from sin, evil, or godlessness and turning toward God, Jesus, and a righteous life.[9] According to J.N. Bailey,[10] the term ἐπιστρέφω in the New Testament is used mostly to represent turning from sin to God by Gentiles who converted from idolatry to Christianity, by Christians turning

---

in Greek-Speaking Judaism and Early Christianity," in ed., Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day, *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 69-95, especially 88-89.

5. See David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 144-50.

6. Lk 7:36-50; 13:1-5, 6-9; 15:8-10, 11-32; 16:19-31; 19:1-10; 23:39-43; 24:44-49 and Acts 2:14-40; 3:12-26; 5:27-32; 8:18-24, 26-40; 9:11-18; 10:1-11:18; 13:24; 16:11-15, 16-34; 19:1-7; 20:21; 22:1-16; 26:1-23.

7. By connecting conversion with other themes, especially forgiveness and reconciliation, salvation, the mercy of God, and joy, Luke expands the understanding of conversion. Moreover some scholars try to show how conversion in Luke-Acts contributes to Lukan theology. See Guy D. Nave, The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts (AcadBib 4; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 29-38. He argues that repentance in Luke-Acts is part of the plan of God within the inclusio formed by the theme "fruits worthy of repentance" (Luke 3:8 and Acts 26:20). Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*, 139-44, believes that repentance in Luke is inextricably linked to the Jewish covenant, that is, repentance is the process of restoring sinners into relationship with God.

8. There are some scholars who raise a question on the grounds that μετανοέω is not the equivalent of שוּב, since שוּב is always translated as επιστρέφω in the LXX. In recent years, James G. Crossley suggests, however, a possible solution that the Gospel writers with a standpoint of the inclusion of gentiles in the Christian community would have discarded επιστρέφω which was consistently used to describe Jews re-turning to God, and instead taken μετανοέω without such a meaning, so as to avoid an exclusive reference to Jews re-turning to God in particular in the messages of John the Baptist and Jesus. James G. Crossley, "The Semitic Background to Repentance in the Teaching of John the Baptist and Jesus," *JSHJ* 2.2 (2004), 138-57. J. Behm, 'μετανοέω, μετάνοια', *TDNT*, IV, 989-1022, here 990, also views μετανοέω as the equivalent of ἐπιστρέφομαι which has the same sense of שוּב, "to turn," "to convert." For an opposing argument, see also A. Boyd-Luter, "Repentance, New Testament," *ABD*, V, 672-74, here 673; Guy D. Nave, The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts, 119-20.

9. Witherup, *Conversion in the New Testament*, 18-21.

10. J.N. Bailey, 'Repentance in Luke-Acts,' 288-89.

from sin, and by Jews returning to God. The terms μετάνοια and μετανοέω in the New Testament are used chiefly to express acknowledgment of sin and wrongdoing, and resolve to change, especially concerning specific sins, either by Christians, non-Christian Jews, or non-Christian Gentiles. As a consequence, conversion in the New Testament is both a change in thinking and behaviour which entail a change in thinking with regard to the life and ministry of Jesus. Conversion in the New Testament also denotes the very appropriate human response to sin and wrongdoing. It is reorientation of life as a fundamental change of one's life.[11]

The Old Testament understanding of conversion can be said to be as follows: 1) The fundamental meaning of conversion is "turning away from evil" and "turning to God" in line with renewal of the covenantal relationship between God and the people of God. That is attendant on the radical rejection of other gods and exclusive commitment to God. 2) The message of conversion is chiefly directed to the people of God, not to others.[12] That is to say, conversion in the Old Testament, as opposed to the New Testament, is not a missionary activity of getting converts to a religion. This is not to say that making proselytes is not important to Judaism. 3) Conversion demands inclusion in the worshipping community by the covenant ritual of circumcision. 4) Conversion is not a singular event, but an ongoing process of realignment to God. 5) Conversion has symbolic acts or the rites of repentance, such as the confession and penitential prayer for forgiveness, fasting, sackcloth and ashes, water rituals and concrete changes in ethical behaviour.[13] To sum up, with respect to the New Testament concept of conversion, one of the most important influences is very much the Old Testament. In other words, the concept of conversion in the Old Testament continues to flow through and develops in the New Testament.

In Jewish sources,[14] such as the Wisdom of Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Prayer of Manasseh, Joseph and Aseneth, the writings from Qumran, Flavius Josephus and Philo of Alexandria, the terms μετάνοια, μετανοέω, are generally used to express the change of mind

11. Nave, The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts, 120-36.
12. Christopher J.H. Wright, "Implications of Conversion in the Old Testament and the New," 14.
13. Tobias Hägerland, "Jesus and the Rites of Repentance," *NTS* 52 (2006), 166-187; Witherup, *Conversion in the New Testament*, 17-18, enumerates ten major ways as the main ideas of the OT understanding of conversion. See also J.N. Bailey, 'Repentance in Luke-Acts,' 28-121.
14. See J.N. Bailey, 'Repentance in Luke-Acts,' 29-51; Nave, The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts, 70-118: Fernando Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*, 23-55; Andrea Lieber, I set a Table before You: The Jewish Eschatological Character of Aseneth's Conversion Meal," *JSP* 14.1 (2004), 63-77; James G. Crossley, "The Semitic Background to Repentance in the Teaching of John the Baptist and Jesus," 138-157, here 145-154; Sterling, "Turning to God: Conversion in Greek-Speaking Judaism and Early Christianity," 74-88.

and behaviour required of people to obtain forgiveness and be saved from sin. That is to say, they are largely used for a change of life or religious reorientation. Bailey contends that by using μετανοέω to denote the term, שוב, early Jewish authors, as opposed to later Jewish authors, put more emphasis on the aspects of remorse, regret and compassion, so as to stress what repentance entails or how it is manifested.[15] His sharp delineation between an intellectual change of mind and an emotional sense of remorse, however, raises a nagging problem regarding the cognitive science of conversion. Taken together, it seems right to say that the New Testament idea of conversion relies on Jewish background for the basic idea of conversion. In Hellenistic Philosophy in the Greco-Roman Milieu,[16] such as the Stoics and the Cynics, the terms express the notion of a change in thinking with a sense of regret and remorse. A change in thinking, μετάνοια and μετανοέω, is also appropriate for "sins" committed intentionally and out of ignorance. It is also the expected response to sins committed against human beings and divine beings. To put it another way, it denotes both moral and religious transformation. Genuine repentance has to be manifested by a demonstrable change of behaviour. In the light of this evidence, it is not convincing that there is little or no affinity between the usage of μετάνοια and μετανοέω in Greek thought and its usage in Christian thought.[17] It seems safe to say, therefore, that the New Testament concept of conversion has much in common with the idea of conversion as it occurs in Hellenistic Philosophy in the Greco-Roman Milieu.

In what follows, the texts about conversion in Luke-Acts will be examined to elicit the characteristics of Luke's idea of conversion. An exploration of the understanding of Luke regarding conversion must involve not only the texts including words of conversion, but also the texts with imagery of conversion.[18] Luke begins with his conversion in the infancy narrative. "For he will be great before the Lord, and he shall drink no wine, nor strong drink, and he will be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb. And he will *turn* many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God, and he will go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to *turn* the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the

15. Bailey, 'Repentance in Luke-Acts,' 48-60, 117-118, argues that Greek literature use the terms, μετάνοια and μετανοέω, to represent both an intellectual change of mind as well as an emotional change of regret.

16. See also Bailey, 'Repentance in Luke-Acts,' 76-121; Nave, The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts, 40-70: Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*, 56-70; Lieber, I set a Table before You: The Jewish Eschatological Character of Aseneth's Conversion Meal," *JSP* 14.1 (2004), 63-77; Crossley, "The Semitic Background to Repentance in the Teaching of John the Baptist and Jesus," 145-154; Sterling, "Turning to God: Conversion in Greek-Speaking Judaism and Early Christianity," 71-74.

17. Nave, *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts*, 69-70.

18. Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 96.

wisdom of the just, to make ready for the Lord a people prepared." (1:15-17). "And you, child, will be called the prophet of the Most High; for you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways to give knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of their sins," (1: 76-77). John's ministry is to turn not only Israelites to God, but also people to one another. The connection of conversion with forgiveness of sin is tangible in John's preaching of a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins (3:3, 8). For John, authentic conversion is required for a proper lifestyle as being visible. The emphasis on conversion found in the John's ministry also appears in the ministry and teaching of Jesus (Lk. 5:27-32; 7:36-50; 10:13-15; 13:1-5, 6-9; 15:1-32; 16:19-31; 17:3-4; 19:1-10; 23:39-43; 24:44-49). In Luke 5:27-32, Jesus asserts at Levi's house, where the Pharisees are murmuring against Jesus' ministry to tax collectors and sinners, that the aim of his ministry is conversion. "And Jesus answered them, 'Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance'" (5:31-32). The forgiveness of the sinful woman in Luke 7:36-50 makes it so convincing that Jesus is a forgiver of sins, teaching about forgiveness and faith. That it is a story of conversion is confirmed very well by H.D. Buckwalter.[19] The woman's actions could be considered as gratitude of sins forgiven as well as signs of reverence for Jesus as the woman's redeemer.[20] The woes in Luke 10:13-15 are pronounced on the Galilean towns. "If the mighty works done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon (as notorious Gentile cities), they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes." The text gives the instruction that if Gentile cities would do this how much more should Jews repent of their sins. The demand of forgiving the penitent up to seven times a day in Luke 17:3-4 shows that conversion in Luke might be repeated and not be a single event, at least in the case of a fellow human being.[21] It is striking that it does not refer to restitution which the penitent makes. In Luke 19:1-10, Zacchaeus, who is welcomed by Jesus as Savior and accepted in his company, acknowledges his wrongdoing. Still more he

19. H. Douglas Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology* (SNTSMS 89; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 151.

20. The vexing problem of the story of the sinful woman is the question, when was the woman of this story forgiven? That is to say, the core of argument lies on whether she was forgiven after her actions, considered to be acts of repentance, or before her actions, understood to be expressions of love or thanksgiving for forgiveness granted. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 686-87; John J. Kilgallen, "Forgiveness of sins (Luke 7:36-50)," *NovT* 49 (2007), 105-116.

21. In Rabbinic teaching, it remains hard to atone for sins committed against a fellow Israelite. This is largely because restitution is not always possible in the case of a fellow human being. See Sir. 27.30-28.5; Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1977), 179 and n. 161; Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*, 148.

gives a promise to do fourfold restitution of monies attained through deception in the past, and gives half of his possessions to the poor. Here, Zacchaeus' attitude towards possessions and to the poor is positively understood as his repentance. In contrast to the one criminal who derides Jesus, the other criminal on the cross acknowledges his own sin and claims Jesus' innocence. Such an attitude is seen as a confession of his sin and a manifestation of repentance. Here Jesus' words of assurance to the repentant criminal denote his salvific authority as Messiah. "And he said to him, Truly, I say to you, today you will be with me in Paradise" (Lk. 23:43). In Jesus' commission of the apostles, the word that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem, reminds them of the importance of repentance and forgiveness of sins. Moreover, the word in Luke 24:48, in contrast with the command in Mt. 28:18-20, contains the extension of the offer of repentance to the Gentiles.

In Acts, Luke, as is foreknown in Luke 24:44-49, concentrates all the more his attention on this motif of conversion (Acts. 2:14-40; 3:12-26; 5:27-32; 8:18-24, 26-40; 9:11-18; 10:1-11:18; 13:24; 16:11-15, 16-34; 19:1-7; 20:21; 22:1-16; 26:1-23). The conversion in Acts is divided into two categories: 1) Conversion in speeches: Peter's speech at Pentecost (2:14-40), Peter's speech to the people in the portico called Solomon's (3:12-26), the speech of Peter and the apostles before the High Priest and the Sanhedrin (5:27-32), Paul's speech in Antioch of Pisidia (13:24), Paul's speech to some disciples in Ephesus who were baptized only with John' baptism of repentance (19:1-7), Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders in Mileto (20:21), Paul's speech to the crowd in Jerusalem (22:1-16), Paul's speech before Agrippa (26:1-23). 2) The story of conversion: The Simon Magus (8:18-24), the Ethiopian eunuch (8:26-40), Paul (9:11-18), Cornelius and Peter (10:1-11:18), Lydia (16:11-15), the jailer in Philippi (16:16-34). The call to repent in Acts is the focus of the apostles' preaching from the outset. Most importantly, the call to repent through Peter's speech is followed by an account of mass conversion of the Jews (2:14-40, 3:12-26), thereby establishing the early church. Here, both aspects of conversion appear together, turning from sin and turning to God (μετανοήσατε and ἐπιστρέψατε). According to the speech, promise of the blessing of all nations to Abraham and Moses' promise of a future prophet, are fulfilled in Jesus as Messiah who is sent by God. In what sense, the themes of conversion in this speech are intimately linked with the restoration of Israel, which means that conversion is given to Israel as the

collective people of God after the exaltation of Jesus.[22] The sermon of Peter and the apostles before the High Priest and the Sanhedrin in Acts 5:27-32 puts its emphasis on the exaltation of Jesus by God. "God exalted him at his right hand as Leader and Savior, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins" (Acts 5:31). Conversion in this speech, as in the aforementioned preaching, is rightly associated with Jesus' exaltation as well. In order to be forgiven, it is imperative that the Simon Magus repents of his wickedness concerning the intent of his heart that he will offer money for the gift of the Spirit. "Repent therefore of this wickedness of yours, and pray to the Lord that, if possible, the intent of your heart may be forgiven you" (Acts 8:22). However, there is at no time a reference to conversion with relevance to Simon Magus' indulgence in magic or divination. The story of the Ethiopian eunuch' conversion in Acts 8:26-40 is the first occurrence of Gentile converts beyond the boundaries of the Jewish religious communities, even though Luke designates the Cornelius narrative in Acts 10 as the first Gentile convert. In the narrative flow throughout Acts, the Ethiopian eunuch is not so much the ideal or typical convert as a symbolic convert who, as in Acts 1:8, goes across the limits of Luke's geographical world and beyond Luke's religious community.[23] Along the same lines of the story of the Ethiopian eunuch's conversion, the story of Cornelius and Peter in Act 10:1-11:18 can be interpreted. The vision of Peter is intimately coupled with that of Cornelius, thereby changing his thinking of the conversion and inclusion of Gentiles. "And Peter opened his mouth and said: Truly I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation any one who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him" (Acts 10:34-35). The promised word of Acts 1:8 that the gospel will reach the end of the earth is now being fulfilled in this conversion story. In the same vein, two stories of conversion, Lydia (16:11-15) and the jailer in Philippi (16:16-34) can also be considered as the fulfillment of Acts 1:8, in which case conversion seems to be a proper response to the Gospel proclaimed by apostles. The stories of Paul's conversion (Acts 9:11-18; 22:1-16; 26:1-23) is more rightly understood in the aspects of conflicts between Judaism and Christianity than in that of the fulfillment of Acts 1:8. Each version of Paul's conversion story not only contains an instruction about his mission as apostle to Gentiles (Acts 9:15-16; 22:14-15; 26:16-18), but also two versions of that lie in polemical conditions for the Gospel before

22. David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 2:130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 138-40; Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*, 152.

23. Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*, 98-107, especially 106, contends that there is nothing to buttress the idea that the Ethiopian eunuch, according to F.F. Bruce, must have followed the conversion pattern established at Pentecost as a typical conversion. See F.F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952), 194.

the crowd in Jerusalem and Agrippa. Acts 26:1-23 denotes most apparently the purpose of Paul's conversion, that he is sent by God to open Gentiles' eyes, to turn the Gentiles *from darkness to light* and *from the power of Satan to God*, so that they may obtain *forgiveness of sins*. This drastic transformation in Paul's life is also an experience of salvation along with the calling which is apparent in Paul.[24] Against the contention that Paul was not converted

24. J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1959), 24-35, claims that the experience of Paul on the Damascus road should be understood as the story of a call, because common factors with the experience of Paul on the Damascus road are also found in Gal. 1:15 where Paul explains his own call in the light of the prophetic call in Old Testament (Isa. 49:1-6; Jer. 1:4-5). K. Stendahl argues a different view that Paul's experience on the road is not a conversion from the works of righteousness of Judaism, but a call to be the apostle to the Gentiles. That is why understating Paul's experience on the road as inner experience of conversion is the Western understanding of Paul, which is compelled by the reading of Augustine, Luther and Calvin. According to him, Paul comes to a new understanding of the Law through his Damascus Road experience. K. Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (London; SCM Press, 1977), 7-23, especially 11-12. But it is untenable that conversion, as Stendahl has stated, is a change of religion, namely, "Here is not that change of religion that we commonly associate with the word conversion." In the New Testament, even though there are Gentile converts, the emphasis never rests on changing religions, but rather on turning to God or finding who Jesus is. For more on contradiction to Stendahl's argument, see Richard V. Peace, *Conversion in the New Testament: Paul and the Twelve* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing, 1999), 27-29; J.M. Events, "Conversion and Call of Paul," in ed., Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin and Daniel G. Reid, *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 156-63. On the other hand, seeing the experience of Paul on the Damascus road as conversion, S. Kim holds that Paul's conversion on the road offers the source for both his apostolic call and his theological understanding of the Gospel. In other words, Paul indeed received his gospel as part of his conversion experience and all of his theology is resulted directly from that experience. Along the same line, A.F. Segal also tried to link Paul's conversion experience to his theology, because Paul's understanding of the Law is derived from his conversion experience. He goes further by arguing that Paul's conversion experience also plays a crucial role in his understanding of the Christian community. See S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); A.F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University, 1990). Since the experience of Paul on the Damascus road occurs in contexts of the stories of conversion and that of a polemic, it is taken to be both conversion and call. Acts 9:11-18 seems to have more emphasis of conversion in connection with chapter 8-10 surrounded with the stories of conversion of the Ethiopian and Cornelius. In contrast to Acts 9:11-18, Acts 22:1-16 and 26:1-23 lie in polemical situations in which he must advocate himself as the apostle to the Gentiles before the crowd in Jerusalem and Agrippa. For the above contention, see Charles W. Hedrick, "Paul's Conversion/Call: A Comparative Analysis of The Three Reports in Acts," *JBL* 100 (1981), 415-32; Events, "Conversion and Call of Paul," 156-63; Robert G. Hoerber, "Paul's Conversion/Call," *Concordia Journal* (1996), 186-88; W. Rordorf, "Paul's Conversion in the Canonical Acts and in the Acts of Paul," *Semeia* 80 (1997), 137-144; Peace, *Conversion in the New Testament: Paul and the Twelve*, 17-101; Philip H. Kern, "Paul's Conversion and Luke's Portrayal of Character in Acts 8-10," *TynBul* 54 (2003), 63-80; J. Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition* (London; New York: T & T Clark International, 2006), 165. Analyzing Paul's conversion in Acts 9, 22 and 26, Gaventa, summarizes it in three main points: 1) Paul's conversion has divine initiative. 2) Conversion itself is not an end, but rather a means for the growth of the gospel. 3) Paul's conversion is not an individualistic conversion, but an individual conversion, since Paul's conversion is always concerned with his calling to witness the gospel. Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*, 52-95. On the other hand, Peace, *Conversion in the New Testament: Paul and the Twelve*, 17-101, enumerates three aspects as the core pattern of Paul's conversion. That is to say, first, there is insight that Paul is aware of the truth about what his true state really is before God, and who Jesus really is. Second, there are the turning from persecuting the church to joining the church, and a

since he did not change religious affiliation, irrespective of the traditional view,[25] the fact that he was converted must be argued in that Paul's assessment of Jesus involves a redefining of the nature of God himself, and demands a new hermeneutic which reconstructs his theology by Scripture, the Law and the way to live for God. What is more, elsewhere he views his conversion as an event of new creation outside of the power of the self.[26] All things considered, it is legitimate to see the experience of Paul on the Damascus road as both conversion and calling.

Now that we have examined the texts of conversion in Luke-Acts, what follows are some elements in common from the conversion texts of Luke-Acts. First of all, conversion for Luke is turning to God, discovering who Jesus is, and turning from sin, which entail a transformation in thinking and behaviour.[27] That is to say, conversion is a reorientation or a transformation of conceptual system by which life is reshaped. For Luke, there is not a stark distinction between change of thoughts and actions, between cognitive and moral change, between external and internal transformation, and between personal and community

---

turning from opposing Jesus to following Jesus. Third, there is the transformation from a zealous Pharisee into a zealous apostle in preaching the good news about Jesus. For him repentance is when a person sees one's true state before God. At any rate, Paul's conversion in three spheres comes to bring new insight into God as an encounter with himself, new turning toward God as an encounter with Jesus, and a new life as an encounter with his culture.

25. In the traditional view, Paul's experience is regarded as inner experience that the harder a person tried, the more he fell short under the threatening demands of the law. On the other hand, W. James expresses psychologically very well conversion in this traditional view. Conversion is the process of strongly personal or individual change by which a person who struggles with a sense of guilt and inferiority become a person with a conscious sense of being right and unified as a consequence of achieving a firmer hold on religious realities. See W. James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: Collier MacMillan, 1961). 172, 189; Walter E. Conn, "Conversion: A Developmental Perspective," *Cross Currents* 32 (1982), 323-28; Lewis R. Rambo, "Current Research on Religious Conversion," *Religious Studies Review* 8 (1982), 146-59; Brock Kilbourne and James T. Richardson, "Paradigm Conflict, Types of Conversion, and Conversion Theories," *Sociological Analysis* 50 (1989), 1-21. More recently, the stage model which integrates the perspectives of anthropology, psychology, sociology, and religious studies is offered by Rambo as follows: Context: The Ecology of the Conversion Process, Crisis: Catalyst for Change, Quest: Active Search, Encounter: Advocate and Potential Convert in Contact, Interaction: The Matrix of Change, Commitment: Consummation and Consolidation of Transformation and Consequences: Effects of Converting Processes. Lewis R. Rambo, *Understanding Religious Conversion* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), 165-70.

26. E. Käsemann, *Perspectives on Paul* (London: SCM Press, 1971), 8-9; S. Chester, *Conversion at Corinth* (London: T & T Clark, 2003), 79; M.D. Scott, 'Conversion in Luke and Paul: Some Exegetical and Theological Explorations' (PhD dissertation, Durham University, 2010), 200-201, 226-228.

27. Witherup claims that conversion as the underlying idea always contains a turning, whether a turning *from* something or someone or *to* something or someone, whereas conversion for W.R. Nicholas results in salvific repentance in that conversion involves a change of thinking about someone (i.e., oneself, God, or Jesus Christ) or something (i.e., idols) in order to be saved from eternal judgment. See Witherup, *Conversion in the New Testament*, 21; Wilkin Robert Nicholas, 'Repentance as a condition for Salvation in the New Testament,' (ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1985), 36-94, especially 93-94.

formation.[28] Secondly, conversion involves accepting the community of faith as the authentic people of God, with baptism as an expression of initiation and a ritual of conversion. Most recent studies of conversion, Social-Scientific Approaches, bring these features of conversion to light. That is to say, conversion is a change of community, transferring from one community to another to socialize to a new group, and a reinterpretation of one's past life from the perspective of one's new community.[29] Thirdly, conversion for Luke is both a gift of God by divine initiative and a proper response of the human being.[30] The gracious divine initiative is an essential feature in Luke's conversion stories. Or to put it another way, the first and initiating act of conversion is always God's.[31] At the same time, it is a proper response which is expected to occur in sinners when God calls them to conversion through Jesus and his message. Fourthly, with an allusion to the universality of sin, conversion is required of everyone, and an opportunity to repent is given to everyone regardless of diverse ethnic and social backgrounds, such as, tax collectors, soldiers, harlots, sinners, Samaritans, eunuchs, the Jews, Gentiles, all nations.[32] Fifthly, conversion for Luke is not only an event, but also a process. Conversion is ongoing transformation in order to fully embrace and indwell this new life of the community of the converted.[33] Sixthly, conversion for the Gentiles is the same as conversion for the Jews. Even though some scholars[34] insist on a strict distinction between

28. Joel. B. Green, "Conversion in Luke-Acts: The Potential of a Cognitive Approach," in Consultation on the Use of Cognitive Linguistics in Biblical Interpretation, *Conversion in Luke-Acts* (*SBL*). *wpd* (2006), 1-28, here 20, 26, 28.

29. P. Berger and T. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 144-50; Green, "Conversion in Luke-Acts: The Potential of a Cognitive Approach," 15.

30. Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 61-84, here75; Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*, 125; Bailey, 'Repentance in Luke-Acts,' 285; Witherup, *Conversion in the New Testament*, 72; Nave, *Repentance in Luke-Acts*, 38; Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*, 217-18; Green, "Conversion in Luke-Acts: The Potential of a Cognitive Approach," 20.

31. Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*, 217-18.

32. Nave, *Repentance in Luke-Acts*, 221, 224; Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*, 219.

33. Green, "Doing Repentance: The Formation of Disciples in the Acts of the Apostles," 2, 7; Witherup, *Conversion in the New Testament*, 72-73; Patricia M. Davis and Lewis R. Rambo, "Converting: Toward a Cognitive Theory of Religious Change," in ed., Kelly Bulkeley, *Soul, Psyche, Brain: New Directions in the Study of Religion and Brain-Mind Science* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 159-73, here 159, Patricia M. Davis and Lewis R. Rambo feel that "the individual is converting from a meaning system as well as to a meaning system. Conversion is thus usually the process of disruption of the existing meaning system, which results in disorientation and eventual reorientation to a new or revised meaning system."

34. Nave, *Repentance in Luke-Acts*, 3-4, 224, argues that while repentance for the Jews in Acts is chiefly related to a change of thinking regarding Jesus, repentance for the Gentiles is portrayed as believing in Jesus, namely, conversion. Along a similar line with Nave, Ravens also contends that in view of covenantal relationship with God, it is Jews who repent of their sins, whereas for Gentiles who are not members of the covenant, repentance is simply turning to God and believing in Jesus as the promised Messiah. He also claims that sin and sinner are

repentance for the Jews and conversion for the Gentiles, their assertion, as pointedly stated at the outset of this discussion, is not convincing in showing that repentance for Luke is used only for Jewish people as already believers in God, and conversion for Gentiles. Seventhly, Luke is primarily inclined to focus on the treatment of personalized conversion, rather than the broad call to the conversion of a people or a nation in the Old Testament.[35] Even though the apostolic preaching,[36] as well as John's preaching, which consists of a demand for repentance is primarily directed collectively to the crowd, individual stories of conversion are all the more dominant and impressive in Acts. The following stories in Acts reveal this: The Ethiopian eunuch (8:26-40), Paul (9:1-19; 22:6-16; 26:12-18), Cornelius (10:1-11:18), Lydia (16:14-15), and the Philippian jailer (16:25-34). Lastly, the emphasis of conversion in the Gospel of Luke is mainly placed on the concrete change of life by John's preaching and Jesus' teaching, in particular within one's attitude towards possessions. Conversion is manifested in good deeds (cf. Luke 3:8, 11, 13-14; 5:28; 8:1-3; 15:12-14, 29-30; 17:3-4; 19:2, 8).

Some works exploring conversion in Luke-Acts are subsequently treated at some length so as to gain extensive understanding of conversion of Luke. Jon Nelson Bailey, first of all, argues that accompanied by a life of faith and ethical righteousness, repentance is a change of attitudes and actions as reorientation of one's life with respect to response to the word of God. Repentance, at the same time, contains embracing the community of faith as the true people of God. For him, repentance is synonymous with conversion that puts its emphasis on movement or reorientation as well as a result of repentance. Having surveyed the usage of μετάνοια and μετανοέω in Old Testament, Jewish sources, works of Hellenistic history and biography in Greco-Roman world, and works of Early Christianity, he comes to a conclusion that depending on his Jewish background, Luke develops the idea of repentance in a way that is particularly appropriate for his Hellenistic audience in a Christian community consisting of Jews and Gentiles. By means of synthesizing and developing Jewish, Christian and Greek ideas, Luke denotes repentance as fairly respectable in terms of intellectuality, morality, and

---

used in Jewish settings, namely, a technical term for a Jew who has transgressed the law of Israel. Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*, 155-56. But David Neale points out rightly the fact that sinners represent all who are in need of God's mercy. See Neale, *None but the Sinners: Religious Categories in the Gospel of Luke*, 193.

35. Navone, *Themes of St. Luke*, 45, argues that conversion in Luke is primarily set in eschatological conditions, but occasionally put outside eschatological context, so as to indicate a conversion that is individual and partial. See also Witherup, *Conversion in the New Testament*, 55, 58.

36. There are eight missionaries preaching in Acts, of which six are for the Jews (Acts 2:14-36, 38-39; 3:12-26; 4:8-12, 19-20; 5:29-32; 10:34-43; 13:16-41) and two for the Gentiles (Acts 14:14-17; 17:22-31). Calls for repentance occur in three of the accounts of preaching to the Jews (Acts 2:38; 3:19; 5:30), and in two of that to Gentiles (Acts14:15; 17:30).

religion.[37] However, Bailey fails to adequately consider the concept of repentance in imageries and stories of repentance in Luke-Acts, owing to only a concentration on a word study of μετάνοια and μετανοέω. In the same way, he misses linking repentance to the other themes of Luke. Notwithstanding, he has made very significant contributions to understanding the concept of repentance in Luke-Acts.

Guy D. Nave attempts to show how repentance serves as the means for establishing and resocializing the Christian community in Luke-Acts, and for transforming traditional world views within the context of the narrative and on the narrative structure in Luke-Acts as a literary approach. Repentance, as found in Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian literature, has the same meaning with them, and represents a change in thinking that logically results in a change in behaviour or way of life. For him repentance is the indispensable change in thinking and behaviour, so that individuals as the people of God help to fulfill God's plan of universal salvation, and still more, serve to establish a community composed of all people. Nave argues that while repentance in Luke presents primarily a change of thinking in interaction with other people, repentance in Acts is chiefly concerned with a change of thinking regarding Jesus of Nazareth. Moreover, he goes so far as to contend that repentance for the Gentiles differs from the Jews in that repentance for the Gentiles is described simply as believing in Jesus.[38] However, Nave appears to miss the fact that lack of repentance and not sin is the reason to God's condemnation of a person.[39] His contention implies that sin is not the reason for God's condemnation toward a person. For him, it is also not convincing in showing a distinction between Jewish and Gentile repentance, since both a change in thinking about Jesus and a new belief in Jesus as simply believing in Jesus carry almost the same meaning. Nevertheless, his work does offer a considerable insight for a study of repentance in Luke-Acts in that he seeks to find a function and a role of repentance in God's salvation plan throughout Luke-Acts.

Having felt that compared with materials of Acts in studies of conversion, those of the Gospel of Luke have been relatively neglected by scholars, Pernando Méndez-Moratalla tries to establish a coherent theological pattern of conversion in Luke. He singles out ten paradigms of conversion in Luke as the result of analysis of seven texts on conversion,[40] that

37. Bailey, 'Repentance in Luke-Acts,' 28-121, 284-293.
38. Nave, *Repentance in Luke-Acts*, 39-144, 145-224.
39. Ibid., 178, 222.
40. Seven texts which he analyzes in Luke is as follows: Baptist (3:1-17), Levi (5:27-32), a city woman (7:36-50), the Parable of Prodigal Son (15:11-32), Zaccheus (19:1-10) and the Ruler (18:18-30) as non-conversion.

is, Divine Initiative, Conflict, Sin/Sinners, Repentance, Wealth/Possessions, Forgiveness, Table-Fellowship and Joy, Reversal, Climactic Pronouncement, and Christological Emphasis. For him all these denote the presence of salvation which is made by Jesus. He gives attention in particular to the transformation of social values and the ethical demands. Jesus in the Gospel of Luke challenges predominant social and religious values by embracing in his fellowship sinners and outcasts, particularly through table-fellowship. In other words, the Lukan conversion stories are not simply a challenge or reinterpretation of temporary socio-religious values, but a reversal. Repentance is manifested especially in a changed attitude to possessions, which is all the more serious on account of a matter of allegiances, which as the result of conversion, move inevitably from loyalty to mammon to loyalty to God.[41] Yet I am left with misgivings about the paradigm of conversion in Luke which is asserted by him, because he has simply created too much out of too little evidence. There seems to be theological themes throughout the Gospel of Luke rather than peculiar features of conversion in Luke as paradigm.

Joel B. Green begins his study of conversion in Luke-Acts with cognitive science that emphasizes not only somatic existence as the basis and means of human existence, but also unconsciousness and metaphor which embody thought.[42] In doing so, he attempts to dismiss the issues raised by recent discussions of conversion in Luke-Acts as the helpful insights of cognitive science, under four headings: Repentance versus Conversion, A New Conceptual Scheme, Conversion and Socialization, and Community Formed and Forming.[43] To put it another way, he objects to the distinction between repentance for Jews and conversion for Gentiles and elucidates conversion as a new conceptual scheme which leads to a new way of seeing things, an opening of the mind so as to understand what was previously incomprehensible. Furthermore, conversion, he contends, is not only an ongoing process of socialization, but also autobiographical reconstruction which shatters one's past and reassembles it in keeping with the new life of the converted. Fruits worthy of repentance represent especially in the community of the converted through the community practices, such as economic *koinonia*, prayer, and witness. For him conversion is believed to be the human experience of embodiment, that is to say, "the convert one who has undergone a redirectional rotation and is on the move in faithful service to the purpose of God."[44] He

41. Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*, 71-214, 217-22.
42. Green, "Conversion in Luke-Acts: The Potential of a Cognitive Approach," 5.
43. Ibid., 11-20.
44. Ibid., 28.

comes to a conclusion that conversion in Luke-Acts is a transformation of conceptual scheme by which life is reordered. For him this is also concerned with the eschatological context of conversion by the role of the Spirit toward conversion. What is more, having studied conversion in Acts, he also comes to the same conclusion that "conversion is the transference of one's orienting allegiances which gives rise to and is confirmed in community-nested practices appropriate to those new allegiances and which opens the way to ongoing transformation as one comes more fully to embrace and indwell this new life-world."[45] Conversion is redirecting one's life in order to serve only one master, and at the same time, this requires loyalty in all things.[46] Conversion by Green is well explicated as a transformation of conceptual scheme by which life is reoriented in the service to the purpose of God. In the light of this, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the theme of conversion is one of the major theological themes of the Lukan parables, and is, furthermore, in consonance with the theme of conversion in Luke's theology that runs through Luke-Acts.

I have showed here that the theological themes of the Lukan Parables can be subsumed under four broad categories: the marginalized, wealth and possessions, prayer and conversion. I have especially tried to show that these themes are noticeably consistent with those found throughout the Gospel. From the results given above, we now need to group the themes and build a topic which unites all of them. In the chapters that follow, this topic will be dealt with in detail.

45. Green, "Doing Repentance: The Formation of Disciples in the Acts of the Apostles," 7, 19.
46. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 107-108, views the concept of repentance as the redirection of one's heart and life toward the purpose of God.

Chapter 6
The Lukan Parables in The Travel Narrative

In order to search for a unifying theme of the Lukan parables, it is imperative that we examine the travel narrative (Lk 9:51-19:28) in the Gospel of Luke, since all the parables which we have analyzed in Luke are located in the travel narrative. Accordingly, the aim of this chapter is to unveil proper kernel themes of this travel narrative, and to consider what relationship the Lukan parables have with the core themes in the travel narrative, so as to find a unifying theme.

1. The Delineation of the Travel Narrative

Luke 9:51 is widely accepted as the beginning of the travel narrative, since a programmatic introduction clearly signals a new beginning, with the ἐγένετο–formula which is a Lukan introductory character stemming from Septuagint expressions.[1] From a narrative point of view, 9:51 reveals, in solemn tone, a situation that is very different from the one before. The repeated references to Jesus' determination to go to Jerusalem in 9:51 and 53, also underline the fact that Luke 9:51 is the beginning of the travel narrative. We can also add the terms πορεύομαι in 9:51, 52, 53 and 56 here. On the other hand, the issue of where the Lukan travel narrative ends is a more vexing problem than where it begins. The closing verses proposed by scholars are largely 19:27/28 and 19:44/46/48. A significant number of scholars claim that when Jesus virtually enters Jerusalem, Luke's travel section ends with 19:44, 46 or 48. That is why the travel notices continue after 19:28. In what follows, I will deal with suggestions of the delineation for the end of the travel narrative, and then put forward the most proper alternative.

1. See A. Denaux, "The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Luke," in ed., C. Focant, *The Synoptic Gospels* (Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1993), 357-92, especially 369-77; F. Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9:51-19:28* (Brussel: Voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2004), 207-328, here 207-48. F. Neirynck's view of the ἐγένετο–formula that Denaux and Noël follow is as follows: 1. ἐγένετο + καί + *verbum finitum*: 5:1,12,17; 8:1,22; 9:28,51; 14:1; 17:11; 24:15 (other usages except introductory expression: 19:15; 24:4). 2. ἐγένετο + *verbum finitum*: 1:41; 2:1; 7:11; 9:18,37; 11:1,14,27; 17:35; 18:35; 19:29; 20:1; 24:51 (other usages except introductory expression: 1:8,23,59; 2:6,15,46; 9:33; 17:14; 24:30). 3. ἐγένετο + infinitive: 3:21 (cf. Mk 1:9); 6:1 (cf. Mk 2:23); 6:6, 12 (other usage except introductory expression: 14:22). With respect to the beginning of the travel narrative, both, except for the above contention, add that 9:51 is undoubtedly the beginning of the travel narrative, because Luke adopts the journey to Jerusalem from Mk 10:1-52 which has a new stage in Mark's Gospel.

1-1. Lk 19:44[2]

E.E. Ellis feels that the entry story in 19:28-40 and Jesus' weeping over Jerusalem in 19:41-44, are chiefly linked with the travel narrative, although they function as transition to the Jerusalem section. For him 19:28-44 is a commentary on the Parable of the Pounds (Lk 19:12-18), and still more proceeds the themes of 18:15-19:44. Moreover, Ellis elicits several parallels between the end of the Galilean and 19:28-44, thereby confirming the concluding character of 19:28-44.[3] J.L. Resseguie distinguishes each larger section in the Gospel of Luke, by means of the pattern of Jesus' rejection. That is to say: Jesus' rejection by his own people (4:14-31), Jesus' rejection by the Samaritans (9:53), and Jesus' rejection by the temple authorities (19:45-20:18).[4] In the same vein, D. Gill contends that not only is Jesus still on the way in 19:28, 29, 36 and 41, but he also does not enter the temple, since there are the continuous travel notices after 19:27.[5]

Expressing some doubt concerning the same structuring value between Lk 19:29 and Mk 11:1, and the importance of the ἐγένετο–formula, A. Denaux defends the delineation in 19:44 as the end of the travel narrative. He holds, first of all, that it is not sufficient for the ἐγένετο–formula to present as the beginning of a new pericope, section or part, since in order to delineate a text unit, it is imperative that other factors are taken into account, such as content, change of time, place, characters, etc. Besides, as shown in F. Neirynck's discussion of the ἐγένετο–formula, there is no ἐγένετο–formula in some pericopes, subsections in Luke.

---

2. Scholars who view Lk 19:44 as the end of the travel narrative are: Ellis, *Luke*, 224-225; Geldenhuys, *Luke*, 291; Floyd V. Filson, "The Journey Motif in Luke-Acts," in ed., W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin, *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: The Paternoster Press, 1970), 68-77; David Gill, "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages," *HTR* 63 (1970), 199-221; J.L. Resseguie, "Interpretation of Luke's Central Section (Luke 9:51-19:44) Since 1856," *SBT* 5 (1975), 3-36; idem, *Spiritual Landscape: Images of the Spiritual life in the Gospel of Luke*, 29-44; Arland J. Hultgren, "Interpreting the Gospel of Luke," *Int* 30 (1976), 353-65; Hobert K. Farrell, "The Structure and Theology of Luke's Central Section," *TJ* 7 (1986), 33-54, here 50; David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 33 n. 3; Bock, *Luke. Volume 2*, 957-58; Stephen C. Barton, *The Spirituality of the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1992), 71-112; Denaux, "The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Luke," 369-88; Paul Norman Jackson, "Allegiance to Jesus from the Transfiguration to his Death in Luke's Gospel," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 40 (1997), 48-62; Brendan Byrne, *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke's Gospel* (Minnesota, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 94 n. 4, 155; Paul Borgman, *The Way According to Luke: Hearing the Whole Story of Luke-Acts* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing, 2006), 7-15; Eugene Hensell, "The Great Journey in Luke's Gospel," *Review for Religious* 66 (2007), 316-319.

3. Ellis, *Luke*, 224-225; Geldenhuys, *Luke*, 46, 291. Bock also chooses 19:44 as the end of the travel narrative, as the goal of the journey is Jerusalem, and at 19:41-44 Jesus arrives at Jerusalem. For him 19:45-48 describes that Jesus is clearly in the temple. See Bock, *Luke.* 957-58.

4. Resseguie, "Interpretation of Luke's Central Section (Luke 9:51-19:44) Since 1856," 3-36, here 3 n. 2.

5. Gill, "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages," 199-221, here 212-13.

Denaux divides the ἐγένετο–formula into two series: the cases where the ἐγένετο–formula occurs at the beginning of text units, and the cases where the ἐγένετο–formula arises in the middle of a text unit. In the latter case, the ἐγένετο–formula is accompanied by a general situation and the necessary conditions for the narrative action to be possible. In other words, the second part of the formula has elements of the preceding general introductory description. In this respect, 19:28 belongs to the parable of Pounds, and the entry story begins with 19:29, because the second part of the ἐγένετο–formula in 19:29 is a realization of the general mention of 19:28. In the same way, the second part of the ἐγένετο–formula in 20:1 reiterates the general summary in 19:47-48, and 19:45-46 belongs to the temple section (19:45-21:38) because of the content concerning the cleansing of the temple. Therefore, rather than linking it to the preceding context, 19:45-46.47-48 should be linked to the following context, that is to say, to the temple section. Denaux also claims that Luke, in his travel narrative, certainly shows dependence on Mk 10:1-52, while he presents, to a considerable extent, his independence, particularly in his composition of 19:29-44, in which he relies on Mk 11:1-11. That is to say, Luke's reworking of Mk 11:1-11 shows that Luke views 19:29-44 as belonging to the travel narrative. Luke reinterprets Mark's entry story by means of the redaction of Mk 11:1-11 and the addition of 19:39-44. Unlike Mk 11:11, Luke in 19:45 records that Jesus enters the city, not the temple. In this way, Luke represents his theological point of view: He makes a sharp distinction between the temple where Jesus ministers and teaches as a messianic King and Lord (19:45-21:38), and the city of Jerusalem where Jewish religious leaders are master, and where still more of the passion of Jesus will take place (Lk. 22-23).[6] In recent years, even Denaux puts forward 13 theses to show the redactional links between the parable of the Pounds (19:11-28) and the Entry Story (19:29-44).[7]

1-2. Lk 19:46[8]

6. Denaux, "The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Luke," 369-88.

7. A. Denaux, "The Parable of the King-Judge (Lk 19:12-28) and its Relation to the Entry Story (Lk 19:29-44)," *ZNW* 93 (2002), 35-57.

8. For those who view 19:46 as the end of the travel section, see J.H. Davies, "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in ed., F.L. Cross, *Studia Evangelica II* (TU, 87, Berlin, 1964), 164-69; J. Lambrecht, "Reading and Rereading Lk 18:31-22:6," *À cause de ι'Évangile* , (1985), 585-612; P. Kariamadam, "The Composition and Meaning of the Lucan Travel Narrative (Lk 9:51-19:46)," *Bible Bhashyam* 13 (1987), 179-98; Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 150 n. 158; Frank J. Matera, "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:46): A Conflict with Israel," *JSNT* 51 (1993), 57-77, here 57-58.

Linking 19:38a with the prefiguring of the ascension to 13:35b, J.H. Davies contends that the travel narrative ends with 19:29-46, the story of the entry into Jerusalem. For Luke, the Journey to Jerusalem occupies the first part of the ascent to heaven through death and resurrection. During the Journey, Jesus teaches the disciples, and at the end of that he enters the city as king, and the Temple as judge. This foreshadows the real end, in that the Journey via Jesus' death and resurrection into his heavenly kingdom brings him glory, and in contrast, the city, Jerusalem and the Jews bring destruction and rejection.[9]

On the grounds of a geographical notice in 18:31-19:46 and a literary *inclusio* between 19:47-48 and 21:37-38, J. Lambrecht prefers this delineation. That is to say, every pericope in 18:31-19:46 does indeed have a geographical indicator, and 19:47-21:38 is framed by a literary *inclusio* of 19:47-48 and 21:37-38. But for him it is not so very important where the travel narrative precisely ends, since in 9:30-31, Jesus' exodus has already been notified, and the Journey must be construed in terms of the events which will take place there. In addition, a string of events in 19:28-44 and the cleansing of the temple are still more significant than the entry of the sanctuary. In any case, Jesus' teaching in what follows comes into being in him cleansing the temple in 19:45-46.[10]

In the same vein, with Lambrecht, F.J. Matera defends this delineation, outlining two reasons: Firstly, until 19:45 Jesus does not enter the city Jerusalem. Secondly, 19:47-48 and 21:37-38 form a literary *inclusio* which functions as a token of the beginning and ending of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem: Καὶ ηδιδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (19:47); Ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων (21:37).[11]

1-3. Lk 19:48[12]

Having looked at several suggestions concerning the point of termination of the travel narrative, H.L. Egelkraut determines that the travel narrative ends with 19:48, since the goal

9. Davies, "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," 164-69.

10. Lambrecht, "Reading and Rereading Lk 18:31-22:6," 585-612.

11. Matera, "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:46): A Conflict with Israel," 57-58, n. 2.

12. For those who view 19:48 as the end of the travel section, see J.M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke: The Greek Test with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 139; H.L. Egelkraut, *Jesus' Mission to Jerusalem: A Redaction Critical Study of the Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke, Lk 9:51-19:48* (Frankfurt/M: P. Lang; Bern: H. Lang. 1976), 3-11; F. Ó Fearghail, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts. A Study of the Role of Lk 1:1-4:44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work* (AnBib, 126, Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), 48-51; Green, *Luke*, 399; Brent Kinman, *Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem: In the Context of Lukan Theology and the Politics of His Day* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 5-6; Robert Stephen Reid, "On Preaching 'Fictive Argument'; A Reader-Response Look At A Lukan Parable And Three Sayings On Discipleship," *Restoration Quarterly* 43 (2001), 13-31.

of the Journey is the city of Jerusalem, and it was not reached before 19:48. This is why the indicators in which the group of the travel is still near to the city Jerusalem definitely appears in 19:29, 37 and 41. In this regard, for him other proposals (18:14, 18:30, 19:27/28 and 19:40/41) fail to show an appropriate and reasonable end to the travel narrative.[13]

F. Ó Fearghail concentrates on the travel notice, so as to attest to that Jesus' journey toward Jerusalem continues at least until 19:46. According to him, the last travel notice in 19:45a is grammatically linked to 19:45b, as well as 19:46. In comparison with the solemn introduction in 9:51-52, it is not suitable to end the Journey with 19:45-46, which has the negative impression, "a den of robbers," with reference to the temple. In addition, 19:45-46 as the cleansing of the temple functions as the preparation for Jesus' teaching. Contrasting the reaction of the people and that of the high priests and scribes, 19:47-48 summarizes both reactions that will take place as the result of Jesus' instruction. Moreover, that the travel narrative ends with 19:48 is, for him, all the more obvious, since that major characteristic during the Journey, namely, the didactic character and Jesus' rejection seem to culminate in 19:47-48, and that the ἐγένετο–formula and the time notice in 20:1 has an introductory character.[14]

J.B. Green also selects 19:48 as the end of the Journey, since 19:48 signals that Jesus has actually entered Jerusalem. He notes that Luke elaborates these final steps as follows: Jesus is "near" (19:11), "going up to" (19:41), "approaching" (19:45) and "enter[s]" (19:47) Jerusalem. However, Green casts doubt on whether this delineation would influence the interpretation of the narrative. Furthermore, he, at the very least, accepts that 19:47-48 might function as a summary heading for the following section, which is primarily filled with Jesus' teaching in the temple (20:1-21:38), in which case 19:47 and 21:37 frame a literary *inclusio*: "Every day he was teaching in the temple."[15]

---

13. Egelkraut, *Jesus' Mission to Jerusalem: A Redaction Critical Study of the Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke, Lk 9:51-19:48*, 3-11, also refutes those who take the extent of the travel narrative from 9:51 to Acts 2:1, as the goal of the Journey is the ascension. He explains four reasons for his disagreement, that is, 1. At the end of chapter 19, the travel notices cease. 2. Rather than the ascension, the goal stated in 19:51, is Jerusalem. 3. As other major sections in Luke-Acts do not begin with this formula ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι…, (9:51 and Acts 2:1), it seems absurd to assume that a certain section with this formula should continue to the point where this formula occurs again. 4. There is little possibility that a section in Luke would continue in Acts, since it is most likely that the two volumes were circulated separately from the outset.

14. Ó Fearghail, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts. A Study of the Role of Lk 1:1-4:44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work*, 48-51. Given the fact that high priests and scribes conspire for the first time to kill Jesus in 19:47, according to Ó Fearghail, it can be said that the theme of Jesus' rejection, which has run throughout the travel narrative, comes into culmination in 19:47-48.

15. Green, *Luke*, 399.

1-4. Lk 19:28[16]

J. Székely agrees with the majority of the exegetes that the travel narrative ends with 19:28.[17] He advances similarities of a new beginning between 9:52-56 and 19:29-40 in sending the disciples to prepare for Jesus' arrival, as well as in the rejection of Jesus. In addition, 19:28 forms a literary *inclusio* with 9:51, and Bethany and the Mount of Olives form a certain

16. For those who view 19:27 or 28 as the end of the travel section, see G.B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* (London: A & C. Black, 1968), 139; Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, 63-64; George Ogg, "The Central Section of the Gospel according to St Luke," *NTS* 18 (1971), 39-53; Frederick W. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke' Gospel*, 123; Simon J. Kistemaker, "The Structure of Luke's Gospel," *JETS* 25 (1982), 33-39. Kistemaker divided the Gospel of Luke into three segments (3:1-9:50; 9:51-19:27; 19:28-21:38) except for the introduction (Chapters 1-2) and conclusion (Chapters 22-24). See also Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1242; Longenecker, "Taking up the Cross Daily: Discipleship in Luke-Acts," 50-76, here 64; J. Székely, *Structure and Theology of the Lucan 'Itinerarium'* (Budapest: Szent Jeromos Katolikus Bibiátarsulat, 2008), 97-99; Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9:51-19:28*, 283-285; Stephen Hultgren, "The Apostolic Church's Influence on the Order of Sayings in the Double Tradition. Part II: Luke's Travel Narrative," *ZNW* 100 (2009), 199-222.

17. Apart from the above suggestions, there are, to be sure, other proposals. Even though there is the argument that the travel narrative ceases with 18:14, which concludes the "great interpolation," the suggestion in recent years is no longer acceptable because the limitations of the source critical approach have been exposed. J. Kodell first finds an interlocking technique of Luke at the beginning and the end of the great interpolation (9:51-18:14) by means of a thematic *inclusio* (9:46-48; 18:15-17). In so doing, he puts forward a major unifying theme of the interpolation: "the disciples of Jesus must receive the kingdom like a little child." Jerome Kodell, "Luke and the Children: The Beginning and End of the Great Interpolation (Luke 9:46-56; 18:9-23)," *CBQ* 49 (1987), 415-430. As for the above suggestion, H.L. Egelkraut rightly refutes it, pointing out that without the parallel in Mark no one would notice that a unit ends in Lk 18:14. On the other side of the coin, C.L. Blom*ber*g argues that the travel narrative is closed with the final passion prediction in 18:31-34, putting much emphasis on the passion prediction (9:22; 9:44). On the one hand, 9:22 and 9:44 provide a literary border and theological perspective for 9:51-18:30. On the other hand, 18:31-34 provides an introduction to the following section with solemnity and at the same time a climactic conclusion to the previous wandering as any in Luke's gospel. In other words, the final passion prediction functions as a pivotal transitional passage which simultaneously serves as a conclusion to the preceding material and an introduction to forthcoming events. As a result, he comes to a conclusion that Luke's central section should be identified as 9:51-18:30 with a transitional phrase at 18:31-34. This proposal is followed by J. Nolland who defends the view that the artificial travel narrative ends with 18:34. Luke from 18:35 not only provides the actual progression from Jericho to Jerusalem, but also forecasts what will occur in Jerusalem. However, it is sufficient to view 18:31 as only a transitional passage, and not the beginning of a new section, since after 18:31 Jesus is still travelling on his way, particularly around and in Jericho. I.H. Marshall claims that the travel section ends with 19:10. The view that the Parable of Pounds is the end of the travel narrative is absurd, for the parable does not look back but looks forward. The parable functions as a narrative bridge between the two sections in the Gospel of Luke. For the contention of 18:14 as the end of the travel narrative, see C.F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in ed., D.E. Nineham, *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot* (Oxford, 1955), 37-53, here 42-50; B. Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," *Studia Evangelica I* (TU, 73, Berlin, 1959), 206-16. For the contention of 18:30/34 as the end of the travel narrative, see Blomberg, 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section,' 52-58, especially 56-58; Nolland, *Luke*, 528-29. For 19:10 as the delineation of the travel section, see Marshall, *Luke*, 401; K. Paffenroth, *The Story of Jesus according to L* (JSNTSup 147, Sheffied, 1997), 65.

inclusio with 24:50 as well. Moreover, there are many verbal links between 19:47-48 and 20:1 and between 19:47-48 and 21:37-38. But he carefully adds that for Luke not much emphasis is put on separating the travel narrative from the Jerusalem section.[18]

In recent years, F. Noël argues that the travel narrative ends with 19:28, basically under four headings. Firstly, he claims that the end of the Parable of the Pounds (19:1-17) is 19:28. For him, the parable is intimately related to 19:28, in that with καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο, Luke refers to the preceding parable in 19:28, and with the repetition of Jerusalem, 19:11 and 19:28 form a literary *inclusio*. For Luke the difference of the name of Jerusalem in 19:11 (Ἰερουσαλήμ) and 19:28 (Ἱεροσόλυμα), like two attitudes towards the king in the Parable of Pounds, represents two aspects which come into being in the royal and heavenly enthronement (Ἰερουσαλήμ), and at the same time, the destruction of the city (Ἱεροσόλυμα).[19]

Secondly, Noël believes that after 19:28, the travel notices present only Jesus' approach of the city such as 19:29 (ὡς ἤγγισεν), 19:37 (Ἐγγίζοντος δὲ αὐτου) and 19:41 (ὡς ἤγγισεν, ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν), not travel notices themselves. In other words, it is not reasonable to regard πορεύομαι as the terminus technicus of the travel section, since Jesus is travelling around throughout the Gospel. Even the verb ἐγγίζω is generally used outside the travel section to show the approach to a town and city (7:12; 18:35, 40; 19:29, 37, 41; 24:28 for town among eighteenth times). Jesus is travelling around in the Galilean section, whereas in the travel section he has a clear and explicit goal connected with Jerusalem in mind. He admits that Luke follows Mark's travel narrative and depends on the Markan source particularly in the beginning (Lk 9:51-10:1) and end (18:31-19:28) of the travel narrative of Luke, albeit with some redactional additions and changes. Moreover, Luke's interest in the travel narrative does not lie in this direction, but rather in the fact that Jesus is on his way toward Jerusalem as his destination.[20]

Thirdly, Noël feels that the Parable of the Pounds is the concluding pericope of the travel narrative. He holds that the Parable of the Pounds hermeneutically functions as a commentary of Luke's narrative construction, linking Luke's version of the parable and the context, characterized by the transition of the travel narrative into the Jerusalem section. Luke makes an interpretative pause at the end of the travel narrative by means of putting the parable in

18. Székely, *Structure and Theology of the Lucan 'Itinerarium'*, 97-99.
19. Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9:51-19:28*, 283-285.
20. Ibid., 285-296.

this context. It seems intended so that the parable looks back on the whole travel section and at the same time looks forward to the events which will occur in the Jerusalem section.[21]

Lastly, Noël tries to demonstrate that the Jerusalem section begins with 19:29 under four subheadings: The ἐγένετο–Formula in Lk 19:29, The Geographical Unity of Lk 19:29-24:53 and The Introductory Function of the Entry Story. Firstly, Noël states that, just as Jesus approaches Jericho in 18:35, which has the ἐγένετο–formula, and enters Jericho in 19:1, so Jesus approaches the neighbourhood of the city in 19:29 which also has the ἐγένετο–formula and is in the temple in 19:45. Likewise, given the fact that the Jericho and entry section are a unit in two movements, it is unlikely that 19:45 is the commencement of a new section. Secondly, Noël seeks to show the geographical unity of 19:29-24:53. With the *inclusio* in 19:29 and 24:50 which have Bethany as the geographical notice, Luke frames the third part of his Gospel. This is why Luke deliberately omits the geographical indication three times from the Gospel of Mark (Mk 11:11, 12; 14:3). In 21:37-38, Luke summarizes Jesus' activity in Jerusalem, simplifying Mark's time indications: in the daytime Jesus teaches in the temple and he spends the night on the Mount of Olives. For Luke's generalizing way in 21:37-38, there cannot be a break in 19:45-48. For this reason, the verses function only as transition between the entry into the temple and Jesus' instruction there. Furthermore, for Luke, temple and city are such complementary places that he can alternate with the Mount of Olives in the Jerusalem section. In this respect, the geographical indications in Luke serve a literary function rather than an exact geographical function. Also, in order to prepare Jesus' arrival, Luke, as in 9:52-56, creates two subsections (19:29-32 and 22:8-13), which are brought in by a mission of the disciples, thereby indicating a new start of events. From this observation, he can, to a certain extent, make sure that the entry story is a new start rather than a concluding episode. Thirdly, Noël holds that the entry story has the introductory function. Luke who has the entry story as the introduction of the temple section (19:29-21:38) in mind, edits the entry story (19:29-46) from Mark, linking the motifs of the royal entry (19:29-38 par. Mk 11:1-10) and the cleansing of the temple (19:45-46 par. Mk11:15-17) which remain separated by the episode of cursing a fig tree, and adds Jesus' lament over Jerusalem (19:41-44). Furthermore, in 19:29, Luke mentions a string of places which arise in the Jerusalem section, such as Bethphage, Bethany and the Mount of Olives. In the content of the entry story, the mission theme (19:29-34), as has been mentioned, and the rejection motif (19:39-44), carries the conviction that the entry story is an introductory episode. The rejection motif (19:39-44)

21. Ibid., 296-302.

reminds us of Jesus' rejection in Nazareth (4:23-30) at the beginning of the Galilea section and that in the Samaritan village (9:53-56) at the beginning of the travel narrative. The entry story functions as the beginning of the new section in that the announcements of the foregoing sections reach their completion, with the acclamation of Jesus as king of peace and glory.[22]

Even though thus far many opinions have been suggested to try and settle the teasing problem of the delineation of the travel narrative, it is still very difficult to determine where the Journey ends. There is little doubt that the ἐγένετο–formula, the pattern of Jesus' rejection, and the repeated passion predictions, can indicate a new beginning of a section, or at the very least a transitional point. A literary *inclusio* and caesura, travel notices, and Jerusalem or the Temple as the destination of the Lukan travel narrative can also play a significant role in determining the delineation of the end of the Journey. Even the Parable of the Pounds has immense appeal for the delineation of the end of the travel narrative in that the parable summarises so far the Lukan travel narrative, and still more looks ahead what will happen to Jesus in the city Jerusalem. In spite of plenty of evidence, I am still left with the impression that Luke does not put much emphasis on separating the travel narrative from the section of Jerusalem, and that even Luke seems to interlace the travel narrative (9:51-19:28), the entry story (19:29-44) and the temple section (19:45-21:38). Nevertheless, all things considered, I prefer, and defend 19:28 as the end of the travel narrative for the following reasons: 1. 19:11 at the beginning of the Parable of the Pounds and 19:28 form a literary *inclusio*. Creating an interpretative pause at the end of the travel narrative, the parable looks back on the whole travel section and at the same time looks forward to the events which will happen in the Jerusalem section. 2. 19:29-34 and 9:52-56 represent similarities in sending the disciples ahead to prepare Jesus' arrival, and 19:39-44 and 9:52-56 also denote affinities in the rejection motif. 3. In addition, 19:28 forms a literary *inclusio* with 9:51, and Bethany and the Mount of Olives in 19:29 form a certain *inclusio* with 24:50 as well. 4. Just as Jesus approaches Jericho in 18:35, which has the ἐγένετο–formula, and enters Jericho in 19:1, so Jesus approaches the neighbourhood of the city in 19:29, which also has the ἐγένετο–formula, and is in the temple in 19:45. In so doing, the Jericho and the entry section is a unit in two movements. Accordingly, 19:29 is very likely the beginning of a new section, that is, the Jerusalem section.

22. Ibid., 302-328.

2. The Interpretational Approaches of the Travel Narrative

Jesus' long journey to Jerusalem is one of the most interesting themes, with distinctive features in the Gospel of Luke. It is not only a difficult subject to tackle, but also a very complex issue, which has not been definitively resolved. The interpretation of the travel narrative is complicated largely due to the discrepancy between form and content. This part of the Gospel is formally a journey of Jesus to Jerusalem (9:51; 13:22; 17:11; 19:11, 28). The content of this part is, however, everything but narrative material for a travel narrative, but consists of sayings as Jesus' instruction and parenesis. F.J. Matera finds eleven discourses accompanied with changes of time and place, which Jesus delivers in the travel narrative. It is surveyed that the travel narrative is mostly comprised of Jesus' discourses other than only a few episodes, which are not discourses (13:10-21; 13:31-35; 14:1-6; 17:11-22).[1] On the other hand, it is difficult to map out a clear itinerary of Jesus towards Jerusalem, since many pericopes in the travel narrative only have some brief geographical indications, and still less are vaguely connected to each other by a colourless introduction. Of the explicit indications (9:51, 53; 13:22; 17:11; 18:31; 19:11, 28) which mention the journey and its destination, 17:11 seems to indicate that Jesus is still near to Galilee without a large advancement to Jerusalem, although the story has progressed considerably. That is, "On the way to Jerusalem he was passing along between Samaria and Galilee." Rather than inform the readers of the itinerary of Jesus to Jerusalem, implicit travel notices (9:56, 57; 10:1, 17, 38; 11:1; 13:10; 14:1, 25) seem to denote greater vagueness with respect to the itinerary. D.P. Moessner enumerates the obstacles with the journey notices in incoherence, infrequency and indefiniteness or vagueness.[2] At any rate, attempts to settle the discrepancy between form and content in the travel narrative have been elaborated by different approaches. In what

1. Matera, "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:46): A Conflict with Israel," 57-77, here 65-66, argues that the discourses develop the evaluative point of view which Jesus supports and tries to communicate to the disciples. The evaluative assessment is the standpoint or the system of value one employs to evaluate the world. A conflict of evaluative points of view between Jesus, Pharisees and lawyers shapes the plot of Luke's narrative, and as a result, the journey section informs the reader why and how Jesus came into conflict with Israel. Eleven discourses which Matera singles out from the travel narrative are as follows: 10:2-16, 11:2-13, 11:17-36, 11:39-52, 12:1b-13:9, 13:23b-30, 14:8-24, 14:26-35, 15:3-17:10, 17:22-18:14 and 19:12-27. It has already emerged from the argument of Resseguie that the purpose of Luke's central section is to sharply expose two conflicting ideological points of view which have diametrically opposed ways of thinking and viewing the world. However, he deals only with 14:14-33 as a test case to demonstrate the thesis, not the whole of Luke's central section. James L. Resseguie, "Point of View in the Central Section of Luke," *JETS* 25 (1982), 41-47.

2. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*, 14-20, in addition to the above discrepancy, discusses two more discrepancies between form and content, under the next heading, discrepancy between the traditions and the journey motif and discrepancy between provenance and setting of the Journey.

follows, I will first of all present the current scholarly views about the Lukan travel narrative in four categories such as historical approach, redaction critical approach, chiastic structure, and Old Testament models.

2-1. Historical Approach

In explaining the arrangement of the travel narrative, the historical interpretation was the leading method until the beginning of the 20th century. The historical interpretation, according to Luke's preface with καθεξῆς, views the Lukan travel narrative as a chronologically and geographically exact description of Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem. The historical point of view can be divided into two categories, one single journey and multiple journeys. As far as the single journey is concerned, F. Godet argues that Luke describes one continuous journey as Jesus' the last journey to Jerusalem, and at the same time tries to situate it in the Johannine scheme. He asserts that Jesus passed through Perea in consonance with Mark 10:1, since he arrives at Jerusalem from Jericho (18:35, 19:1).[3] In the same vein, A. Plummer claims that "however long the time, and however circuitous the route, it is a journey from Capernaum to Jerusalem" which is described in great detail by Luke. He adds the historical truth of this section to it on the grounds of Luke's honesty that he does not attempt an accuracy concerning things that he did not find in his sources.[4] There are, however, some problems with this view. The travel narrative still has a Jewish environment which one can find neither in Perea nor in Samaria, and still more, Luke never mentions Perea or the Decapolis in his Gospel. Even the historical approach cannot so much as explain the reason why the Journey has lack of a topographical and chronological setting, as well as want of continuity and progression of the Journey.

On the other hand, with respect to multiple journeys, another attempt at explanation mentions that Luke made use of sources that contained several journeys of Jesus to Jerusalem. F. Schleiermacher contends that according to the Gospel of John, Jesus did not come from Galilee, when he sets off on his last journey to Jerusalem, and so the beginning (departure from Galilee) and the end in the Lukan central section do not deal with the same journey, namely, one originally connected journey. In other words, Luke has combined accounts of both journeys, harmonizing that departure from Galilee with this entry into Jerusalem.[5] His

3. Godet, *Luke*, 2:4, 6-8.

4. A. Flummer, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1964), 260-61.

5. F. Schleiermacher, *Luke: A Critical Study* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellin Press, 1993), 166-68. Dean Wickes also views the Journey as a composite of two distinct sources with Jesus' travel to Jerusalem. Dean R. Wickes,

main focus seems to be on reconciling the Lukan travel narrative with that of the Gospel of John. With a similar view, G. Ogg holds that Luke has two streams of tradition, each of which had its own account of Jesus' last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, and that he makes use of one of them (A) for writing 9:51-10:42 and the other (B) for writing 17:11-19:28. According to Ogg, Luke had only (B) in the beginning, which was used for writing 17:11-19:28, but somewhat later he became acquainted with another stream of tradition (A), which contains another account of Jesus' journey. In order to give his reader a fuller understanding of the person and message of Jesus, Luke makes use of (A) in writing 9:51-10:42. At the same time, when Luke acquires a record of the activities of Jesus, he edited it as is in 11:1-17:10 as such, and added this to 9:51-10:42 as a supplement. 11:1-17:10 contains largely a record of the activities of Jesus prior to his final journey during his ministry in Galilee, Phoenicia and the Decapolis. Luke integrated 11:1-17:10 into Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem because of his concern for chronology.[6] Having observed the notion that a threefold repetition of an act demands strong attention, G. Mackinley finds that in the Gospel there are also three narratives with Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem, as follows: 4:31-10:42, 11:1-14:24 and 14:25-20:18, each of which follows a chronological sequence. His attempt, as in Schleiermacher, also reflects his concern to remove discrepancies in chronology between the Gospel of John and the Synoptics.[7] C.J. Cadoux also finds three journeys as follows: 10:25-13:9 as one journey, 18:9-14 as the end of another, and the triumphal entry as yet a third. He explains the obscurity of the Lukan travel narrative by proposing that Luke intended to eliminate discrepancies between his view of Jesus' itinerary and Mark's view of it. Even he believes that all the Gospels, apart from Matthew, are historical in chronological order.[8] E.J. Cook, who follows Cadoux's point of view, finds four journeys in the travel narrative: 9:51-10:42, 11:1-13:9, 13:22-13:33 and 14:25-19:28. He also tries to harmonize the Lukan travel narrative and Johannine reports of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem: between Luke 9:51-10:42 and the unmentioned feast in John 5, Luke 11:1-13:9 and John 7, Luke 13:22-33 and John 10, and Luke 14:25-19:28 and the last Feast of Easter.[9] Irrespective of the sources, Luke himself speaks of only one departure toward Jerusalem and only one arrival at Jerusalem. In addition, Luke is not interested in the chronological and geographic details of the Journey, but rather

The Sources of Luke's Perean Section (Chicago: UCP, 1912), 36-37.

6. Ogg, "The Central Section of the Gospel according to St Luke," 39-53, here 40, 47-49 and 52-53.

7. G. Mackinley, "St. Luke's Threefold Narrative of Christ's Last Journey to Jerusalem," *The Interpreter*, 7 (1910/11), 260-78, especially 269, 270.

8. C.I. Cadoux, "The Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem," *Exp* 9/3 (1925), 175-192, here 176, 183.

9. E.J. Cook, "The Synoptic Indications of the Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem," *ExpTim* 41 (1929/30), 121-23.

simplifies the geographical outline in his Gospel and Acts. With this in mind, searching for where the events took place exactly is futile. What is important in the travel narrative is not a chronicle, but a logical succession in the history of salvation.

In recent years, inspired by Girard's work,[10] A.B. Baum takes up the historical interpretation, referring to the historical literature of Antiquity, so as to emphasize Luke's historical credibility. He mentions that the classical authors had a great deal of responsibility for conveying precise chronological and topographical information within their works. He sees the Lukan prologue as a historiographical and programmatical statement which contains his investigation method and the purpose of his work. He believes that Luke discarded the topographical details for the sake of his readers, not because of ignorance about the location of the passages. But by means of content and speeches in the section, Luke does correct the indefiniteness of time and space. Baum considers the travel narrative as a journey through Perea, since the population there consisted mostly of Jews, and Jesus had not yet ministered in their region. With respect to the relationship between Luke's and John's journey of Jesus to Jerusalem (John 7:10, 10:22, 11:17, 54), he mentions that, even though Luke's travel narrative is not inconsistent with the historical date in John, establishing a clear combination is not possible. For Baum the main emphasis of the travel narrative is not only on the preparation of the disciples for the time between the ascension and the parousia, but also on the judgment on the people that are not willing to follow Jesus on his last journey. As a result, he comes to a conclusion that the travel narrative in the Gospel of Luke is the work of a historian who, as historians of antiquity, provides a real and chronological narrative of Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem.[11] However, we must take into consideration the fact that Luke was influenced not only by classical historiography, but also by rhetoric and biblical historiography. Luke can be viewed as an historian of salvation history in the sense that he depicts the Jesus event in the light of historical facts, and portrays the way of Jesus and the Church in successive spheres of activity. Apart from Markan priority, Baum does not compare the affinity in the threefold and twofold tradition. Instead, he depends on the seventy missionaries, or Philip the Evangelist as an eyewitness mentioned in the Lukan prologue. On the basis of the We-passages (Acts 20:3-21:18), he conjectures that Luke may have had the opportunity to meet a lot of eyewitnesses, and hear from them during that journey. In so

10. L. Girard, *L'Évangile des voyages ou la section Lc. 9:51-18:14 de saint Luc* (Paris, 1951).

11. A.B. Baum, 'Lukas als Historiker der letzten Jesusreise' (PhD dissertation, Kampen, 1993), 26, 103-149, 192, 196, 211, 307-308, 310, 400-401. I am indebted to the analysis and evaluation of Noël concerning Baum's hypothesis, see Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9:51-19:28*, 140-82.

doing, he notes that Luke in particular met the Jerusalem deacon Philip in Acts 21:8-9. But he attempts to establish something to be based on too much speculation. Besides, the verb καθεξῆς in the Lukan prologue can be interpreted in the literary and logical sense rather than the chronological sense. Baum must also admit to the chronological and geographical indistinctness in the travel narrative. For instance, Luke never mentions the region Perea in his gospel, though Baum insists that Jesus first passed through Perea and traveled via Jericho to Jerusalem.

Luke, in the travel narrative, is largely not interested in the chronological and geographic details. Given Luke's considerable redactional effort in the utmost solemnity of 9:51, he keeps a theological intention and significance in view. At times Luke's feature of simplifying the geographical outline of his Gospel and of Acts,[12] underline this. In this respect, what we need to focus on in the travel narrative is his theological significance in the light of the history of salvation, rather than topographic precision. But it cannot be said that, for Luke, the travel narrative is not consistent with his prologue, since in the prologue the term καθεξῆς, puts its emphasis on a logical succession of the events of salvation according to God's design rather than a chronological sequence. Even so, the overall location of the travel narrative could have significance particularly at the level of the Gentile mission, in which case the reference to Samaria in the Journey probably foreshadows the Gentile mission inaugurated by Jesus.

2-2. Redaction Critical Approach

Attempts have been made to consider the travel narrative within a broader Lukan background as the salvation history. It tries to explain what Luke's theological concern in the Journey is, and how the theological themes found in the travel narrative serve to explain the purpose of the Gospel of Luke. With relevance to the survey of redaction criticism, Egelkraut treats four categories in detail: 1) The Journey Symbolizes Jesus' Passion Consciousness, 2) The Journey as Teaching, 3) The Journey Symbolizes Gentile Mission, and 4) The Journey Symbolizes Discipleship.[13] The above distinction can simply be merged into three categories: Christological Interpretations, Ecclesiological and Mission interpretations, and Combinations

12. He omitted in 5:12 Capernaum of Mk 2:1, in 6:17 Galilee and Perea of Mk 3:7-8, in 9:17 the region of Tyre and Sidon of Mk 6:45-8:26, and in 9:18 Cesarea Philippi of Mk 8:27.

13. Egelkraut, *Jesus' Mission to Jerusalem: A Redaction Critical Study of the Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke, Lk 9:51-19:48*, 44-59.

of the both. In what follows, I will examine and evaluate the redaction critical approach of the travel narrative in three categories.

2-2-1. Christological Interpretations

Firstly, the most remarkable treatment of this is H. Conzelmann's Christological explanation that the Journey is a symbolic journey presenting Jesus' awareness of his coming passion in which he, as 13:33 says,[14] must suffer. A fixed goal and no real change of place during the Journey show the changed emphasis in Jesus' ministry, which is his consciousness of the coming suffering in Jerusalem. He therefore does not travel in a different area, but in a different manner. In so doing, Luke expands the necessity of Jesus' passion into an entire period of his ministry, thereby exposing a concrete form within the narrative itself. In this respect, the Journey notices create the atmosphere, and function as a viable symbol of Jesus' resolved awareness of the necessity of his passion and death.[15] However, Conzelmann does not consider that the Journey is the way, not only to the passion, but also to the glorification, which is expressed by the ἀνάλημψις motif. Most scholars believe that the ἀνάλημψις in 9:51 has quite a broad meaning, in which case, the term refers to the whole chain of events, including Jesus' resurrection and ascension, as well as his passion and crucifixion.[16] Even though the theme of Jesus' suffering is very important in the central section, it is also announced that his glorification is the other side of the cross and resurrection. Jesus' exaltation is accentuated particularly in the Parable of the Pounds at the end of the Journey.

2-2-2. Ecclesiological and Mission Interpretations

Hoping to fill the gap between the Galilean and the Judean periods, B. Reicke argues that

14. For Conzelmann this verse summarizes Jesus' awareness of a divine mission which he must suffer in Jerusalem: "Nevertheless I must go on my way today and tomorrow and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem." (13:33).

15. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 62, 65, 197.

16. Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," 211; P.A. van Stempvoort, "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts," *NTS* 5 (1958-59), 30-42, here 33; J. Dupont, "'ΑΝΕΛΗΜΦΘΗ (Act. 1:2)," *NTS* 8 (1961-61), 154-57; Davies, "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," 164; Gill, "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages," 202; C.H. Talbert, "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lucan Christology," *NTS* 14 (1968), 259-71, here 264-65: Kariamadam, "The Composition and Meaning of the Lucan Travel Narrative (Lk 9:51-19:46), 180, contends that the various healings in connection with important journey notices in the Journey show Jesus' soteriological point.; T.L. Brodie, "The Departure for Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-56) as a Rhetorical Imitation of Elijah's Departure for the Jordan (2 Kgs 1:1-2:6)," *Bib* 70 (1989), 96-109, here 102-103; Creed, *Luke*, 141; Marshall, *Luke*, 150-52; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 162; Nolland, *Luke*, 535; Bock, *Luke*, 968.

Luke made use of material available to him, most of which was composed mainly of Q and peculiar traditions. Luke simply arranges the material in the biographical framework, inserting a few remarks on the Lord's going up to Jerusalem. Instruction and discussion in the Journey as ecclesiastic-didactic character relate intimately to both the internal and external problem of the Early Church: The internal problem is connected with the life of the congregations, and the external with relevance to the missionary task of the Church. In so doing, instruction of the apostles and discussion with opponents serves as leaders and teachers of the Christians, namely, how the Christians live in the world, and how they treat the opponents who occur in their missionary context. As a consequence, for Reicke, Luke, through the travel narrative, demonstrates how Jesus instructed his disciples and confronted his adversaries, for the sake of the Early Church.[17]

Viewing the term πορέυομαι as a *terminus technicus* for Jesus' progress toward Jerusalem, D. Gill focuses his attention largely on the travel notices with πορέυομαι. Through the analysis of the *Reisenotizen* (travel notices), he comes to the conclusion that Luke puts special accent on the difficulties of true discipleship, and links discipleship in his own time with Jesus' suffering. Jesus' journey to Jerusalem is the typical model of the Christian's life, and at the same time, an answer to the question as to why there are difficult things in Christian's path. Just as the way of his cross ended with his glorification, so the Christian's life though filled with difficult things will, as a result, lead to glorification for the Christian. Besides, the Journey as the second major theme conveys a necessity of the mission to the Gentiles, although the connection between the Journey and the mission is lacking in the sources. That is to say, for Luke Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem is the first step in the mission which will finally be continued to the ends of the earth.[18]

W.C. Robinson takes up the issue of the three divisions of Conzelmann expressing that Luke's view of *Heilsgeschichte* is composed of the time of Israel, the time of Jesus and the time of church. In the theological homogeneity of Luke-Acts and the continuity between Jesus and the Church, Luke's two works have the two-fold aspect, thereby presenting the second and third stages of the history of salvation, that is, the life of Christ and a history of the beginning of Christian missions. By means of the double use of ἀρχή and ἄρχεσθαι, this division is reinforced: referring to the beginning of Jesus' public ministry, and to the outpouring of the Spirit as the beginning of the ministry of the church, in which case, the

17. Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," 206-16, especially 207-210.
18. Gill, "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages," 199-221, here 214-15, 220.

two-fold division is in congruence with the general orientation of the Gospel "to Jerusalem" and of Acts "from Jerusalem." Luke, Robinson feels, makes the continuity of the history of salvation visualized by means of a way, ὁδος and δρόμος in the Gospel of Luke and Acts. Accordingly, "witnesses to God's revelation are witnesses of this ὁδος, from Jesus' εἴσοδος to his ἔξοδος."[19] He argues that the temporal condition for apostleship is denoted spatially by the condition of participation in Jesus' journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. In this view then, the travel narrative demonstrates that the disciples go in company with Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem.[20]

In contrast to Robinson's understanding of the Way motif, S. Brown lays his emphasis on the salvation of the individual rather than on the history of salvation. From his observation of πειρασμός, he elicits the conclusion that during all of Jesus' ministries, Satan's temptations continued, since it is clear in the lives of his disciples. In so doing, travelling together with Jesus on his Way represents the perseverance of the apostles, whereas turning aside from Jesus' Way denotes apostasy from discipleship. Presentation of "standing by" Jesus in the Gospel of Luke is changed to a devotion to the apostles in Acts. The changes in the meaning of the Way metaphor are linked to the proclamation of the Way of the word in Acts rather than to an historical person, place and geographical journey. Jerusalem's centrality is changed into a source of missionary journeys after playing the important role in a destination and a scene for Jesus' ἔξοδος, and in a stage of Jesus' resurrection and ascension. Likewise, the Way has a more independent and metaphorical meaning in Acts. The Way of the Lord now becomes Christianity itself as the journeying paradigm because of the new perspective on mission and on Jerusalem.[21] On the whole, he goes further by throwing the importance of Jerusalem into relief, and still more by showing the importance of the interregnum period as the place and time when journeying paradigms are changed.

2-2-3. Combinations of Christological and Ecclesiological Interpretations

Viewing Luke's thought about salvation history as the starting point for understanding the travel narrative, A. Denaux follows Robinson's contention that Luke sees the continuity of the history of salvation as a way. Even he thinks that the motif of hospitality and divine visits

19. W.C. Robinson, "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative (9:51ff)," *JBL* 79 (1960), 20-31.
20. Ibid., 20-31, especially 27, 30.
21. S. Brown, *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (Rome: Pontifical Bible Institute, 1969), 6-20, 114-130 and 131-145.

which prevail in Hellenistic and biblical literature have become the impetus in developing and extending the Lukan travel narrative from the Markan travel narrative (Mk 10:32; 11:1).[22] The problem of the Lukan travel narrative arises from the mission to the Gentiles in Acts, that is, if a Christian accepts the principle of freedom towards the Jewish Law, does the continuity of the history of salvation still remain secure? During the Journey, Jesus offers the eschatological salvation first to Israel, but Jesus is rejected by them. For this reason, the history of salvation has become a history of doom. On the other hand, Jesus encounters Gentiles, who, in contrast to Israel, accept his salvation offer. At this point, the acceptance and rejection of Jesus' salvation offer make the transition of salvation from Jews to Gentiles, thereby creating the scaffold of the mission to the Gentiles in Acts as well. In this regard, the travel narrative is ambivalent about the history of doom because of the rejection of the Jews, and the scaffold of the mission because of the acceptance by the Gentiles. Apart from this, according to Denaux, the travel narrative contains both the theme of ascension and of discipleship.[23]

J. Székely argues that in Luke, the journey is an image of Jesus' exodus towards death and glorification. In other words, the travel narrative is seen in terms of the christological interpretation that Jesus is indeed on his way to his destiny and his victory.[24] At the same time, the way is also a prefiguration, not only of the life of the church, but also of the Gentile mission. Along the way, the journey is the preparation of the disciples for the time of Jesus' absence after the ascension. On the course of the Journey, the disciples are prepared for authentic witness to Jesus' words and deeds. He elicits the mission theme from Jesus' presence in Samaria and a semi-pagan territory, but also from the number seventy (or seventy-two) at the beginning of the mission discourse. In his view, the number seventy (or seventy-two) is reminiscent of the seventy peoples of the earth in Gn 10, and the seventy-two elders of Nm 11:24-30. He also views the travel narrative, as we have seen from Reicke, as a manual for missionaries through its several instructions. During Jesus' Journey, the consequence of the conflict between Jesus and the leaders of the Jewish religion creates a

22. Denaux, "The Theme of Divine Visits and Human (In)hospitality in Luke-Acts. Its Old Testament and Graeco-Roman Antecedents," in ed., J. Verheyden, *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 255-279.

23. Denaux, "Het lucaanse reisverhaal (Lc. 9:51-19:44)," *CBG* 14 (1968), 214-242; 15 (1969), 464-501; idem, "The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Luke," 357-392; idem, "Old Testament Models for the Lukan Travel Narrative. A Critical Survey," in ed., C.M. Tuckett, *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997), 271-305; idem, "The Parable of the King-Judge (Lk 19:12-28) and its Relation to the Entry Story (Lk 19:29-44)," 35-57.

24. Székely, *Structure and Theology of the Lucan 'Intinerarium'*, 130-33, 159-61.

turning of salvation towards the Gentiles. In this respect, the travel narrative forms the turning point of the Way that the evangelist uses to expose the history of salvation. The conflict theme at the outset is confirmed in 9:51 with τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν, as well as in the great travel notices, and the Parable of Pounds (19:12-28).[25] In addition, Luke, as in the Greek *symposion* literature, contrasts sharply between Jesus' teaching and that of the Pharisees. The Lukan banquet motif functions as an important apologetical role, as it challenges the social importance of contemporary Judaism and its prohibition of common meals with Gentiles. The church later follows the practice of shared meals in accordance with Christ's example and divine guidance. According to Székely, Luke is fond of expressing Jesus as the wandering guest who offers salvation. In the travel narrative particularly he adds a more ethical theme to this idea. In so doing, the way in the Journey becomes understood as a manner of living that brings salvation to men, and still more demands a responsible attitude for men who try to build up a new society and realize salvation for each other. Jesus is the Guide who has originated this living way through his death and resurrection by his journeying among us. The way continues as if it reached Theophilus, and us.[26]

F. Noël takes up as the mention that Luke is inspired to create his travel narrative from the travel notices of Mark, which portrays Jesus' going up to Jerusalem. His basic conviction is that redaction critical exegesis is the best means to unveil the christological and ecclesiological scope of the Lukan travel narrative. In order to realize the theological, christological and ecclesiological consequences of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, the evangelist, Noël believes that Luke, by means of the disturbed genre, intentionally brings about a tension between form and content in the travel narrative. Jesus is on his way towards the ascension, which is described in 9:51 with ἀνάλημψις, and he ultimately reaches the ascension through his passion, death and resurrection.[27] This christological purpose is intrinsically connected to an ecclesiological intention. Jesus' instruction and parenesis in the travel narrative are crucial for the sake of the disciples of Jesus' day, and the Christian community in which Luke lives. Given the fact that the instruction in the Journey is given by the Lord for the period from his departure until his return at the end of times, it is naturally intertwined with the christological and ecclesiological theme. Jesus' teaching in the Journey stimulates discussion and conflict within his people so that they make a choice against, or in favour of him. Moreover, for Luke,

25. Ibid., 132-35, 136-40.
26. Ibid., 141-50, 168-70.
27. Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9:51-19:28*, 218-28.

Jesus' words and deeds have a fundamental openness towards non-Jewish people, starting with a Samaritan atmosphere (9:52-56). In so doing, Luke, through the travel narrative, invites his reader to follow Jesus on his way and learn his teaching.[28] After determining the delineation of the travel narrative,[29] Noël sets out the discussion of the double love command (10:25-28) in the travel narrative, so as to show that Luke is also influenced by Mark, and to seek the plausibility of some of the interpretations of the great interpolation as a whole. He claims in the course of this that believing that Q is behind 10:25-28 is unnecessary, and that Luke depends exclusively on Mark without reference to any other material which is available to him. On the whole, his emphasis is laid on methodology, in which both a diachronic and synchronic reading must be used in the Lukan travel narrative, since in his view, the diachronic reading has been underestimated in recent literature.[30] Yet, with respect to demonstrating that Luke could have composed 10:25-28 without reference to any other source or tradition, it is inconclusive. Even though it is disputed at the present time, a Q version of the love commandment or Luke's dependence on Mt 22:34-40 is largely viewed as Luke's source.[31]

2-3. Chiastic Structure

It has been proposed that chiastic (a b b' a') and concentric (a b c b' a') structures are the interpretation keys for the travel narrative. Proponents of the chiastic structure seek to unveil the purpose of the section, paying particular attention to similar themes, motifs and stories repeated within its structure. The centre of the chiasm is generally a turning point which contains the climax or the most important ideas, with the centre being parallel to the extremes. The survey shows that the use of chiasmus can play a mnemonic role, with aesthetic and conceptual function.[32] Proposals of chiasmus concerning the Lukan central section are extended in slightly different ways by F.O. Fearghail, R.S. Reid and Paul Borgman. I will briefly examine the chiastic structure approach to travel narrative as these proposals appeared.

Showing a chiasmus as the basic structure of the Journey, M.D. Goulder drives a wedge in the debate of an amorphous miscellany, such as incident, discourse, parable, polemic,

28. Ibid., 391-95.
29. Ibid., 249-328.
30. Ibid., 329-89, he mainly deals with source-criticism as a diachronic reading.
31. For more on defenders for this argument, see Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9:51-19:28*, 335 n. 1257, 337 n. 1262 and 339 n. 1268.
32. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, 81; Blomberg, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and The Outline of Luke's Central Section," 234.

miracle, apocalyptic, apothegm. According to him, the same chiastic pattern in Luke's arrangement of the geography constructs Luke-Acts as a whole: "Galilee, Samaria, Judaea, Jerusalem, the Resurrection, Jerusalem, Judaea, Samaria, the uttermost part of the earth."[33] In the central section, before and after the great interpolation (9:51-81:14) they implicitly display the presence of chiasmus in that the second prophecy of the passion in 9:44 corresponds to the third prophecy of the passion in 18:31, and that the setting of a child in the disciples' midst in 9:46 is parallel to Jesus' receiving the children in 18:15. However, a real chiasmus in the travel narrative does not appear until Luke's exposition of Deuteronomy in 10:25. The chiastic structure is built on two Deuteronomic pillars of the Shema in Dt. 6:5 and Decalougue in Dt. 5:16. They are respectively parallel to 10:25 and 18:18. The main chiasmus in the Journey is as follows:

a) 10:25	a') 18:18	The Question how to inherit eternal life,
b) 11:1	b') 17:5	Faithful Prayer, illustrated by
c) 11:14	c') 17:11	A Healing
d) 11:37	d') 16:14	Pharisaic Hypocrisy, illustrated by
e) 12:1	e') 16:14	The love of Money
f) 12:35	f') 15:1	Repentance
g) 13:10	g') 14:1	Rejection of Israel and Invitation to the Outcast.

In this way the travel narrative forms a chiasmus between the two Deuteronomic pillars: That is to say, the Great Commandments by which we shall inherit eternal life in 10:25 and 18:18. Amidst these are Jesus' teaching about faithful prayer, his healing, his warning against Pharisaic hypocrisy and their love of money, his teaching about repentance, and finally a contrast between the rejection of Israel and invitation to the outcast. The intersection of the chiasmus is 13:34 with Jesus' first lament over Jerusalem, thereby recalling Jesus' word when he comes to Jerusalem (19:41-44).[34]

C.H. Talbert who follows Goulder adds much more detail. He first divides it into eleven parts, beginning in 10:21:

a) 10:21-24	a') 18:15-17	Kingdom revealed to children,
b) 10:25-37	b') 18:18-20	Inheriting eternal life
c) 10:38-42	c') 18:9-14	De-emphasizing good works
d) 11:1-13	d') 18:1-8	God's willingness to answer prayer

33. M.D. Goulder, "The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey," in ed., F.L. Cross, *Studia Evangelica II* (TU, 87, Berlin, 1964), 195-202, here 196.
34. Ibid., 195-202.

e) 11:14-36	e') 17:11-37	Healing , Kingdom signs, judgment warning
f) 11:37-54	f') 17:1-10	Brotherly rebuke and meals
g) 12:1-48	g') 16:1-31	Hell, riches, and stewardship
h) 12:49-13:9	h') 14:25-15:32	Family loyalties, prudence, repentance
i) 13:10-17	i') 14:1-6	Sabbath healing, people more important than animals
j) 13:18-30	j') 14:7-24	Kingdom parables, banqueting, and the outcasts
k) 13:31-33	k') 13:34-35	Perishing in Jerusalem.

In the two passages of the second column, the sequence of chiasmus breaks easily. Moreover, he has considerable difficulty in binding together a pair which bears little resemblance to each other. For this reason, he attributes chiasmus structures in the central section to the final redactor of the work.[35]

Viewing the chiastic structure in the central section as the work of a pre-Lukan Jewish-Christian theologian, K.E. Bailey divides it into ten main sections, each of which include subdivisions and parallels:

a) 9:51-56	a') 19:10, 28-48	Jerusalem: eschatological events-day, death, fulfillment, judgment, salvation
b) 9:57-10:12	b') 18:35-19:9	Follow me: people come to Jesus, Jesus goes out
c) 10:25-42	c') 18:18-30	What shall I do to inherit eternal life?
d) 11:1-13	d') 18:1-14	Prayer: assurance, steadfastness, right approach
e) 11:14-32	e') 17:11-37	Sign and the (present/coming) kingdom: Son of man
f) 11:37-12:34	f') 16:9-31	Conflict with the Pharisees: money, heavenly treasure
g) 12:35-59	g') 16:1-8, 16	The kingdom is not yet and is now
h) 13:1-9	h') 14:12-15:32	The call of the kingdom to Israel (and outcasts)
i) 13:10-20	i') 14:1-11	The nature of the kingdom: love and not law-Sabbath healings, humility
j) 13:22-35		Jerusalem: eschatological events-salvation, judgment, vision, fulfillment, death, day.

He observes that, of the material in the travel narrative, about 90% constructs an inverted outline, with a few exceptions in some short pieces of tradition. It is striking that by means of repetition, Luke underlines Jerusalem on the outside and at the center of the so-called the Jerusalem Document. According to him, death and the eschatological day reach the acme of the document. The theme of humility is stressed in the second half of the inverted structure, introducing the theme from a discussion of humility in 14:7-11, concluding with the remark that, "For everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be

35. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, 51-56, later extends the chiasmus structures to the entire travel narrative. See Talbert, *Reading Luke. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*, 111-112.

exalted." The shift of such an emphasis also occurs in section h), the call of the kingdom to Israel and to outcasts. He comes to the conclusion that the so-called Jerusalem Document plays a significant role in delineating blocks of material and determining their main themes, which result in the considerable theological reflection of the author.[36]

C.L. Blomberg first of all disagrees with Talbert's contention that the chiastic structure in the central section is the work of an editor, and he argues instead that Luke used not only a chiastically structured parable source, independent of the other gospel strata, but also preserved its sequence of material whilst embedding it into other sources. In other words, Luke depends on a very early tradition that had a chiastic structure in order to preserve accurate transmission. Along the same line, inspired by Bailey's hypothesis, he makes up a chiastic structure on the basis of ten paired parables: The Good Samaritan-The Pharisee and The Tax-Collector (10:25-37 and 18:9-14); The Friend at Midnight-The Judge and The Widow (11:5-8 and 18:1-8); The Rich Fool-The Rich Man and Lazarus (12:13-21 and 16:19-31); The Barren Fig Tree-The Prodigal Son (13:6-9 and 15:11-32). Luke 14:7-24 then, forms the core of a chiasmus of Jesus' parables. His entire chiasmus in Luke's central section is as follows:

10:25-37	18:9-14	controversy	(lawyer-10:25; self-righteous-18:9)
11:5-8	18:1-8	discipleship	(disciples-11:1, 17:22; cf. 11:5, 18:1)
11:11-13	17:7-10	discipleship	(disciples-11:1, 17:5; cf. 11:11, 17:7)
12:13-21	16:19-31	controversy	(one of multitude-12:13; Pharisees-16:14)
12:25-38	16:1-13	discipleship	(disciples-12:22, 16:1)
13:1-9	15:1-32	controversy	(some present-13:1; Pharisees-15:2)
14:1-6	14:28-33	controversy	(Pharisees-14:1; great multitudes-14:25)
14:7-24		controversy	(Pharisees-14:1).

In the entire chiastic structure, it is very striking that each pair of parables has a particular audience, such as disciples, opponents, and some of the crowd. His general view concerning this chiasmus is that it serves as a mnemonic purpose rather than profound theological or aesthetic purpose, since a parable document would not have been a narrative with coherence.[37]

Having considered the problem with a topical outline, F.Ó. Fegarghail views the travel notices as a literary device providing a journey framework for the travel narrative, as starting point for the Journey framework. He suggests the travel notices have a seven-part

36. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant. A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*, 79-85.
37. Blomberg, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and The Outline of Luke's Central Section," 240-48.

arrangement that offer the Journey a principle of arrangement: 9:51, 10:38, 11:53-54, 13:22, 14:25, 17:11 and 18:31. Along this line, Fegarghail builds a seven-part structure for the travel narrative, in which 13:22-14:24 becomes the central position in the structure.

a) 9:51-10:37	a') 18:31-19:48	Introduction and Conclusion of the travel narrative
b) 10:38-11:54	b') 17:11-18:30	Acceptance and Rejection and the Kingdom of God
c) 12:1-13:21	c') 14:25-17:10	Readiness for Judgment and Discipleship and Repentance
d)	13:33-14:24	The Universality of Salvation.

He seeks for thematic similarities between the paired parallels, but the correspondence in each parallel paired occurs under several themes, not a single theme. The thematic correspondences between 9:51-10:37 and 18:31-19:48, for example, come into being within diverse topics: Jerusalem as the goal of the journey (9:51; 18:31; 19:11, 28, 29-48), Jesus' preaching of the kingdom (9:57-62; 19:11-28), his rejection (9:53; 10:13,25; 19:11-28, 39, 41-44, 47), acceptance (9:57-62; 18:35-43; 19:1-10:48), Jesus' royal (cf. 9:60, 62; 10:1; 19:11-28, 29-38), prophetic (9:54, 62; 19:45-46) and teaching roles (10:25; 19:39). In his view, the central verses, 13:22-14:24 provide the prospect of salvation for the Gentiles, and include a number of Lucan themes, connecting the centre of the Journey to its extremes: Jerusalem as the goal of the journey (9:51; 13:33; 19:28, 29-48), Jesus' healing activity (13:33; 18:35-43), his prophetic status (cf. 9:54; 13:33; 19:45-46), his lament over the city (13:34-35; 19:41-44), the allusion to Ps 118:26 (13:35; 19:38), the temple (13:35 19:45-48) and Jesus' death in Jerusalem (13:33; 19:47-48). For him, such correspondences reveal that the material was disposed with a chiastic order under an atmosphere of emphasis on the unity of the section.[38]

R.S. Reid basically sees the gospels as literary works written by means of rhetorical conventions of a strategy of discourse that enables the readers to discover the intentions of its implied author. In his view, the author's voice, the fictive argument of his narrative, can virtually be found in the reasons why he tells the various stories, and in the order that he tells them. In light of this, he analyses Luke's journey to Jerusalem, with expecting something to give help to preachers. In order to overcome the weaknesses of chiastic inversion as the compositional technique, he employs step parallelism as an aesthetically acceptable alternative to inversion, thereby grouping materials into thematic sub-collections. His chiastic

38. F.Ó. Fegarghail, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts. A Study of the Role of Lk 1:1-4:44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), 48-61.

construal of the Journey to Jerusalem Metanarrative[39] is as follows:

a) 9:51-56	a') 19:28-48	The decision to go to Jerusalem and Jesus arrives in Jerusalem
b) 9:57-62	b') 19:11-27	Three Sayings for would-be followers and Parable of the three Retainers
c) 10:1-20	c') 19:1-10	Peace or Judgment Pronounced over Houses and Cities
d) 10:21-24	d') 18:31-43	The Hidden, the Revealed, and the Ability to see it
e) 10:25-42	e') 18:15-30	On inheriting Eternal Life
f) 11:1-13	f') 18:1-14	Teaching on Prayer
g) 11:14-36	g') 17:11-37	Evidences of the Kingdom among you
h) 11:37-54	h') 17:1-10	Judgments against Religious Hypocrisy, and Occasions for Stumbling VS. Occasions for Faith
i) 12:1-41	i') 16:16-31	Collected Teachings for Disciples and Crowds
j) 12:42-48	j') 16:1-15	Parable of the Shrewd Manager
k) 12:49-53	k') 15:1-32	On the Necessity of Repentance
l) 13:10-30	l') 14:1-24	Eschatological Reversals in Stories and Sayings and in the Dinner Party
m) 13:31-35		Lamenting Jerusalem.

After framing a chiastic structure of the Journey, he, according to the fictive argument of Luke's literary strategy, examines three sayings for would-be followers in 9:57-62 in light of Parable of the three Retainers in 19:11-27. Both the sayings stories and the parable answer the question "what is required of a follower?" That is to say, a follower must be willing to take great risk in the business at hand, or discard unsuitable things for his service. In this case, both are parallel with Deut 1:34-40 and 31:1-13. The respective sayings of Deuteronomy contain the announcement to the generation of Israelites that they are not qualified to enter into the promised land because of their lack of trust in God, and include the confirmation of the promise that the Lord will go before them and destroy all his enemies. For this reason, Reid is convinced that Luke has employed the Deuteronomic story to frame his travel narrative in that he contrasts boldness and fearfulness among followers, and also promises to destroy all enemies. Finally, he elicits help for the preacher from the vantage point in which theology of a text is viewed in two ways, the advantage that deals with the gospels as biographers of Jesus, and histories of Christianity. That is, on the one hand Jesus' pronouncements are truisms providing for a variety of situations, on the other Jesus' sayings and stories are structured rhetorically for "an argument intended to thematize the essential

39. Metanarrative used in critical theory refers to a grand overarching account, or all-encompassing story. The story of the whole Bible, for instance, can be called Metanarrative, a grand narrative in terms of the history of salvation.

truth."[40]

Rather than simply on reading, Paul Borgman, in studying the Gospel of Luke, puts his emphasis on hearing. He seeks to become the ideal audience as one who hears the story through circular pattern. He finds a reversed parallelism (1-2-3, then 3'-2'-1') that is composed of nine themes in the travel narrative. According to him, the chiasmus has more to do with narrative emphasis than an aid to memory, and the ancients were very familiar with it. The structure of the reversed parallelism that he suggests is as follows:

a) 9:51-10:24	a') 18:35-19:44	Peace to This House and The Things that Make for Peace
b) 10:25-42	b') 18:15-34	"What Must I Do to Inherit Eternal Life?"
c) 11:1-13	c') 18:1-14	What to Pray For, and How
d) 11:14-32	d') 17:20-37	Neither Signs nor Status: Hear the Word, Do It
e) 11:33-12:12	e') 17:1-19	Look Inside Yourself, and Do the Word
f) 12:13-34	f') 16:1-31	Relinquish Possession-or the Spirit of Posssessing
g) 12:35-48	g') 15:1-32	Relinquish Privilege: Use It for God's Purposes
h) 12:49-13:17	h') 14:1-35	Relinquish Family and Religious Rules
i) 13:18-19	i')13:31-35	Kingdom and Jerusalem
j) 13:23-30		Be Saved? Strive to Enter.

The centre of this frame is "strive to enter God's kingdom" in 13:23-30, thereby presenting the story's focus as a kingdom of peace. Within the Journey he finds a spiraling repetition "in which something from the prior passage is qualified or expanded by which follows."[41] In so doing, "the buried questions or possibilities of the first sequence come to the surface in the next one."[42]

The chiasm hypotheses, however, have two problems in particular. Firstly, it is impossible to make a full-scale symmetric structure of the travel narrative. In each case of the chiastic structure, it always lacks accurate parallels. The relationship between them is irrelevant, general and thematically indefinite. For instance, the relationship between the three parables of chapter 15 and three verses in 13:6-9 under the title, 'conversion' are very questionable

40. Reid, "On Preaching 'Fictive Argument'; A Reader-Response Look At A Lukan Parable And Three Sayings On Discipleship," 13-31.

41. Borgman, *The Way According to Luke: Hearing the Whole Story of Luke-Acts*, 8-9.

42. Ibid., 10. See also 7-15. Apart from this, the following scholars defend a chiastic structure: Nolland, *Luke*, 530-31; M.D. Hamm, "The Freeing of the Bent Woman and the Restoration of Israel: Luke 13:10-17 as Narrative Theology," *JSNT* 31 (1987), 23-44; H.K. Farrell, "The Structure and Theology of Luke's Central Section," *TJ* 7 (1986), 33-54; Kariamadam, "The Composition and Meaning of the Lucan Travel Narrative (Lk 9:51-19:46)," 179-98; Matera, "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:46): A Conflict with Israel," 57-77.

and disputable.[43] Secondly, they are inclined to fall into the danger of pure subjectivism because they restrict themselves to thematic agreements. Marshall points out that such attempts have the danger of forcing the text, and Fitzymyer also shows a rather sceptical attitude towards the chiastic structure expressed by Talbert.[44] With respect to a chiastic structure, the main question is, "could it possibly be understandable for the reader?" in a situation when the Gospel is simply read aloud in a temporal succession from the outset to the end. Nevertheless, the chiastic structures give us in reality considerable insight into understanding the Journey. If we direct attention to these frames that Luke gives, we can obviously figure out the theological significance of the Journey better.

2-4. Old Testament Models

Driven by the OT, scholars strive to settle the tension between the form and content in the travel narrative in many ways based on the OT: Moses, Elijah, Davidic King, Suffering Servant, exodus, and the like. What is quite obvious to the scholars who investigate the use of the OT in Luke-Acts[45] is that the NT writer has consciously used the OT, as well as had been influenced unconsciously by the OT. In line with C.F. Evans's 'Christian Deuteronomy' that

43. See the chiastic structures of Gould, Bailey, Talbert, Blomberg, Farrel, and Schweizer.

44. See Marshall, *Luke*, 402; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 96-97.

45. See D.L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern, Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 49-51; idem, "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts: Christology and Mission," in ed., D.J. Lull, *SBL 1990 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 494-511; J.T. Sanders, "The Prophetic Use of the Scriptures in Luke-Act," in ed., C.A. Evans and W.F. Stinespring, *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 191-98; Thomas L. Brodie, "Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative," in ed., Earl Richard, *New Views on Luke and Acts* (Collegeville: MN: Liturgical Press, 1990), 78-85; F. Bovon, "The Role of the Scriptures in the Composition of the Gospel Accounts: The Temptations of Jesus (Lk4:1-13 par.) and the Multiplication of the Loaves (Lk 9:10-17 par.)," in ed., G. O'Collins and G. Marconi, *Luke and Acts* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 26-31; J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts," in ed., E.H. Lovering, *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 524-38; C.A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 13-44, 47; Brigid, C. Frein, "Narrative Predictions, Old Testament Prophecies and Luke's Sense of Fulfillment," *NTS* 40 (1994), 22-37 J.B. Green, "The Problem of a Beginning: Israel's Scriptures in Luke 1-2," *BBR* 4 (1994), 61-86; R.L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995), 41-80; Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup, 141; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 18-28, 112-116, 210; D.W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 2000), 4-10, 17; K.D. Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (London: T & T Clark International, 2005), 1-34; Gail.R. O'Day, "The Citation of Scripture as a Key to Characterization in Acts," in ed., P. Gray and Gail R. O'Day, *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 207-221.

in the travel narrative Luke's purpose was to outline a Christian Deuteronomy,[46] scholars expand and develop his hypothesis, or proffer other suggestions from other angles.

At the outset, Evans begins with 9:51-53 and 10:1, showing that they are in a situation analogous to that of Moses who on his way to the Promised Land sends out one emissary from each tribe to spy the country. Furthermore, Jesus' sending out seventy (two) missionaries in 10:1 is also juxtaposed with the seventy elders who were appointed by Moses to share his work. He, above all, wants to explain the reason why Luke puts Jesus' passion, resurrection and ascension in Jerusalem just after a solemn biblical introduction with ἀνάλημψις, and also inserts the collection of instructions into Jesus' journeying to Jerusalem. In his view, this is largely because Luke had recourse to the Jewish apocalyptic work, Ἀνάλημψις Μωυσέως that is probably a fragment of an original "Testament of Moses" written between 7 and 29 AD. Therefore, Luke with some ingenuity must have compiled the heterogeneous blocks out of the originally independent pericopae. Evans shows the possibility of Christian Deuteronomy through the following assumption: If a Pharisaic Quietist of the first century A.D. could take up his hopes and teaching in a book as a supplement to Deuteronomy, then it is possible that a Christian evangelist has also ordered his material with his own view as a Christian Deuteronomy: A view that it is self-evident for him to identify Jesus with a prophet like Moses in situations that form both correspondences and contrasts between the Gospel and the Law. Taking all that into consideration, Evans contends that the sequence of passages in the central section is intimately parallel to a selection of texts from the book of Deuteronomy as follows:[47]

1. Dt 1:1-46	Lk 10:1-3, 17-20	Sending forerunners
2. Dt 2-3:22	Lk 10:4-16	Inhospitable kings and cities
3. Dt 3:23-4:10	Lk 10:21-24	Special revelation
4. Dt 5:1-6:25	Lk 10:25-27	The summary of the Law
5. Dt 7:1-26	Lk 10:29-37	Relations with foreigners
6. Dt 8:1-3	Lk 10:38-42	Spiritual food
7. Dt 8:4-20	Lk 11:1-13	No privation
8. Dt 9:1-10, 11	Lk 11:14-26	Casting out wicked people and demons
9. Dt 10:12-11:32	Lk 11:27-36	Keeping God's word, light, and frontlets
10. Dt 12:1-16	Lk 11:37-12:12	Clean and unclean
11. Dt 12:17-32	Lk 12:13-34	Richness toward God
12. Dt 13:1-11	Lk 12:35-53	Reward/punishment for faithfulness/unfaithfulness

46. C.F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," 37-53.

47. This parallel table is what Denaux simply summarizes. See Denaux, "Old Testament Models for the Lukan Travel Narrative," 300.

13. Dt 13:12-18(32)	Lk12:54-13:5	Communal judgment and repentance
14. Dt 14:28	Lk 13:6-9	Bearing fruit
15. Dt 15:1-18	Lk 13:10-21	Sabbath release from debt, slavery, disease
16. Dt 16:1-17	Lk 13:22-35	Feasting in Jerusalem
17. Dt 17:8-18:22	Lk 14:1-14	Food for Levites/banquet parables
18. Dt 20:1020	Lk 14:15-35	Excuses from battle and banquet
19. Dt 21:15-22:4	Lk 15:1-32	Father and son, restoration of the lost
20. Dt 23:15-24:4	Lk 16:1-18	Slaves, usury, and divorce
21. Dt 24:6-25:3	Lk 16:19-18:8	Fair treatment of poor and oppressed
22, Dt 26:1-19	Lk 18:9-14	Obeying the Law

Through this parallel, Evans holds that it is clear that Luke presents it in accordance with a Deuteronomic sequence on the grounds of the general similarity of subject matter, and the coincidence of order. In spite of the fact that there are many followers of Evans' Christian Deuteronomy,[48] Blomberg casts doubt on Evans' hypothesis, with three crucial questions: Are there parallels in ancient literature to this approach? How close are the parallels in reality which he has connected? And, does he exclude other suggestive parallels which can be elicited between Luke and Deuteronomy? From his survey of early Jewish midrashim on Deuteronomy and other ancient Jewish literature, such as *Debarim Rabbah* and *Sipre*, and *Pesikta Rabbati*, he could not find other evidences to back up Evans' parallels. Moreover, a few of the verbal parallels which Evans denotes, Blomberg argues, after observing fourteen verbal parallels, are highly suggestive and vague except for some cases.[49]

M.D. Goulder basically assumes that Luke relies on Matthew, trying to prove the secondary character of the Q sayings in Luke.[50] Along this line, he adopts the calendar or lectionary thesis so as to explain Luke's changes in the sequence of Matthew. In his view, the travel narrative follows the Jewish cycle of lectionary readings for both the Torah as a fixed cycle and *haptarah* as additional readings which consist of the Prophets and the Writings. He argues that the Torah was read every year, and that there were also five alternative cycles of the Prophets (the Fomer Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve), as well as a

48. Leon Morris, *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries* (London: Tyndale, 1964), 53; C.H. Cave, "Lazarus and the Lukan Deuteronomy," *NTS* 15 (1968-69), 319-25; J. Bligh, *Christian Deuteronomy (9-18)* (New York: St. Paul Publications, 1970), 6; Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*, 100, 129, 226; James A. Sanders, "The Ethic of Election in Luke's Great Banquet Parable," in ed., J. Crenshaw and J.T. Willis, *Essays in Old Testament Ethics* (New York: KTAV, 1974), 245-71, here 254; Sharon H. Ringe, "Luke 9:28-36: The Beginning of an Exodus," *Semeia* 28 (1983), 83-99; R.W. Wall, "'The Finger of God': Deuteronomy 9:10 and Luke 11:20," *NTS* 33 (1987), 144-150.

49. Blomberg, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and The Outline of Luke's Central Section," 223-28. See also Denaux, "Old Testament Models for the Lukan Travel Narrative," 277-80.

50. John Drury believes that in this section Luke is less dependent on Matthew than Deuteronomy. Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (London, Darton: Longman & Todd, 1976), 138-64.

number of cycles of the Writings (the work of the Chronicler, the Wisdom of ben-Sira, a series of shorter books to form a cycle beginning with Daniel and end with Proverbs). The Lukan travel narrative, he contends, generally follows the Torah cycle of Deuteronomy.
His set of parallels is as follows:[51]

1. Dt 1:1-3:22	Lk 9:51-10:24	Sending forerunners
2. Dt 3:23-7:11	Lk 10:25-11:13	Summary of Law, including prayer
3. Dt 7:12-11:25	Lk 11:14-54	Stiffneckedness of Israel
4. Dt 11:26-16:17	Lk 12:1-13:9	Apostasy vs. prosperity
5. Dt 16:18-21:9	Lk 13:10-14:24	Rejection of God's message, banquet/battle excuses
6. Dt 21:10-25:19	Lk 14:25-16:13	Same sequence of parallels as Evans
7. Dt 26:1-29:9	Lk 16:14-17:4	(Parallels break down)
8. Dt 29:10-30:20	Lk 17:20-18:14	Repentance or else wrath
9. Dt 31:1-30	Lk 18:15-43	The new generation
10. Dt 32:1-52	Lk 19:1-20:18	Threats of destruction

Goulder feels that the travel narrative is designed to prepare the Feast of Easter and the baptismal ceremony as a long catechetical instruction. Furthermore, the Lukan central section intends to teach the converts as well as to remind other Christians of the nature of their vocation. But his set of parallels introduces very general themes which reappear regularly throughout many parts of Scripture. Besides, many scholars pointed out that Goulder's use of midrash as narrative creation is inadequate, since merely quotation and allusion of the OT in the NT do not automatically make them midrashic. The midrash as an interpretation of the OT has solely comments, embellishments and applications.[52] Even C.A. Evans argues that "Luke has neither rewritten nor incorporated Deuteronomy. At most he has alluded to portions of it, followed the order of its content, and selected dominical tradition that touches on larger theological issues with which Deuteronomy and its interpreters were concerned."[53]

Being sufficiently aware of the weaknesses of the former approaches, D.P. Moessner tries to solve the dissonance of form from content, not in the book of Deuteronomy as such, but in two important Deuteronomistic patterns or motifs. For him the analogy to Deuteronomy appears to be the best, since there is a great block of teaching in the form of a journey to the

51. This summary form of Goulder's parallels is provided by Blomberg, see Blomberg, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and The Outline of Luke's Central Section," 230. Cf. Denaux, "Old Testament Models for the Lukan Travel Narrative," 300-301.
52. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, 22-23.
53. C.A. Evans, "Luke 16:1-18 and the Deuteronomy Hypothesis," in ed., C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 121-139, here 123.

Promised Land. In his view, up until now there have been no attempts to relate the tension between the teaching and the course of the journey in Deuteronomy, to that of the Lukan travel narrative. In this respect, he undertakes to establish patterns which can function as the literary and theological model for both the teaching and the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem. Jesus, the prophet like Moses (Deut. 18:15-19), is a teacher who announces a new Torah paralleled with Torah of the old (Deut. 1-26).[54] He compares Moses and Jesus by means of the four features in the prophetic vocation:[55] a) The vocation comes into existence in a vision to be the mediator of God's words on the Exodus journey by a voice out of the cloud. Versus a') Jesus is also called to mediate on the mountain by a voice out of the cloud. b) The persistent stubbornness of the people in hearing the voice in the image of the molten calf. Versus b') Jesus faces a stubborn generation who rejects to hear to the voice from the cloud. c) For this reason, Moses has a suffering journey to death for the people. Versus c') Jesus is also destined to suffer for his people. d) Only the renewed people of the land, namely, the children of the mountain will enter the Promised Land. Versus d') likewise, the children who are willing to embrace the authority of the prophet receive the blessing of the covenant promised to Abraham.[56] Moessner argues that when Luke structures his travel narrative, he was dependent on the Deuteronomistic view of Israel's history:[57] a) The history of Israel is one long, persistent story of a "stiff-necked", rebellious and disobedient people. b) God sent his messengers, the prophets to mediate and instruct them his will, and to exhort them to repentance lest they bring upon themselves judgment and destruction. c) Nevertheless, Israel rejected all these prophets, even persecuting and killing them out of their stubbornness. d) Therefore, Israel's God had rained destruction upon them in 722 and 587 B.C.E., and would destroy them in a similar way if they did not heed his word. On these grounds, he asserts that the Deuteronomistic view of Israel's history offers the conceptual world in which one can envisage a cohesive depiction of a prophet rejected by Israel in the travel narrative. In so doing, the Lukan portrait of Jesus in the Journey becomes a travelling guest prophet on his way to Jerusalem, bearing the dynamic presence of God.[58] He strives to show that in the

54. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*, 30.
55. Ibid., 48-50. See D.E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1983).
56. Ibid., 60-69.
57. The idea originated with O.H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1967), 60-64.
58. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative,*

travel narrative, Luke integrates the Deuteronomistic view of Israel's history and the Moses typology, that is, the rejected prophet and the prophet like Moses. He goes so far as to underline that the fourfold scheme of the prophet like Moses of Deuteronomy extends to Luke's entire work:[59] a) The calling to a journey mission: Jesus (Lk 9:29-35); Moses-Stephen (Acts 7:30-32, 38); Paul (Acts 9:3-19; 22:6-11; 26:12-18). b) The call to suffering and rejection by the whole people of Israel: Jesus (Lk 9:18-50); Moses-Stephen (Acts 7:23-29); Paul (Acts 9:16-30; 22:18; 26:17). c) The journey is a mission of salvation to the central place of all Israel (Jerusalem): Jesus (Lk 9:51-19:44); Moses-Stephen (Acts 7:7, 17, 35-46); Paul (Acts 19:21-28:31). d) The journey ends with rejection by a stubborn nation, and at the same time the salvation is given to the children of Abraham, to the outcasts, and to the nations of the world: Jesus (Lk 14:44-49, Acts 1:8); Moses-Stephen (Acts 7:42-50); Paul (Acts 21:27-28:31).

In spite of giving great insight into the Lukan travel narrative, important problems arise from Moessner's arguments. First of all, it is doubtful whether Luke could have found the fourfold portrait of the prophetic mission of Moses in Deuteronomy. It appears to be a concept in the mind of Moessner rather than in that of Luke. Moreover, the Deuteronomistic view of Israel's history which is brought over from Steck by Moessner, shows a lot of weakness in using it as a standard. Such a hypothesis gets no support from the whole of the OT, and the features of the Deuteronomistic view of Israel's history by O.H. Steck occur outside Deuteronomy. It is even doubtful whether Luke perceived it in the same way that Steck does.

W.M. Swartley above all finds that the Synoptic Gospels take a common structure that forms a Galilean section, a Journey to Jerusalem section, and a Jerusalem section. Israel's fundamental faith traditions have framed the content and structure of Jesus' story in the Synoptics.[60] In turn, the exodus and Sinai tradition have influenced the Galilean sections. The temple tradition has a bearing on the Jerusalem section, and the tradition of the Kings has appeal for the Passion story. The conquest tradition in Exodus and Deuteronomy that God is with the people and moves with them to the Promised Land, influences the synoptic travel narrative.[61] In essence he agrees with Evans, Drury, Goulder and Moessner that the travel

---

81-257.

59. Ibid., 306.

60. W.M. Swartley, *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels. Story Shaping Story* (Peabody: Hendrickson Pubishers, 1994), 1, 4-5.

61. Ibid., 10-21, 32-43, and 95-153.

narrative as a Christian Deuteronomy follows the content of the instruction of Deuteronomy during Israel's journey towards the Promised Land. Six themes which compose of three couplets, he contends, pervade the narrative. Luke unveils Jesus as follows: Jesus as journeying banquet guest and rejected prophet; the journey to peace and justice; the journey leads to conquest and judgment of evil. For him, these themes present the influence of the Deuteronomic entrance and conquest traditions. It is striking that the first theme in each couplet is connected to the next. That is to say, the journeying Guest/Banquet Lord brings the gospel of peace in the sense that he destroys Satan and his arsenal of evil. The rejected is also the prophet of justice in that his word becomes judgment on those who reject the banqueting guest and the gospel of peace. This influence of Israel's way to land-conquest traditions is also continued in Acts in that the spread of the Gospel into the Gentile world presents the ruin of Satanic power. Given all these features, Swartley feels, it is obvious that the travel narrative has been influenced by Israel's way to land-conquest traditions.[62]

Swartley's reductionism regarding the common threefold structure in the Synoptic Gospels raises many problems about its validity. He is not even consistent in structuring the material. He refers to a "Galilee-journey-Jerusalem"-structure, and later to the "Galilee-Jerusalem"-structure or "Galilee-journey-Jerusalem-Return to Galilee". It seems absurd to equate Jesus' journey to Jerusalem with the journey to the Promised Land and the conquest of the Promised Land. If in the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus is the divine warrior, as alleged by Swartley, the real victory is achieved in his death and resurrection, not on the way to Jerusalem in the travel narrative.

In a recent monograph on the Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts, M.L. Strauss' evaluation of the Deuteronomy hypothesis is surely right in that Moessner lays too much emphasis on the Moses typology, and he connects the motif of the rejected prophet too exclusively with the Book of Deuteronomy too. In contrast to Moessner, he claims that Luke portrays Jesus' role and destiny in terms of the entire prophetic tradition, such as Moses, Elijah, David and Suffering Servant. In addition, for Luke, Jesus' approach of and entrance into Jerusalem have royal and Davidic implications. He believes that the travel narrative is modeled on Deutero-Isaiah rather than the book of Deuteronomy. The exodus memory in the Book of Consolation (Isa 40-55) has gone through a prophetic transformation and reinterpretation, an experience which the imagery of the exodus from Egypt is used to picture the eschatological return of the exiles from Babylon to Jerusalem. In so doing, this return is described as a new exodus to the

62. Ibid., 126-145.

Promised Land. The Lukan exodus motif is in reality made on the basis of Isaiah's diction of the eschatological new exodus as the primary OT motif. With this understanding, Strauss asserts that the travel narrative is a new exodus where Jesus as the Isaianic eschatological deliverer guides God's people, defeating the forces of sin and Satan. Moreover, in Isa 11, rather than in Isa 55:3, the coming Davidic King performs the eschatological regathering. According to Strauss, Isaiah's portrait of eschatological salvation pervades Luke's work. In comparison with the first exodus in which Yahweh leads his people out of Egypt to the Promised Land, the Isaianic new exodus is the glorious return of Yahweh to his people, thereby gathering and leading them. For him the quotation of Isa 40:3-5 in Lk 3:4-6 is meaningful for the universalist tune for the Gentile mission, and the reference to a road prepared for the coming of the Lord who brings salvation. This description is certainly parallel with the Isaianic description of the new exodus that through Yahweh's messianic envoy he comes to his people to deliver them. Just as the goal of the new exodus in Isaiah is Jerusalem where Yahweh's glory will be revealed as well reign as king, so Jesus' goal in Luke is also Jerusalem where he fulfills his ἔξοδος, his death and exaltation. As a result, the new exodus which is a time of salvation inaugurated with the coming of Jesus, functions as a metaphor for the eschatological time of salvation throughout Luke, not only the Lukan travel narrative.

Even though the term ἔξοδος refers to death,[63] it is doubtful that the term also presents the subsequent events of resurrection and ascension which take place in Jerusalem. What is clear is that the term ἔξοδος refers to Jesus' death, as texts like 2 Pet 1:15; Wis 3:2; 7:6 and Jos. Ant. 4, 8, 2, 189 show. But in the biblical traditions, particularly the LXX, the term ἔξοδος, as S.H. Ringe remarks,[64] refers to the beginning event of that journey, not to its conclusion. On the other hand, Nolland sheds light on the understanding of the term's meaning, suggesting that in the correlation between ἔξοδος and ἀνάλημψις, they both convey the end of the earthly career of Jesus in different ways: Where the ἔξοδος puts the accent on his death, the ἀνάλημψις focuses on his ascension to glory.[65] In addition, it is difficult to attest to the fact that Luke would be influenced by only one tradition, since the motif of the exodus permeates throughout the OT.

63. For those taking this viewpoint, see J. Mánek, "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke," *NovT* 2 (1958), 8-23; S.R. Garrett, "Exodus from Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24," *CBQ* 52 (1990), 652-680.
64. Ringe, "Luke 9:28-36: The Beginning of An Exodus," 94.
65. Nolland, *Luke*, 500. See also the same author's "Feuillet," *RevThom* 77 (1977), 191.

One needs to search for as many things in the OT as possible that possibly influenced the Lukan travel narrative, such as vocabulary, motifs, characters, or models. Moreover, the Christological models (prophet, king, suffering servant, etc.) cannot be confined only to the travel narrative, but rather they saturate the whole Gospel of Luke, not to mention the Synoptic Gospels. Even R.F. O'Toole enumerates eight themes as Lukan Christology: Jesus as Human Being, Jesus as Prophet, Jesus as Savior, Jesus as Servant of Yahweh, Jesus as the Christ (the Messiah), Jesus the Son of Man, Jesus the Son (of God), and Jesus as (the) Lord.[66] The OT typologies are only one part of Luke's rich Christology. From a source-critical perspective, on the one hand, Moessner so readily accepts Steck's fourfold Deuteronomisitc scheme as the framing principle of the travel narrative that he replaces Mk and Q as Luke's sources. On the other hand, Drury and Goulder make use of the Deuteronomy hypothesis to enhance the possibility of Luke's dependence on Mt. Accordingly, Denaux pays strong attention to a diachronic approach as a methodological principle so that one safely studies the Lukan travel narrative in the intertextuality between OT and NT texts.[67]

66. R.F. O'Toole, *Luke's Presentation of Jesus: A Christology* (SB, 25, Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004).

67. Denaux, "Old Testament Models for the Lukan Travel Narrative," 298.

3. Christological and Ecclesiological Purpose in the Travel Narrative

Thus far, I have examined and evaluated the current scholarly view about the Lukan travel narrative in four categories, namely, from the perspective of a historical approach, redaction critical approach, chiastic structure, and Old Testament models. The current scholarly view of understanding the travel narrative converges on a Christological and Ecclesiological purpose. The Christological theme is intrinsically connected with an ecclesiological intention in the travel narrative.

3-1. Christological Purpose in the Travel Narrative

First of all, in view of redaction-criticism, it is generally accepted that the travel narrative is a literary creation of the evangelist who is inspired by the travel motif in Mk 10:1-52. Along this line, they contribute considerably in discovering the aim of the travel narrative. On the whole, the redaction-criticism approach to the Lukan travel narrative reveals a strong christological purpose and ecclesiological goal. The travel narrative is the way not only to suffering within awareness of the necessity of Jesus' passion and death, but also to glorification which is expressed by the ἀνάλημψις motif in 9:51. According to Robinson, Luke makes the continuity of the history of salvation visual by means of a way, ὁδος and δρόμος in the Gospel of Luke and Acts. In addition, from Old Testament models, Luke portrays Jesus' role and destiny in terms of the entire prophetic tradition, such as Moses, Elijah, David and Suffering Servant. What is more, for Luke Jesus' approach of and entrance into Jerusalem have obviously royal and Davidic implications. The imagery of the exodus from Egypt is also used to describe a new exodus to the Promised Land in Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. Jesus' goal in Luke is Jerusalem where he fulfills his ἔξοδος, his death and exaltation. The journeying Lord brings the gospel of peace, and in so doing destroys Satan and his arsenal of evil. On the other hand, during the Journey, Jesus offers the eschatological salvation first to Israel, but Jesus is rejected by them. For this reason, the history of salvation has become a history of doom. On the other hand, Jesus encounters Gentiles who, in contrast to Israel, accept his salvation offer. At this point, the acceptance and rejection of Jesus' salvation offer make the transition of salvation from Jews to Gentiles, thereby building the scaffold of the mission to the Gentiles described in Acts too. In this regard, the travel narrative is ambivalent, that is to say, the history of doom by rejection and the scaffold of the mission by acceptance. In order words, for Luke Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem is the first step in the mission which will finally be continued to the ends of the earth.

3-2. Ecclesiological Purpose in the Travel Narrative

Jesus' journey to Jerusalem is the typical model of the Christian life. Given the fact that the instruction in the Journey is given by the Lord for the period from his departure until his return at the end of times, Jesus' instruction in the travel narrative is crucial for the sake of the disciples of Jesus' day, and the Christian community in which Luke lives. Obviously at this point, Reicke is quite right: As regards the internal and external problems in the Christian community, instruction of the apostles and discussion with his opponents serves the leaders and teachers of Christians, namely, how the Christians live in the world, and how they treat the opponents whom they encounter in their missionary context. As a consequence, Luke, through the travel narrative, demonstrates how Jesus instructed his disciples and confronted his adversaries, so that the results would serve as the Early Church. The Christian life in the travel narrative can also be explained in the motifs of Jesus' ἔξοδος in 9:31 and as a way, ὁδος and δρόμος in the Gospel of Luke and Acts. The Lukan travel narrative reminds the reader of the Exodus from Egypt, with its impression of the aimless wandering of Israel and the confrontations between Moses and the congregation which parallels the conflict between Jesus and his followers in the Journey. In this respect, the travel narrative functions as a new Exodus. All teaching during the new Exodus teach Christians how to serve their God, and how they should live their lives in the world. Likewise, the way (ὁδος), is preparing the disciples for the time of Jesus' absence after the ascension. In the course of the Journey, the disciples are prepared to be authentic witnesses of Jesus' words and deeds. At the same time, the way in the Journey becomes understood as a manner of living that brings salvation to men, and still more demands a responsible attitude from men who try to build up a new society and realize salvation for each other. In this respect, Jesus is the Guide who has originated this living way through his death and resurrection by his journeying among us. The way continues as if it reached Theophilus and us. Even J.L. Resseguie goes so far as to extend the Journey to an itinerary of the spiritual formation for the disciples "which includes (1) the hard road of suffering and death that Jesus travels, (2) the way of brokenness that the disciples travel, and (3) the self indulgent path that the disciples are to avoid."[1] In order words, the travel narrative throws light on not only the itinerary of spiritual formation, but also some of the dangers to it. All the obligations that appear important wane in comparison to following Jesus. Followers are not absorbed in what lies behind for the sake of their spiritual fitness. Moreover,

1. Resseguie, *Spiritual Landscape: Images of the Spiritual Life in the Gospel of Luke*, 29-44, here 37.

the Journey also requires total abandonment: money, accomplishments, self-importance and so forth. Furthermore, the Journey to Jerusalem contours some of the dangers to spiritual formation: self-promotion, self-directed quest for honour, self-serving, hypocrisy and the like. They, in effect, hinder travel to the new Promised Land. On the other hand, S.C. Barton enumerates four instructions as the main teaching of Jesus in the travel narrative: the necessity of wholehearted commitment, single-minded love of God and love of neighbour, an ethic of open, boundary-crossing hospitality, and readiness for the parousia.[2] In conclusion, ecclesiological purpose here can be epitomized as the Christian life in this world.

The only thing remaining is to tie the theological themes found in the parables to the purpose of the travel narrative, as has been argued above. It can be done in the following way: The Lukan parables serve mostly an ecclesiological purpose which indicates how the Christians should live in this world now and then, although there are christological implications either explicitly or implicitly in the Lukan parables. By means of features which only the parable bears, the Lukan parables frankly portray a range of ambiguous and contradictory values found in the very familiar details of ordinary life, and reverse and subvert the audience's world, as well as present a challenge to a new life in Jesus' sayings and deeds. In so doing, the Lukan parables effectively help to archive the ecclesiological purpose which is one of two overarching pillars in the travel narrative, that is to say, the Christian life.

2. Barton, *The Spirituality of the Gospels*, 99-104.

Chapter 7
A Unifying Motif of the Lukan Parables: Perspective on the Christian Life

From the results of chapter 5 and 6, we now need to group the theological themes and build a topic which unites all of the themes. I propose here ‘Perspectives on the Christian life’ as the overarching theme, grouping the theological themes of the Lukan Parables that have been presented above. This is just because all of them are intimately related to instruction on the Christian life. Moreover, given the fact that the Lukan parables are placed in the travel narrative, which includes the Christian life as one of two pivotal themes of the travel narrative as a whole, it further supports the argument that the Lukan parables function as parables of the Christian life. In what follows, I will outline the ‘Perspective on the Christian Life’ by examining how Christians should live in the world according to Jesus’ instruction which emerges from the Lukan parables. I have divided ‘Perspective on the Christian life’ into three categories, describing them in terms of relationships: The relationship with neighbours; The relationship with material possessions; and the relationship with God.

1. The Relationship with Neighbours: Love and Forgiveness

In the Lukan parables, the relationship of the Christians with neighbours is presented as love and forgiveness. First of all, it is obvious that the Parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) teaches us to love our neighbour, and that this love is to be unconditional and unqualified, emphasizing that we must put love of neighbour into action. Regardless of ethnic or social ties, the people of God must show mercy to all, even one’s enemies. None of us must limit boundaries of care and obligation. The parable firmly rejects all prejudice and discrimination, namely, racial, intellectual, financial, religious and nationalistic prejudice, or anything else that would restrict doing acts of love. The teaching of the parable harmonizes well not only with Jesus’ concern of the outcasts of the society, but also with Jesus’ emphasis on loving one’s enemies. The parable reminds us of the sermon on the plain where the love command is so central (6:27-36). In this respect, the Samaritan is indeed a practical example of the teaching of Jesus. Just as Jesus sees and has compassion on the widow at Nain (7:13), so the Samaritan sees and has compassion on the injured man. Compassion with divine quality enables one to feel deeply the suffering of others, and still more to move from the world of observer to the world of helper. The commandment of practice, “Go and do likewise” not only seeks to turn a man with a mania for creeds and anemia for deeds into a man of practice,

but also teaches that it is our task too which we must all tenaciously pursue and combats against. Even though loving our neighbour as oneself is difficult, there is no alternative for followers of Jesus.

The purpose of the Parable of the Prodigal Son (15:11-32) lies in the father's love and compassion. At the heart of the parable is the father's love towards his sons in which the father deals impartially with his sons. His love not only enables repentance for the younger son, but could also, demolish the elder son's hostility and grievances, and enable his participation in the celebration. "The story," as J.R. Donahue mentions, "is really a story of the 'Prodigal father'-lavish in love-who shatters the servile self-understanding of both sons and wants both to be free."[1] Along this line of analogy, God, who Jesus represents in his ministry is identified with the forgiving and merciful father presented in the parable. Particularly in relation to the introduction of vv. 1-2, the parable functions as a defense of Jesus' association with sinners. Like the instruction of the parable, if Jesus' receiving sinners and eating with them reveal God's mercy and forgiveness, then the Pharisees and the scribes' grievances must cease. The point, in relation to the story between the elder son and his father, lies in understanding grace rather than partiality and envy. If the elder son continuously clings to self-righteousness and the mind of merit and reward, he will never understand his father's generous and unmerited actions. In the end, his obstinacy prevents him from feeling his father's love, even the fact that he has been living in the shade of his father all this time, "Son, you are always with me." But if, having discarded his own standpoint, he stands in his father's position with love and compassion towards the younger son, he will finally understand the grace offered without any cost and unconditional forgiveness. In the case of the preceding two parables, he is to treasure the mind of the shepherd and the woman who place tremendous value on their lost one. Jesus' aim is not to rebuke, but to persuade. That is to say, according to the father's love and forgiveness towards his sons, those who are grumbling in 15:1-2 must be willing to accept as a token of forgiveness, and love the return of sinner.

In addition, The Pharisee and The Tax-Collector (18:9-14) implicitly can be mentioned in that the parable also provides an instruction about justification. That is to say, there is no justification before God without love of neighbour, for example, the Pharisee in 18:9-14 who despises one's own neighbour, and at the same time, there is justification before God within the humble admission of sins and the plea for forgiveness, whilst fully relying on God's

1. J.R. Donahue, "The Parables of Luke," *BibTod* 41 (2003), 283-288, here 285.

mercy.

By means of Lukan parables, Luke conveys a strong call for the need to love and forgive all people. According to Jesus' teaching in Lukan parables, the Christians, thus, should love and forgive our neighbours, including enemies and sinners. This is a right attitude that all the Christians should have towards their neighbours.

2. The Relationship with Material Possessions: The Right Use

The relationship of the Christians with material possessions is the right use of wealth. The Rich Fool (12:13-21) not only teaches us about attitudes towards wealth and possessions, but the right use of one's wealth for others. The parable betrays the planning of the rich and his attitude towards wealth and possessions, by means of the narrative device of soliloquy. That is to say, the rich denotes that one's life consists in the abundance of his possessions through his plan to tear down his barns and build bigger ones, and his monologue, "Soul, you have ample goods laid up for many years; take your ease, eat, drink, be merry" (v. 19). But the plan of the rich man is shattered by the abrupt intrusion of God in v. 20. God calls him a fool because he believed that he controlled his own destiny. In conclusion, the main instruction of the parable is that one's life does not consist in the abundance of possessions, but rather in God. In this context, what does it mean to be rich towards God? It is reminiscent of the Jewish heritage where the Torah requires that gleanings from a harvest be left for the poor, the widow, the orphan, and the immigrant (Lev 19:9-10, 23:22, Deut 24:21). As a result, his wealth became an idol which blinded him. It is difficult to discard the wrong attitude towards wealth, like the rich in our modern acquisitive society that tempts us to believe that one's security and pleasure are found in possessions.

The parable of the Unjust Steward (16:1-13) is a crisis parable, and a "how much more" parable. The audience is faced with the radical demands of the kingdom that is begun by Jesus' preaching and ministry. The concerns between a proper attitude to wealth and eschatological crisis should not be separated, since the eschatological awareness influences how one sees material possessions. Just as the steward acted in the worldly crisis for his safety, how much more in eschatological crisis should Jesus' followers act for their safety? Prudence means both preparedness for one's safe future, with right awareness of a crisis and the proper use of wealth in view of the presence of the kingdom and of coming judgment, just as the steward did in his crisis. Despite listening, engaging, debating and complaining about Jesus, the Pharisees, like the rich man in the next parable do not realize that the

eschatological crisis has arisen from Jesus' preaching and ministry. In addition, the correct use of worldly wealth focuses in particular on almsgiving, which is also a main teaching in the next parable that exposes mammon's powerful force which can enslave people. "You cannot serve both God and Mammon" (v. 13). The closing saying may be a warning against being unfaithful in God's service and a warning against being enslaved by mammon. Jesus here seems to personify mammon as an evil, powerful, cosmic force diametrically opposed to God's plan to set at liberty those who are oppressed. The pursuit of wealth and wholehearted allegiance to God are mutually exclusive. V. 13 makes it clear that unfaithfulness in the use of worldly wealth reveals ultimate loyalties and heart attitudes. If the disciples use their worldly wealth faithfully, it is to express that they serve God with wholehearted love. Whereas, if the disciples use their worldly wealth unfaithfully, it is to express that they do not serve God. In conclusion, the disciples' use of wealth is tied to their future in heaven. Given this, the disciples must manifest their own position in the eschatological perspective without hesitation. On the whole, the parable not only functions as a challenge to evaluate correctly the nature of present time and take necessary action, but also teaches the proper use and attitude towards material possessions.

The Rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31) is the converse of the preceding parable that for one's safe future the steward uses wealth as prudence under right awareness of his crisis. It is addressed to the Pharisee, whose love of money hinders them from their duty under God's law to give to the poor. According to the description of the parable, the rich man, in contrast to the misery of Lazarus in front of his gate, dresses himself with the most expensive garment to signify either royalty or wealth, as well as throwing a splendid feast every day that is reminiscent of guests participating in a celebration. To put it another way, the rich man has spent excessive resources on his own desires rather than redistributed it to those in need, by almsgiving. In this respect, the parable serves to warn the rich who use wealth only for themselves, while neglecting the needs of the poor. The parable also addresses private charity in its modern form, in that it teaches the correct use of one's own wealth in responsibility to God and other people. Of course, the parable conveys the theme of repentance that is represented as the proper use of possessions, and concern for the poor as one aspect of it, and also the idea of the sufficiency of the Scripture, thereby demonstrating the fact that Moses and the prophets have permanency and abiding validity (vv. 16-18). Even so, it is self-evident that the proper use of possessions is one of the main themes of the parable. The parable gives the audience a lesson in generous almsgiving and to caring for one's neighbour in need.

In this world, Christians should properly use their own material possessions that are entrusted to them for service of God and the poor. The rich fool in 12:13-21 and the rich man in 16:19-31 show a negative example in the use of their wealth only for their complacency, whereas the steward in 16:1-13 indicates a positive example of the proper use of possessions with a right awareness of his crisis.

3. The Relationship with God: Faith and Repentance

According to the instruction of the Lukan parables, it is faith and repentance that Christians in relationship with God must bear in mind. The Lukan parables below disclose either explicitly or implicitly how Christians should live in relationship with God.

The parables of prayer in the Lukan parables are properly related to faith in God. In the first place, the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8) teaches in effect the certainty of a prayer response on the basis of the character of God. If a man will get up at midnight and grant the request of a rude friend, how much more will your heavenly Father grant the requests of his children? All prayer should approach God boldly, by throwing away all the rising disturbances in relation to one's prayer, such as time, place, content of prayer, or doubting the response to prayer and so on. This is stressed in 11:1-4 (in terms of "our Father") and 11:9-13 (in a certainty of a prayer response). Here is a parable contrasting God who is not like the sleeper. The parable thus encourages the believer to be confident of their prayer on grounds of the character of God. The parable ends with the sleeper's standpoint, which is compared to God willingly granting the request, beginning with the petitioner's viewpoint, with the emphasis on boldness of the petitioner, and having no hesitation and discouragement in the face of opposition. In other words, the point of view of the parable shifts naturally from the attitude of prayer towards the character of God.

The Judge and the Widow (18:1-8) not only makes two main points from one of the characters in the story, that is, the certainty of God's hearing prayer and persistence in prayer, but also tightly interweaves the two points in the application (v. 1 and vv. 6-8). The first point drawn from the character of the judge, after telling the parable, appears in *a fortiori* argument, that if an unjust judge will finally grant the request of a widow, how much more will God vindicate his people who cry to him day and night? There is at the same time a contrast between the judge and God: The contrast is that God, as opposed to the judge, is mercifully patient with the requests of the people, but also will vindicate quickly, unlike the judge's delay. The second point, persistence in prayer, is derived from the widow who kept coming to

the judge saying, “vindicate me against my adversary” (v. 3, 5b, 7a and 1). It is entirely based on the confidence of being vindicated by God (vv. 7-8a), and goes further to have the faith (v. 8b) to always pray and not lose heart, until the coming the Son of the Man. The evidence of faithfulness and alertness is seen in prayer itself, which reveals constant fellowship with God. The matter of how we remain faithful until the coming of the Son of the Man, is certainly persistence in prayer.

As a result, it seems safe to say that confident faith in God is what the prayer is all about. Two prayer parables teach that prayer itself is an expression of faith of the Christians towards God. Indeed, the evidence of faithfulness must be seen in prayer that presents constant fellowship with God.

With regards to repentance, we can enumerate the following parables: The Barren Fig Tree, The Parable of the Prodigal Son and The Pharisee and the Tax-Collector, including implicitly The Rich Man and Lazarus, the Great Feast (14:15-24) and the parable of the Unjust Steward. Chiefly, in The Barren Fig Tree, there are three main points: the figs that the farmer expects, cutting the tree without fruit down according to commandment of the farmer, and a potential additional year by suggestion of the vinedresser, namely the fruit as God’s people, judgment and mercy. “Cut it down; why does it use up the ground?” It is a warning of judgment on Israel as the Israelite community because of their lack of productivity. The delay here becomes a call for repentance like Rom 2:4 where the riches of God’s kindness and forbearance and patience lead to repentance. The parable is clearly a warning of imminent judgment and a merciful call for the repentance of Israel offered for a short while.

In The Parable of the Prodigal Son, the younger son who lost all his property is confronted with the bigger problem, a severe famine, which he could not have anticipated. As he recognizes his desperate need, he begins to seek employment among the citizens of that country, and gets a job from a Gentile, feeding pigs. After all, he is personally as well as financially spent. Therefore the scene focuses on his low and miserable life, more than on the abandonment of his religious customs. “But when he came to himself he said, How many of my father’s hired servants have bread enough and to spare, but I perish here with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and I will say to him, ‘Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you; I am no longer worthy to be called your son; treat me as one of your hired servants.’ and he arose and came to his father” (15:17-20). Here, a question arises as to whether the younger son’s confession and return are sincere acts of repentance. Concerning this question, there is, as seen in the preceding part, an argument that rather than being a

euphemism for repentance, the expression simply reveals his desire to get himself out of his horrible situation.[1] Even though there is certainly no mention of repentance in his monologue, it must be recognized that his confession and change are at least sincere. The expression is nonetheless something of a prelude, leading him to repentance. What is more, it is even more likely to be a prelude to repentance, given the fact that such situations as real-life boundary situations not only can grow true religion, but also can allow him to let God in.

Even though the parable of the Pharisee and Tax Collector (18:9-14) directly instructs on both the manner and content of prayer which occur in comparing the Pharisee's and the tax collector's prayer, the parable still has sub-themes. The Tax collector in the parable plays a role as models of prayer, repentance, conversion and belief in Jesus, through the contrasting between tax collectors and Pharisees. The Pharisee may insist that his many good deeds, often exceeding even the demands of the Law, should bring him justification. Yet justification before God is pertinently expressed by a repentant heart of straightforward confession, entrusting himself to the mercy and grace of God, not by external piety as the confession of the Pharisee that "I thank thee that I am not like other men, extortioners, the unjust, adulterers, or even like this tax collector. I fast twice a week, I give tithes of all that I get (vv. 11-12)." Repentance, therefore, means honestly acknowledging that one has broken the relationship between oneself and God, and fervently desiring the restoration of that relationship.

In addition, in the second part of the parable of the Rich and Lazarus (16:19-31) with μετανοήσουσιν in v. 30, the theme of repentance is explicit to some extent. It is here presented as the proper use of possessions, and concern for the poor. We can also view the Great Feast (14:15-24) and the parable of the Unjust Steward (16:1-13) as parables of repentance which implicitly carry images of repentance in the sense that they respectively convey the need of human response and for urgent decision in the face of eschatological crisis.

Taken together, it is faith and repentance that the Christians should pursue in relationship with God. Christians restore their relationship with God in repentance, and maintain the relationship with God in faith which is particularly expressed in prayer.

In conclusion, in the Lukan parables, Luke appears keen to foster, in particular, a strong sense of the life of faith that Jesus requires of his followers in the context of the Journey with the Lord Jesus to Jerusalem. In this relationship perspective, the life of faith can be divided into three categories. In the first place, the relationship of the Christians with neighbours is

1. See the foregoing part of the analysis and interpretation of The Parable of the Prodigal Son.

presented as love and forgiveness. Luke has a prominent emphasis on the need to love and forgive all people. Christians should love and forgive their neighbours, including enemies and sinners. It is the appropriate attitude that all the Christians should have towards their neighbours. One after the other, it is emphasized that Christians should properly use their own material possessions which are entrusted to them for service of God and the poor. The Lukan Jesus repeatedly warns of the danger of attachment to riches as an obstacle to discipleship, and calls for the positive use of wealth, especially in the form of giving alms to the poor. After all, it is the right use of wealth that Christians should pursue in relationship with material possessions. Lastly, it is especially faith and repentance that the Christians in relationship with God must bear in mind. Two prayer parables convey that prayer itself is an expression of faith towards God. Indeed, the evidence of faithfulness must be seen in prayer which presents itself as constant fellowship with God. As regards repentance, the parables related to repentance call for urgent repentance with a warning of imminent judgment, and still more describe that repentance means honestly acknowledging that one has broken the relationship between oneself and God, and fervently desiring the restoration of that relationship. All things considered, what Christians should pursue in relationship with God is faith and repentance. Given the fact that the Lukan parables' theological themes converge in the Christian life, I conclude that a unifying motif for the Lukan parables is 'Perspectives on the Christian life.' Moreover, in view of the fact that the Lukan parables are placed in the travel narrative which includes the Christian life as one of the two pivotal themes, it is further evident that the Lukan parables function as parables of the Christian life. The Lukan parables were evidently intended by Luke to teach what it means to follow Jesus and how Christians should live in the world. Accordingly, a unifying motif of the Lukan Parables, as shown above, is 'perspectives on the Christian life.'

Chapter 8
The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel

Having identified in the previous chapters the unifying motif of the Lukan parables as 'perspectives on the Christian life' by examining the theological themes of the Lukan parables and exploring the travel narrative, I propose here finally to investigate the purpose of Luke's Gospel, and to ascertain the role of the Lukan parables within that purpose.

1. Some suggested views of the Purpose of Luke-Acts.

1-1. An apologetic defense of Christianity's *religio licita* status

The interpretation of Luke-Acts as a political *apologia pro ecclesia* has long been taught in various other forms.[1] They share much in common in showing that every religion in the Roman world has to be approved by Rome so as to operate with freedom. According to them, Judaism at that time when Luke-Acts was written benefited from the status of *religio licita* from Rome. In this situation, Luke strives to acquire its privileges, showing Christianity as a religion which has to be generously treated by Rome, or as a genuine branch of Judaism. B.S. Easton claims that Luke argues that Christianity is qualified to receive the same legal status as Judaism, since Christianity is virtually nothing more or less than Judaism. Even though there are the differences between Judaism and Christianity, Luke refrains from detailing them, so as not to miss the opportunity of winning official recognition from Rome.[2] On the contrary, Paul is the one who positively distinguishes Judaism from Christianity showing that Christianity is a true way in Judaism to failure and eventual obscurity.[3] Although they make a large contribution to the continuity between Christianity and Judaism, and the political dimension of the narrative, it is difficult to accept it as the purpose of Luke-Acts, for the following reasons: Firstly, from recent scholars' surveys, it is doubtful that the *religio licita* existed at the time of Luke's writing.[4] Even if it did, scholars cast doubts on whether Roman

1. F.J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, part 1, vol. Ⅱ, (London: Macmillan, 1922), 177-87: H.J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1968), 299-316; B.S. Easton, "The Purpose of Acts," in ed., F.C. Grant, *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers* (London, Seabury, 1955), 33-57. For standing in the same vein, see F.F. Bruse, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1952), 23; Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke*, 13-15; F.V. Filson, *Three Crucial Decades* (Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1963), 17-18; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 10; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 102, 630-1, 691-4.
2. Easton, "The Purpose of Acts," 37, 46.
3. Ibid., 114-15.
4. A.C. Winn, "Elusive Mystery: The Purpose of Acts," *Int* 13 (1959), 144-56, here147; Maddox, *The Purpose*

officials would have had the competence to appraise and understand the main point of theological case stated by Luke. Furthermore, they cast doubt on how much weight they would put on the religious apologetic posed by Luke, which to them might have seemed trivial.[5] Secondly, a political apology has no broad textual support. R. Cassidy argues to the contrary that Luke describes Jesus as dangerous to Rome. Jesus "rejected the use of violence and criticized the Gentile kings for their practice of dominating over their subjects" and "refused to defer to or cooperate with the various political officials who were responsible for maintaining those patterns."[6] Furthermore, Jervell contends that, given the negative portraits of the Roman officials in the trial passages (esp. Acts 4:27), it is difficult to envision that Luke is soliciting Rome for favorable conditions, and the opportunity to freely practice Christianity.[7] Thirdly, if the date of Luke's writing is determined to be after the Jewish revolt of 66-74 CE, it is difficult to imagine that, by tying Christianity to Judaism, Luke implores Rome for a political favour in order to perform a religious practice of Christianity.[8]

P.W. Walaskay abandons an *apologia pro ecclesia* and instead, takes up an *apologia pro imperio*, that "the institutions of the church and empire are coeval and complementary" and that "the Christian church and Roman Empire need not fear nor suspect each other, for God stands behind both institutions giving to each the power and the authority to carry out his will."[9] In his view, the evidence of an *apologia pro imperio* can be clearly seen in Luke's account of the trials of Jesus and Paul. But, according J.A. Weatherly, Luke's portrait of the Roman system and its description is at odds with the suggestion of Walaskay, in that Jesus dies with Pilate's consent,[10] but Roman governors fail to release Paul. On the other hand, A. Neagoe claims that "the overall function of Luke's trial narratives is an *apologia pro evangelio*, in the form of a trial and confirmation of the gospel and with particular reference

---

of Luke-Acts, 20-21, 91-93.

5. C.K. Barrett, *Luke the historian in recent study*, (London: Epworth, 1961), 63. According to A.D. Nock, rather than specific legal policy, the *religio licita* reflects Rome's general religious tolerance in order to prevent disorder in the Roman Empire. A.D. Nock, "Religious Developments from the Close of the Republic to the Death of Nero", in ed., S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock and M.P. Charlesworth, *The Cambridge Ancient History. X. The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C.-A.D. 70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 465-511.

6. Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel*, 54-62.

7. J. Jervell, "Paul: The Teacher of Israel: The Apologetic Speeches of Paul in Acts", in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke–Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972), 153–83, here 157.

8. For the dating of the Jewish revolt, see E.P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE-66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 33.

9. P.W. Walasky, *"And so we came to Rome": The Political Perspective of St. Luke* (SNTSMS 49, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 64.

10. J.A. Weatherly, *Jewish Responsibility for the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 106, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 92-97.

to strategic episodes in the unfolding of the Christian story."[11]

1-2. A theology adapted to the parousia's delay

Not satisfied by the arguments of those who see the purpose of Luke-Acts as a *religio licita* status for Christianity, H. Conzelmann claims that Luke wrote to defend the parousia's delay. In the situation in which Jesus has still not returned, and in which the apostles and many from the earliest days of the church were dying, Luke feels the need to explain the delay to prevent their confusion. Luke, then, undertakes to remold the early church's theology to settle their dilemma, which arises from the parousia's delay. As a result of a theological consideration of the relation between history and eschatology, Luke builds a model of the history of salvation to account for the delay. He outlines three epochs: The period of Israel, the satan-free period of Jesus and the period of the church.[12] In this case, the church belongs to the period of the church which is committed to proclaim God's saving message to the world. The other side of the coin, is to what extent the parousia in the light of God's plan of redemptive history moves back to an indeterminable point in the future. Conzelmann's thesis appears fairly persuasive, in that the issue of the parousia's delay does appear on the whole in Pauline letters, the Pastorals, and the writings of Peter, John, and Jude. His argument however, raises a problem, in particular the lack of a concrete instance that gives rise to such writing. Firstly, of the three texts on which he bases his theory (16:16; 4:21; 22:35-37), the first and last do not teach what he supposes. If the texts point to the satan-free period of Jesus and of the church, as he alleges, it would need to be more explicit to the reader of the early church fallen in the dilemma of the parousia's delay. Secondly, in the light of the ancient reader who, in contrast to modern readers, would primarily hear rather than read, Conzelmann's contention is called into question: How obvious would the three-stage of the history salvation proposed by him, be to them? This is not to question the adequacy of the history of salvation as a Lukan theological theme, or as a common theological theme in the New Testament, but simply to question how

11. A. Neagoe, *The Trial of the Gospel: An Apologetic Reading of Luke's Trial Narratives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 220-201, tackles three aspects of Luke's trial narratives: "(1) The trial of Jesus serves to test and confirm the Christological contention of the foregoing Gospel narrative that Jesus is the divinely appointed agent for the restoration of Israel. (2) The trials of Peter and his apostolic companion serve to test and confirm the claim that it is in the name of Jesus and through the ministry of his followers that God is now visiting and restoring his people. (3) The lengthy accounts of Paul's trials test and confirm the contention that the Christian gospel has a legitimate place within the Gentile world and, more specifically, within the Roman empire." For more on this motif, see Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political motivations of Lucan Theology*, 201-19.

12. Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 13-17, 132.

Luke's readers would have been able to see "how the whole story of salvation, as well as the life of Jesus in particular, is now objectively set out and described according to its successive stages."[13] Lastly, as Luke's continuing eschatological interest is clearly visible in his gospel, Conzelmann's theory decisively loses its persuasive power. Rather than moving the parousia into the future, Luke mentions the imminent return in relation to his church. In this respect, Conzelmann fails overall to expound the eschatological concern of Luke.

1-3. The confirmation of the gospel

W.C. van Unnik draws a clue from Hebr. 2:2-4, where salvation was first declared by the Lord, and attested to us by those who heard him, and God bore witness by signs and wonders and various miracles, and by gifts of the Holy Spirit distributed according to his own will. In line with this, he believes that in Acts these themes which encourage the wavering faith recur repeatedly to also reassure the faith of Luke's readers. Hence, he argues that Luke-Acts is a record of Jesus' saving activity presented in his acts and his teaching. He also argues that Luke wrote Acts to give his readers a fuller picture of God's saving work. According to him, Acts assures his readers that the central message of Luke's Gospel and of the Christian *kerygma* remains valid for them. Van Unnik basically sees the message of the Gospels as the Christian *kerygma*, that Jesus' activity is saving. As a result, Luke wrote to reaffirm Jesus as Savior to believers who were possibly wavering in their faith.[14] It is difficult however, to find broad support for this, since he confines his research only to Acts, although he notes that the term ἀσφάλεια in Luke 1:4 may be somehow related to the testimony of Acts. The likelihood of the link between the confirmation in Acts, purported by Unnik, and the term ἀσφάλεια in Luke 1:4 is fairly promising in that the term bears the meaning of "correct factual information" but "certainty" or "dependability".[15]

E. Franklin is basically against the contention of Conzelmann, Vielhauer and Haenchen that Luke's interest in salvation presents abandonment of the eschatological hopes of the early church. According to him, Luke not only stands in the major eschatological stream of the early Christian expectations, but also employs the history of salvation in his two volumes to serve his eschatology, not to replace it. Luke, he adds, desires his readers to be ready to meet their Lord when he appears. In doing this, Luke wishes to reinforce their belief in Christ,

13. Ibid., 132.

14 W.C. van Unnik, "The 'Book of Acts' the Confirmation of the Gospel," *NovT* 4 (1960-61), 26-59.

15. Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, 22.

that is to say, "by pointing out the necessity of the delay and by reasserting the belief in the immediacy of the return;… by describing the sheer rebellious nature of the disobedience which the Jewish rejection entailed; by showing that the life of Jesus was of one piece with the whole saving work of God of which it was the climax."[16] For him, the ascension as an eschatological idea is more important than the parousia. In doing so, Luke replaces future hope with present belief, that is, now is the time of Jesus' glory, as the present Lord who has achieved the goal of his work.[17] In this regard, the ascension of Jesus denotes the moment of Jesus' glorification, the confirmation of his divinity and the fulfillment of Israel's expectations. Faith in Jesus' Lordship reestablishes believers who are now on the brink of being lost because of the problems their belief faced. Though the ascension plays a key role in Luke-Acts, Luke's main concern in Acts is the resurrection (2:31; 4:33; 17:18; 26:23), rather than the ascension. Moreover, his claim that Luke is not interested in salvation or mission, but in witness is at odds with the overall theological scheme of Luke.[18]

In reply to Conzelmann, I.H. Marshall argues that in Luke's use of salvation history, he puts his emphasis on the saving significance of it rather than on the history itself. In like manner, he believes that salvation is the core of Lukan theology. Luke writes, he adds, to offer catechetical instruction regarding the origins of Christianity.[19] In other words, Luke wants to show that the events confirm the reliability of the catechesis, being immersed in their theological significance. In view of his concern for accuracy in the prologue of the Gospel of Luke, ἀκριβῶς and καθεξῆς, as well as ἀσφάλεια, his scheme is to manifest the facts, as he obviously saw them, rather than to create a semi-fictitious account which would not demonstrate them.[20] That is to say, Luke's focal point is the confirmation of the Christian message. He isolates himself, however, from those who think that the demand for such a confirmation is due to the wavering of the faith of Luke's readers. Rather, the need is merely for a fuller presentation of the basic story of the Christian *kerygma*, or catechetical instruction which Luke's reader like Theophilus has only known in general terms. His desire to confirm the kerygma with a fuller account of that is seen in both sides, in the story of Jesus which is to be transmitted by faithful witnesses, and in the continuing story that comes into being in

16. E. Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1965), 174.
17. Ibid., 28-29.
18. For other critique, see also R.J. Karris, "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts," *CBQ* 41 (1979), 80-97, especially 81.
19. Marshall, *Luke-Historian & Theologian*, 19. 86, 92-94, 102, 116-117.
20. Idem, "Luke and his Gospel," in ed., P. Stuhlmacher, *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien* (WUNT 28, Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 289-308, here 305.

the church through the activity of the witnesses. Moreover, the continuity between the ministry of Jesus and the witness of the church can be seen in various common themes: "Teaching about salvation, Christology, eschatology and mission."[21]

With legitimation and apologetic as the genre of Luke's writing, and salvation as the narrative unity of Luke-Acts, J.B. Green suggests that the purpose of Luke-Acts is to reinforce the Christian movement in the face of opposition. That is, by grounding them firmly in their interpretation and experience of the redemptive purpose and faithfulness of God, and by calling them to remain constantly faithful witnesses in God's salvific plan.[22] In his view, the purpose of Luke-Acts is concerned with the practices that represent the standard for legitimating the community of God's people, and the invitation to participate in God's design. In this regard, it can be said that the purpose of Luke-Acts is chiefly ecclesiological. Luke manifests, Green claims, the overall purpose of strengthening the church within "salvation" as the main theme of Luke-Acts. Luke strains to answer the question of the identity of the Christian community by showing the coherence between God's ancient plan and the ministry of Jesus. That is to say, the advent of Jesus is grounded on the ancient covenant, and still more his mission is fully in line with God's agenda. For Luke the call to discipleship aligns and conforms itself to the teaching of Jesus and God's intent. To put it differently, they must embody the beneficence of God especially in their lives, and express their mercy, in particular, toward those in need. On the other hand, the divine purpose at times surfaces in the narrative in several ways, such as during Jesus' baptism, "by means of heavenly messengers, through a constellation of terms expressive of God's design, and through instances of divine choreography of events."[23] The Holy Spirit powerfully puts the divine plan into practice. Moreover, Jesus is identified as Savior in his miracles of healing and table fellowship. All things considered, throughout the Lukan writings the narrative centers on salvation which "embraces life in the present, restoring the integrity of human life, revitalizing human communities, setting the cosmos in order, and commissioning the community of God's people to put God's grace into practice among themselves and toward ever-widening circles of others."[24]

1-4. A polemic against heresy

21. Ibid., 307.
22. Green, *Luke*, 21-22. See also idem, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 22-49.
23. Ibid., 22.
24. Ibid., 24-25.

Through Luke's redaction of his sources, C.H. Talbert finds that there is the existence of anti-Gnostic overtones in Luke-Acts. He enumerates three motifs which include an implication of anti-Gnosticism in Luke-Acts: (1) An authentic witness motif reveals that Luke confronts someone who denied Jesus' humanity and his physical passion, resurrection and ascension. (2) The motif of the true exegesis of scripture shows that Luke faces those who denied the church's belief that the OT confirms Jesus as the Christ, his suffering and rising from the dead, and the general resurrection. (3) The motif of the succession of tradition in Acts warned that false teachers in the sub-apostolic period will arise over against apostolic teaching.[25] Talbert goes so far as to claim along this line, that an anti-Gnostic polemic runs through John's Gospel, 1 John, the Pastorals, and 2 Peter. For him Luke's eschatological timetable (17:20-37; 21:8-36) is very important in that although much of the timetable had already been achieved, the End had not yet come. Luke wrote his two volumes to defend a hermeneutical crisis arising from an overrealised eschatology which is accompanied by a docetic transformation of christology.[26] For this reason, Luke puts forward the apostolic teaching as the original teaching of the early church so as to show the corruption of Gnosticism in the light of it.[27] Still, his thesis, although intriguing, is not acceptable for a few reasons: First of all, he ignores so much Lukan material that he could misread Luke's intentions. According to I.H. Marshall, it is almost impossible to discern whether the emphases are distinctively his, since Luke blends his own material with that of his sources.[28] Secondly, another problem his thesis has is that the Gnostic problem in no way is mentioned explicitly in Luke-Acts. None of the three motifs, the authentic witness, the OT interpretation, and a succession of tradition refer to the Gnostic problem. In this respect, it is particularly problematic to argue that Luke sees Jesus' death by the Jews as a critique of the Gnostic idea of Christian martyrdom.

1-5. A redefinition of relations between Christianity and Judaism

Not satisfied with the claim that Christianity is a legitimate branch of Judaism and is entitled to the status of a *religio licita* in the Roman Empire, A.C. Winn suggests an alternative view that "the rejection of the gospel by the Jewish nation and its acceptance by the Gentiles was not an unforseen catastrophe, but a fulfilment of God's plan and purpose."[29] Jewish and

25. Talbert, *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of the Lukan Purpose*, 55-56.
26. Ibid., 15, 209.
27. Ibid., 2-6, 89.
28. Marshall, *Luke-Historian & Theologian*, 67-68.
29. Winn, "Elusive Mystery: The Purpose of Acts," 152.

Gentile believers who are heirs to the covenants and promises of the OT experience the following predicament: While they now take part in the national life of Israel, the Jewish nation has rejected the gospel which is the fulfillment of these promises. In this situation, how must believers understand themselves? Luke, then, seeks to settle the problem by appealing to God's plan and purpose. The Jewish nation's rejection of the gospel and the Gentiles' acceptance of it is a fulfillment of God's plan and purpose. As a result, according to God's plan and purpose, the church becomes the true Israel, whereas the Jewish nation is disqualified as the people of God. Along this line, Winn illuminates the theological significance of Jerusalem and Rome. Jerusalem plays a role as the world center of the chosen people: The tribes go up to Jerusalem and the promises of the Scriptures belong to her, while Rome functions as the world center of the Gentiles, but at the same time stands for the nations without the Law, and the enemy who treads down Gods people.[30] Luke confirms such a shift by showing that it was foreseen by Jesus, the OT, and the Spirit's presence and work in the church.

For R. Maddox, "Who are the Christians?", is the main concern a question of identity which the early church is undergoing. Jews had rejected the gospel proclaimed by Jesus and the church, but the promises of God were to Israel. If that is the case, were Christians isolated from the community of salvation? What is the status of the church as the people of God?[31] According to Maddox, Luke has a strong anti-Jewish tendency which appears throughout Luke-Acts (Luke 1:4; 2:34; 4:16-30; Acts 7; 13:46; 18:6; 28:14-28). Luke reassures his readers by comparing Jews and believers: That is to say, Jews in these texts are in a state of rebellion, rejecting the word of the Lord, whereas believers are in keeping with the promises of God. "The full stream of God's saving action in history has not passed them by, but has flowed straight into their community-life, in Jesus and the Holy Spirit."[32] Maddox tries to demonstrate his argument from Luke's preface. Here, two words, ἀσφάλεια and πεπληροφορημένα stand for the fulfillment of God's purposes expressed in scripture and of confidence. However, J.L. Houlden carefully refutes Maddox' contention in that he fails to consider adequately the positive aspects of Luke's portrayal of Judaism. According to Houlden, first of all, there is a portrait of the Christian mission's success in the Jerusalem region. In addition, there is Luke's depiction of the solid Jewish background to

30. Ibid., 150.
31. Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, 31-65, 183-86.
32. Ibid., 187.

Jesus and the church. Thirdly, Jesus and his followers lean in a Jewish direction.[33]

On the other hand, J. Sanders goes further by arguing that, according to Luke, Judaism stands in error and is replaced by Christianity. The same can be said of Jewish Christianity too. Consequently, Gentile Christianity is the legitimate successor to Moses, the Prophets and biblical Israel. In other words, Luke portrays Christianity as the true and authentic Judaism, expressing as the people of God, ὁ λαός θεοῦ and people, λαός.[34] In contrast to the church, the Jewish people are described as incorrigible. Furthermore, Luke shows how the Jewish people have rejected Jesus, the gospel and the church through major figures such as Jesus, Peter, Stephen, and Paul. For Luke repentant Jews are at no point different from unrepentant Jewish people in the sense that both seek to justify themselves on the grounds of Moses.[35] Although his suggestion gives us insight into anti-Judaistic trends in Lukan texts, he is missing more important features in which Luke tries to lessen this negative and critical stance.

Winn, Maddox and Sanders' points are vulnerable, in that they fail to allow for enough texts where Luke not only values Judaism positively, but also strives to diminish Jewish guilt for rejecting Jesus. Their results are not well balanced in pivotal aspects. Given the tendency to develop the two opposing Jewish veins on the basis of the idea of a faithful remnant of the OT in Luke-Acts,[36] it is tenuous to identify Luke's purpose as an anti-Jewish theme.

1-6. An interest in evangelism

J. Dupont feels that Luke is primarily interested in the universality of salvation. He strives to show Luke's overarching theological theme by means of a comparison between the introduction and conclusion of Luke-Acts. According to him, Luke exposes his strong theological concern that the salvation of God is manifested to all men, by citing Isa 40:5 at the beginning of the Gospel of Luke, and at the conclusion of Acts, using words that remind us of the text in the introduction of the Gospel. In this way, Dupont discovers Luke's emphasis of the universality of salvation, a comparison between "to all nations" (Luke 24:47) and "to the ends of the earth" (Acts 1:8). In the end, Jesus' mission is completed in Acts by

33. J.L. Houlden, "The Purpose of Luke," *JSNT* 21 (1984), 53-65, here 54-56.
34. J.T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM Press, 1987), 97.
35. Ibid., 317.
36. For this, see J. Jervell, "The Divided People of God: The Restoration of Israel and Salvation for the Gentiles," in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Pub. House, 1979), 41-74; D. Tiede, "Acts 1:6-8 and the Theo-Political Claims of Christian Witness," *WW* 1 (1981), 41-51; Houlden, "The Purpose of Luke," 63; R.L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBLMS 33, Atlanta: Scholars, 1987); G.N. Stanton, "Luke and People of God," *Paper presented to the Divinity Faculty* (University of Aberdeen, February, 1991).

proclaiming its universal message, and Acts affirms the fulfillment of God's saving plan as well, through the expansion of the church which the Spirit directs.[37] On the whole, Luke shows how the ministry of Jesus and the mission of the church were both foretold in Scripture, and still more formed part of the divine plan.

J.C. O'Neill primarily views Luke's purpose as evangelistic. He holds that the apologetic character of Luke-Acts is not forged in a certain political sense, or in the sense of a defensive position, but by the apologetic writings of Hellenistic Judaism which had been faced with a missionary problem for about three centuries, and which were brought into play to convince its Gentile readers of the truth of the Jewish faith. Luke's dependence on the apologetic way of Hellenistic Judaism appears in the preface of his gospel, in the historiographic form of his writing, and in a great number of details in Acts.[38] In this regard, for O'Neill Luke-Acts is an argument for the faith. In his view the primary purpose of Luke-Acts is an attempt to persuade an educated reading public to embrace Christianity. In outward form, Luke-Acts is an "apology" in the sense that "a full statement of the nature of Christianity is a necessary part of the case to be presented to the Romans,"[39] not to acquire official recognition for Christianity, whereas the inner purpose is to lead men to the Christian faith. O'Neill goes further by arguing that Luke's evangelistic treatise, much like the other suggestions about Luke's purpose, has unity in a geographical movement, that is, the movement up to Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem to Rome. Luke makes use of this scheme of events to show that the fortunes of Jesus and the church were always directed by the hand of God. What is more, "it is the account of how the church discovered its true nature in the way God dealt with it on the path from Jerusalem to Rome."[40] In other words, even though the Gospel had been brought to the educated Roman reader by Paul, it had ultimately been planned for the church by God as its independent destiny. Maddox, however, casts doubt on whether the concern of evangelism as the purpose of Luke can cover the whole of Acts too, especially because it fails to consider the concluding section, Acts 21-28.[41]

37. J. Dupont, "The Salvation of the Gentiles and the Theological Significance of Acts," *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Paulist, 1979), 11-33.
38. J.C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1970), 139-159.
39. Ibid., 176. O'Neill here follows the contention of Cadbury that the dedication in the preface of the gospel is not just to Theophilus, the chief object of the work, but that Luke designs to publish his book for the educated world to read.
40. Ibid., 178.
41. Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, 20.

1-7. An apologia for Christianity

In addition to Luke's first intention in Acts,[42] F.F. Bruce later expands the purpose of Luke into three types of defense: (1) Defense against pagan religion, showing that Christianity is true and paganism is false, particularly in conjunction with the two familiar Pauline incidents in Lystra and Athens. (2) Defense against Judaism, showing that Christianity is the fulfillment of true Judaism, especially within Stephen's speech and Paul's defense addresses and loyalty to Judaism. (3) Defense against political accusations, showing that Christianity is innocent of any offence against Roman law. Luke portrays Christianity as Israel's fulfillment and that it is politically innocent.[43] Moreover, he is aware of the fact that Luke's three types of defense still appear in Christian apologists in the second century. Without doing it at the expense of each of the views, he shows the diversity of Lukan apologetics.

G. Sterling argues that Luke wrote his work for a self-definition of Christianity, bringing the model of apologetic historiography into play.[44] First of all, the consciousness of the group's place, that they belonged to subgroups within the large Greco-Roman world, led them to write the story of their group (Content). At the same time, the author who wants to obtain respectability for his group chose to hellenize those varied traditions, that is, the *tradito apostolica* (Luke 1:4), with the basic means of Hellenistic historiography (Form). The writer wishes to relate the story of their own group in an effort to provide a self-definition of that group (Function).[45] To put it another way, Luke defines Christianity in terms of Rome, against which it is politically innocent, in terms of Judaism with which it has a continuation, and in terms of itself which preserves the *traditio apostolica*.[46] As a result, it is imperative,

42. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 29-34, especially 30, holds that the writer's intention in Acts was primarily to defend Christianity and Paul against the accusations of various opponents.

43. Bruce, *The Apostolic Defence of the Gospel: Christian Apologetics in the New Testament* (Lodon: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1959), provides four types of defense as the early Christian defense of the gospel, namely, against Judaism, paganism, the Roman empire, and pseudo-Christianity; idem, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 22-25.

44. G.E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), defines apologetic historiography: "Apologetic historiography is the story of a subgroup of people in an extended prose narrative written by a member of the group who follows the group's own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group within the setting of the larger world." All the results stem from his observation and analysis of the works of twelve authors through three major phases of ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern history: the Persian empire, the Hellenistic world, and the Rome empire: the story of a particular group of people (content), the Greco-Roman world (form), and a self-definition of that group (function).

45. Ibid., 386-87, 16-19.

46. Ibid., 379-83.

Sterling mentions, to understand Christianity as a movement in history within the world in which it exists. Sterling however, has a flaw in that he recapitulates one of the major fallacies of the *religo licita* interpretations by arguing that "Christianity is simply the extension of the Old Testament and therefore politically innocent," in trials of Paul.[47]

Through observing Luke-Acts and external evidence, D. Wenham first establishes Luke's historical context.[48] According to him, if Theophilus in the preface was his patron, Luke may have written with a wealthy Gentile readership in mind, in which case Luke is to bring his Christian story to Rome in which Theophilus may have lived. Moreover, if Luke is a companion of Paul, he may well be accused of being a troublemaker by his opponents. Given these situations, Luke is writing for Romans who have questions about the Christian movement and the relationship between Christian and Judaism. The tensions and troubles between Jews and Christians become more pronounced in some evidence external to Luke-Acts. Above all, the Roman historian Suetonius' description of Claudius shows him expelling all the Jews from Rome, since they were rioting at the instigation of Chrestus.[49] The expulsion which is referred to in Acts 18:2 also finds support in Paul's letters which hint at tensions and troubles between Jews and Christians in the Roman Empire (esp. 1 Thess. 2:16, cf. Rom. 15:7). As a result, the troubles raise questions about how these two movements related to one other: Is the Christian laying claim to theological legitimacy or are accusations against the Christians pertinent? Luke answers the questions as follows: Firstly, Jesus, the Christian movement and Paul are at no point starting a new religion, but are rather fulfilling the Old Testament. Secondly, the troubles have not been provoked by the Christian, but by Jews who have been threatened by the new movement. Thirdly, as far as accusations of criminal or disruptive activity go, Roman officials consistently acknowledged the innocence of the Christians.[50] In writing to answer the questions that arise from this context and these historical events, Luke has an apologetic purpose for Christ and Christianity. His apologetic has the following elements: (1) "A firm historical component: he was writing about recent history and about events that people had experienced or heard about." (2) "A clear theological component: he wanted to show that Christianity was not a novel religion, but that Jesus was

47. Ibid., 385.
48. D. Wenham, "The Purpose of Luke-Acts: Israel's Story in the Context of the Roman Empir," in ed., C.G. Bartholomew, J.B. Green and A.C. Thiselton, *Reading Luke: Inter pretation, Reflection, Formation* (Grand Rapids; Michigan: Zondervan, 2005), 79-102.
49. *Divus Claudius* 25.4.
50. Wenham, "The Purpose of Luke-Acts: Israel's Story in the Context of the Roman Empir," 98.

the fulfillment of the Old Testament and of God's purpose for Israel and the world."[51] Wenham adds finally that the Lukan apologetic purpose for Christ and Christianity is solely one of his interests and goals, such as practical discipleship and the practice of prayer. It is, however, difficult to assume that Luke-Acts aims to explain and interpret some particular event in recent history. In the light of what Luke announces in the prologue, the events or things (περί) present the broad complex of matters with respect to Jesus' ministry and teaching.[52]

R.L. Gallagher and P. Hertig who follow R.H. Stein's argument concerning the Lukan purpose view Luke-Acts as apologetic in two aspects: In its use of the Hebrew scriptures, and approach to the Roman government. Luke quotes the Hebrew scriptures which reveal Jesus Christ as the suffering Messiah (Luke 3:4-6, cf. Isa 40:3-5; Luke 4:17-21, cf. Isa 61:1-2). The rejection of the Messiah by Israel, Jesus' death and resurrection, the Holy Spirit's coming, and the destruction of Jerusalem all belong to the evidence from prophecy, as the prophetic fulfillment of future events. On the other hand, Luke seeks to show the Roman government in a positive light. The ones who hamper the purpose of God are the Jews, not the Romans. That is to say, despite the fact that the government did not find Jesus guilty, the Jewish leaders forced the Roman officials to crucify him (Luke 23:4, 14-16, 22, 24). In Acts, the same happens to Paul in that the Roman government attempts to release him, but Jewish leaders refuse to embrace the decision. The overriding purpose of Acts then, is to explain the spread of the gospel throughout the Gentile world as a flourishing movement under the initiative of the Holy Spirit. In this respect, Acts offers assurance to political leaders that Christianity poses no threat to Rome, and that Roman rule likewise is no threat to Christians. In other words, Luke wants his readers to realize that the Roman officials handle the Christian missionaries with benevolence, and still more, accept them as politically harmless.[53]

1-8. An apologia for the plan of God

J.T. Squire asserts that Luke's work is a kind of cultural translation, so as to tell people under

51. Ibid., 101.

52. F.S. Spencer, "Preparing the Way of the Lord: Introducing and Interpreting Luke's Narrative, A Response to David Wenham," in ed., C.G. Bartholomew, J.B. Green and A.C. Thiselton, *Reading Luke: Inter pretation, Reflection, Formation* (Grand Rapids; Michigan: Zondervan, 2005), 104-24, here 118-121.

53. R.L. Gallagher and P. Hertig, *Mission in Acts: Ancient Narratives in Contemporary Context* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2004), 7-8. Apart from these, those who adhere to the above position are E. Haenchen and J.D.G. Dunn. See Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 106; Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Pres International, 1996), xii-xiii.

the new context of the Hellenistic milieu, that it is different from the context in which the story originally came into existence.[54] He, in comparison with C.H. Talbert's work,[55] explores more extensively the parallels between Luke's work and Hellenistic histories. Squires shows how the histories of Diodorus and Dionysius are revealed in numerous acknowledgements of divine guidance and providence of human affairs by means of inspired oracular pronouncements. In the Hellenistic age, it was also common for a people to seek to trace their own origins back to the remotest antiquity.[56] In this respect, it is most likely that Luke puts his emphasis on the OT origin of Christianity and the fulfillment of Scripture in the events that he writes and reports on, for more than just religious reasons. Luke writes to insiders who are hellenised Christians, using techniques provided by outsiders that they would be very familiar with. As far as he is concerned, it is a vital apologetic process to 'translate' in this way. In so doing, Luke takes up the theme of the plan of God to expand on the central features of the story of Jesus and the early church. There is a threefold emphasis: (1) To confirm the faith of his Christian readers, (2) to encourage and equip them to present the gospel to the Hellenistic world in an already translated form, and (3) to enable them to defend their beliefs in the face of possible objections.[57] Beyond political or defensive reasons, Luke advances his apologetic in that it, like Hellenistic historiography, contains elements of defense, assertion, polemic and exposition.[58]

D. Bock believes that the major agenda of Luke would most likely be God's role in salvation, and his new community which can clearly be supported in the structure and theology of the Gospel.[59] Luke strives to explain the origins of the new community, and how a seemingly new movement is modeled in old divine promise, since newer movements would have been a common eyesore in an ancient world. Luke tries to show that the movement which emerges from Jesus' ministry is a natural extension of Judaism, by divine plan, Scripture, and promise of the salvation which comes through Jesus. Luke aims to reassure

54. J.T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge University Press, 1993), 190.
55. C.H. Talbert, "Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology," *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing, 1984), 91-103, focuses on Polybius 1.4.1-2 and Josephus, *Antiquities* 10.8.2-33, 42, as two apparent examples. Talbert enumerates three components for the sake of the analysis of Luke's motif: "(1) The notion that a divine necessity controls human history, shaping the course of its events, was a widespread belief in Mediterranean antiquity. (2) The idea that history's course fulfills oracles, whether oral or written, was also a cultural commonplace. (3) The functions of a prophecy-fulfillment theme in the Mediterranean world match up remarkably well with what one finds in Luke-Acts."
56. Ibid., 100.
57. Ibid., 53, 186.
58. Ibid., 40, 191, 193-94.
59. Bock, *Luke*, 14-15.

Theophilus about the divine origins and derivation of the new movement (Luke 1:4). Furthermore, Luke elaborates on how the movement was rejected by most Jews, and at the same time how Gentiles could be included in it, on the grounds of the design of God, Scripture and Jesus' ministry and teaching. In this respect, the issue of Jewish rejection provokes Luke's pastoral concern to write Luke-Acts, so that Theophilus can remain in faithfulness, commitment and perseverance.[60] Luke writes for anyone who felt this tension rather than just for this one person. Jewish Christians who are troubled by the rejection of the gospel and Jesus by most Jews, and the Gentile openness to the gospel, could learn that God directed the affair according to his plan.

1-9. An apologia for Christians related to Judaism

L.T. Johnson concentrates on the fact that Jewish apologetic literature contemporary to Luke-Acts held a dual function to defend Jews against "misunderstanding" and "persecution", and that it played a significant role for the Jewish readers themselves. That is to say, by bringing an outsider perspective to connect with them, apologetic literature enabled them to understand their own traditions within a pluralistic context. At the same time, it offers "security" or "reassurance" to Jewish readers by substantiating within a pluralistic, cultural context the antiquity and inherent value of their traditions. In the same way, he argues, this is taking place in Luke-Acts. To the outside Hellenistic reader, the Christian movement is denoted "as a philosophically enlightened, politically harmless, socially benevolent and philanthropic fellowship", while to insiders it enables them to interpret the Gospel "within the context of a pluralistic environment composed of both Jews and Gentiles."[61] According to Johnson, cautious Gentile Christians to whom Luke's narrative was primarily addressed experience severe uncertainty, because of two historical facts: Namely, Jewish rejection of the Gospel, and the Gentile acceptance of it. Such uncertainty leads them to question the faithfulness of the God in whom they had trusted. Luke writes then to give his readers security by means of theodicy, just as Paul did in Romans 9-10. By addressing events in order, Luke presents "how God first fulfilled his promises to Israel, and only then extended these blessings to the Gentiles." As God has manifested himself faithful to the Jews, the Word that reached the Gentiles was therefore entirely trustworthy. By confirming that the story of Jesus

60. Bock, "Luke," in ed., S. Mcknight and G.R. Osborne, *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2004), 349-72, here 350-51.
61. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 3-10, especially 9.

was modeled on that of Israel, and by demonstrating how God was faithful to his promise through restoring Israel, Luke assured his Gentile readers that they could gain confidence in all the things that they had already been instructed in (Luke 1:4).[62] However, it is problematic that he revolves around a question of theodicy in order to resolve the dilemma of Jewish rejection and Gentile acceptance of the gospel. Rather, God, throughout Luke-Acts is the one who legitimates, not the one who needs to be legitimated.

1-10. An effort at conciliation with Judaism

Not satisfied with the conventional theory that Luke hopelessly abandons the Jew because of their stubbornness against the gospel, R.L. Brawley advances a counter proposal that Luke apologetically deals with Jewish antagonism, and offers conciliation. He proposes that the Nazareth story of Jesus in Luke 4:16-30 serves a literary function in the rejection of Jesus, since their refusal establishes his identity as a prophet who is filled by the Holy Spirit, and not least of all as the one who makes messianic claims. Along this line, the literary purpose of the rejection of Paul by some Jews is of equal significance. Luke seeks to explain empirically why Paul goes to the Gentiles with respect to the objection to Pauline universalism. After all, Jewish obstinacy gives great impetus to Paul in turning to the Gentiles.[63] In spite of their rejection by a large and influential segment of Judaism, Luke tries to show how Jesus qualifies as messiah. Furthermore, "Paul's behavior and the mission of the church that includes Gentiles are, for Luke, unequivocally appropriate to the fulfillment of Israel's destiny."[64] In so doing, Luke is not so much to set gentile Christianity free, but link it to Judaism. In addition, Luke is not rejecting the Jews, but appealing to them. Luke's purpose has, in fact, both sides - apologetic and conciliation. With respect to apologetic, the Jewish opposition plays a legitimating role in establishing Jesus' identity and in prompting Paul's Gentile mission. On the other hand, in relation to conciliation, Paul follows Jewish rituals, and according to the apostolic decree, Gentiles are required to make concessions to Jewish Christians, and in addition, the Pharisees are painted conspicuously positively.[65]

1-11. A defense of Paul

J. Jervell contends that Acts as a religious apologetic work is primarily addressed to

62. Ibid., 10.
63. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*, 6-27, 28-50.
64. Ibid., 155-159, here 159.
65. Ibid., 157-58.

Christians who were attacked by Jews on account of Paul, not to Rome. That is why there are a number of secondary motifs in Luke's work that are at odds with a defense addressed to Rome. Luke desires to defend Paul's missionary endeavors before Jewish Christians threatened by Jews who accuse Paul of teaching sedition against Israel, the Mosaic Law, and the temple.[66] In particular, Paul's defense concerning his missionary activity is provided from the account of his trial and especially his apologetic speeches in this context (22:1-21; 23:1; 24:10-21; 26:1-23). For him, the political apologetic thesis appears to be weak due to its absence in the early chapters of Acts, although within the speeches there might be some elements of a political apologetic present which may have stemmed from the sources utilized by Luke. Luke in the last section (Acts 22-28) shows that Paul is the true Pharisee, a Jew faithful to the law, and that he believed and taught the Scriptures. In this respect, the defense speeches in Acts 21-28 represent Paul as the true teacher of Israel and his accusers as the apostates. Luke strives to acquit Paul of all accusations on the grounds of his credibility with Jewish orthodoxy within the church, so that he preserves the special status of the church as the people of God.[67]

Having defended M. Schneckenburger who views Acts as a *Tendenzschrift* written to Jewish Christians in Rome with a twofold apologetic purpose,[68] A.J. Mattill argues that Luke writes to treat the objection of the Jewish Christian against Paul, and to motivate them to support him in the context of his trial in Rome. Luke, Mattill presumes, would have been collecting material for Acts from persons such as Philip and Mnason. However, Luke becomes keenly aware that the suspicion on Paul's political legitimacy from Jewish Christians in Rome leads them to oppose Paul. Luke then decided to show Paul's acquittals in other cities (Acts 16:38 f.; 17:9; 18:14 f.; 19:37-40; 23:29; 24:27; 25:25; 26:31 f.) in order to

66. Jervell, "Paul: The Teacher of Israel: The Apologetic Speeches of Paul in Acts," in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*, 167-68.

67. Ibid., 173-74; idem, "Retrospect and Prospect in Luke-Acts Interpretation," in ed., E.H. Lovering, *SBL Seminar Paper 1991* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991), 383-404, here 402.

68. M. Schneckenbutger's twofold apologetic purpose is as follows: (1) "to defend the Apostle Paul in his apostolic dignity in his personal and apostolic behavior, especially in the matter of the Gentiles, against which Paul defended himself in his Epistles." and (2) "to demonstrate to these same Jewish Christians the political legitimacy of Paul, for they opposed preaching to Gentiles not only because of their particularistic pride but also because of their fear of the Rome government, which, though it recognized the legitimacy of their Judaism, prohibited the proselytizing of Gentiles." The Tübingen School however, generally objects to Schneckenburger's suggestion of "apologetic tendency", since they, in contrast to his proposed date for the writing of Acts (before A.D. 70), view the date as after A.D. 70, so that they are in favour of the "conciliatory tendency". See A.J. Mattill, "The Purpose of Acts: Schneckenburger Reconsidered," in ed., W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin, *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F.F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: The Paternoster Press, 1970), 108-22, here 108, 112-13.

defend him against the charges and attitudes of Jewish Christians. Moreover, in Paul's account before the Sanhedrin, he betrays the fact that there are greater differences within Judaism, rather than between Christians and Pharisees. In conclusion, "Christianity as the true Israel is faithful to the synagogue, Temple, and Scriptures (Luke 1-2; 3:8; 4:16-30; 19:45-47) and was respectful of Roman citizens and law (Luke 3:13 f.; 4:5-8; 5:27-32; 7:2-9; 20:20-26; 22:50-53; 23:1-4, 15, 20-24, 47)."[69] In particular, the five chapters of Acts (22-26) have more to do with the defense of the charge that Paul is an apostate from the Law, and instigates others to apostatize.

1-12. The ethical model for Christian living

Having establishing six criteria to find the Luke's purpose,[70] H.D. Buckwalter contends that Luke "writes to show his readers how Jesus' life stands as the ethical model for Christian living and how the early church has imaged his likeness in their own life and witness."[71] According to Buckwalter's observation, Luke reveals allegiance to the theological stance of the synoptic tradition in his employment on Mark.[72] Furthermore, he refutes P. Vielhauer's allegation that the Christologies of Luke are not in congruence with that of Paul, after viewing his standpoint in light of the close correlation between the "humiliation-exaltation" Christology of Philippians and Luke-Acts. Jesus' humiliation and exaltation epitomized in the Christ hymn (Phil. 2:5-11) are parallel with the literary structure and Christological emphases in Luke-Acts. The Lord Jesus in the Gospel has revealed his servanthood thoroughly through obedient service to the Father. In this regard, the humiliation denotes his obedience, even to the moment of death on a cross, and the exaltation expresses God's affirmation of it in raising him from the dead. The above two aspects expound what Jesus' Lordship means. As a result, to completely understand the meaning of Jesus' Lordship is to understand his servanthood. As in Jesus' obedience, Peter, Stephen and Paul in Acts loyally follow the way of Jesus. In addition, the servanthood of the Lord Jesus in the Christ hymn becomes the ethical standard

69. Mattill, "The Purpose of Acts: Schneckenburger Reconsidered," 122. See also Mattill, "The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H.H. Evans Reconsidered," *NovT* 17 (1974), 15-46; idem, "The Date and Purpose of Luke-Acts: Rackham Reconsidered," *CBQ* 40 (1978), 335-50.

70. His six criteria are as follows: readers, concrete occasion, author's stated aim, broad textual support, unity of Luke-Acts, and theological interest. See H.D. Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology*, 35-41.

71. Ibid., 281.

72. Ibid., 79-89.

for Christian living.[73] With consistent portraits Luke show what it means to be a Christian disciple in his two volumes. That is to say, Jesus and his way of life are proffered as models which a would-be Christian disciple should imitate. Luke's major purpose furnishes his readers with a tract on Christian discipleship stemming from Jesus' life, work, and teaching, and especially personified and exemplified in the early church, in particular, in Peter, Stephen and Paul's conformity to the way of Jesus. It is ultimately Jesus' servanthood that is the pattern for Christian discipleship.[74]

1-13. A multifaceted reading of the purpose of Luke

Not satisfied with speaking of a single purpose, R.H. Stein speaks of the various purposes of Luke-Acts. He uses four broad categories relating to the Lukan purpose: (1) To help convince his readers of the truthfulness of what they had been taught, (2) To clarify the Christian self-understanding of his readers, (3) To clarify Jesus' teaching concerning the end times, and (4) To assure his readers that Rome was not a threat to them.[75] In relation to (1), he claims that from the prologue, one main purpose of Luke is to assure his readers of the truthfulness of what they had been instructed about Jesus' life and teachings. Luke tries to show this truthfulness in five dimensions: Luke's credentials as a historian who investigates everything carefully from the beginning in order to write an orderly account (1:3), eyewitness traditions that this teaching came from those who were eyewitnesses from the beginning (1:2), the proof from prophecy that the things that came into being in Jesus and the church were the fulfillment of prophecy (1:1), the proof from miracles that attest to the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God (esp. Acts 2:22), the proof from the growth of the church, in the sense that God was witnessing to its truth by letting the church grow. With relevance to (2), Luke seeks to settle two related problems: "The first is the rejection of Christ and Christian preaching by the majority of Israel, the second is how Gentile believers related to the promises God made to Israel."[76] The church has continuity with the religion of Abraham, Moses, and the prophets. At the same time, the Gentiles in the church link by faith to faithful Israel, by living in the fulfillment of the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the Prophets which were realized in Jesus' coming as Messiah. On the other hand, most of Israel, in their unbelief, reject and crucify Jesus as God's Son. In connection with (3), according to

73. Ibid., 231-71.
74. Ibid., 275-84.
75. Stein, *Luke*, 35-44.
76. Ibid., 40.

Stein, unlike Conzelmann's contention, Luke still has an imminent expectation in Luke-Acts and "the believer lives in the joy of the already now and the hope of the final consummation."[77] In conjunction with (4), Luke describes Rome in a positive view, that is, when persecution arose, it was generally on account of opposition from the Jewish leadership, not Roman authorities. It means that Christians do not need to fear Rome in following Jesus.

As we have seen above, each suggestion concerning the purpose of Luke-Acts has methodological, textual, and historical problems. At times, their claims can be applicable to the caution that "too little of the Gospel deals with such legal, political concerns and too much exhortation deals with issues beyond simple evangelism."[78] It is fairly hard to view the following proposals as the purpose of Luke-Acts as a whole: a defense of Paul, an anti-Gnostic concern, evangelism, an explanation of the parousia's delay, an apologetic for *religio licita* status, a political *apologia pro ecclesia*, an *apologia pro imperio*, a theodicy of God's faithfulness to Israel, an effort at conciliation with Judaism. To put it differently, even though these can be one of the key aspects of Luke's agenda, it in no way fits Luke's principle aim, since there is much more to it in Luke-Acts. Most importantly, it can be pointed out that some of them ignore the unity of Luke-Acts in attempting to determine the purpose of Luke. While such attitudes may be misleading, those who acknowledge the unity of Luke-Acts can gain some insights into Luke's purpose through threads running through both books.[79] In what

77. Ibid., 44.

78. Bock, *Luke*, 15.

79. Recently, Mikael Parsons and Richard I. Pervo have raised some questions about the unity of Luke-Acts by contending that its unity needs to be questioned and justified, since "the unity of the Lukan writings is a largely unexamined question." They give attention to the differences in genre, narrative and theology in Luke-Acts, and focus on a number of authorial and canonical questions posed by Luke and Acts. As a result, they come to the conclusion that although the same real author wrote Luke and Acts, the two works possess "two very distinct narrative embodying different literary devices, generic conventions, and perhaps even theological concerns." In their view, it is desirable to view Luke *and* Acts as loosely connected, rather than see a close connection between the two. See M.C. Parsons and R.I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 18, 89, 115-126; M.C. Parsons, "The Unity of the Lukan Writings: Rethinking the OPINIO COMMUNIS," in ed. Naymond H. Keathley, *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays on Acts in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders* (Texas, Waco: Baylor University, 1990). From a different angle, Andrew Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe tackle the question of the unity of Luke-Acts by examining the history of reception, noting that Luke-Acts were not read and heard together by the early Christians in the ancient world. In other words, second-century writers did not read Luke and Acts in unison or treat them as a single literary unit. Gregory argues that "Irenaeus and the author of the Muratorian Fragment each read Luke and Acts as two elements of one literary whole, but that Irenaeus's understanding of what this literary unity entails appears to have been different from that of many modern scholarly readings of Luke-Acts." According to him, prior to Irenaeus, Luke and Acts seem to have been used as distinct texts, and after Irenaeus, they appear to have been read primarily "as respective parts either of the Gospel or of the Apostle, the two principle components of what becomes the New Testament."

As a result, "each is appropriate to different circumstances and reflects different needs and interests on the part of those who employ it at any particular time." See A.F. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (WUNT, 2.169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck); idem, "The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 29 (2007), 459-72, here 459, 470. Rowe contends that although Irenaeus accepts the Lukan authorship of both Luke and Acts, as well as making use of Luke's literary coordination of the beginning of Acts with the end of the Gospel, he does not, however, give evidence to support a reading of the two volumes as a single work. Furthermore, according to Rowe, the Muratorian Fragment's claim is for a common authorship of Luke and Acts, not a decisive reading strategy for both works, in which case "the author of the fragment reads Luke not with Acts as *Luke-Acts* but, as did Irenaeus, with the other three Gospels." As a consequence, Rowe goes further by claiming that it is appropriate to read and study the Gospel independently. In addition, Rowe elicits a wide variety of reading strategies from these results, that is, reading strategies which are connected with "the author's intention and literary character of the work, or with the evidence for Acts' early reception and its textual and canonical history." See C.K. Rowe, "History, Hermeneutics and the Unity of Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 28 (2005), 131-57, here 136-38, 152-54; idem, "Literary Unity and Reception History: Reading Luke-Acts as Luke and Acts," *JSNT* 29 (2007), 449-57. Parsons and Pervo correctly pointed out that the unity of Luke-Acts is a largely unexamined hypothesis, and Rowe and Gregory also contributed to directing scholars' attention to Reception History in studying the unity of Luke-Acts. However they have failed to convince the majority of Lukan scholars, and have not overturned the consensus that Luke's Gospel and Acts are really two volumes of one work which must be considered together. Even though there are differences between the Gospel and Acts in the theological, narrative, and generic aspects, it does not overrule the affinities between Luke's Gospel and Acts. In what follows, I will present a few arguments demonstrating the unity of Luke-Acts. H.J. Cadbury claims as follows: "Even the recognition of the common authorship of Luke and Acts is not enough. They are not merely two independent writings from the same pen; they are a single continuous work. Acts is neither an appendix nor an afterthought. It is probably an integral part of the author's original plan and purpose." See Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 8-9. Literary critics are certainly more concerned with the unity of the story than with the unity of Luke's theology. See Stephen Moore, "Narrative Commentaries on the Bible: Context, Roots, and Prospects," *Foundations & Facets Forum*, 3 (1987), 29-62; Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1. p. xiii; Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM Press, 1987), pp. ix-x. In the same vein, Green also argues that Luke's design is not to simply record the story of Jesus, but to write the story of the continuation and fulfillment of God's redemptive purpose to include both the work of Jesus and of the followers of Jesus after his ascension. In his view, the unity of Luke-Acts lies in narrative purpose, not in narrative. See Green, The Theology of Luke, 47; idem, Luke, 10-14. In accordance with consensus of the majority of scholars, J. Verheyden holds that "the Gospel is the introduction to Acts and the basis upon which Acts is built, but also that the Gospel, in a sense, needs Acts and calls for the continuation in which its message is realized in the world, and consequently that Lk and Acts together constitute one work." See J. Verheyden, "The Unity of Luke-Acts. What are up to?" in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL, 142; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 3-56, here 56; idem, "The Unity of Luke-Acts," *HTS* 55 (1999), 964-79. All things considered, it is legitimate to say that Luke-Acts is two volumes of one work, that were written by the same author. Therefore, the conclusion to be drawn here is that Luke-Acts must be considered together in attempting to determine the purpose of Luke. For more on this argument, see C.K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (London: Epworth Press, 1961); idem, "The Third Gospel as a Preface to Acts?" in ed., F. van Segbroek et al., *The Four Gospels 1992*, II. (3 vols.; BETL, 100; FS Frans Neirynck; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1451-66; idem, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, I. (ICC; Edinburgh: T &T Clark, 1994); D.E. Aune, *The New Testament in its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987); J. Dawsey, "The Literary Unity of Luke-Acts: Questions of Style-A Task for Literary Critics," *NTS* 35 (1989), 48-66; J.B. Green and Michael C. McKeever (eds.), *Luke-Acts and New Testament Historiography* (IBR Bibliographies; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994); F. Neirynck, "Luke 4:16-30 and the Unity of Luke-Acts," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL, 142; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 357-95; Beverly Roberts, Gaventa, *Acts* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003); Markus Bockmuehl, "Why not Let Acts Be Acts? In Conversation with C. Kavin Rowe," *JSNT* 28 (2005), 163-66; Luke Timothy, Johnson, "Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception-History Pertinent?," *JSNT* 28 (2005), 159-62;

follows, I will explore the purpose of Luke in detail, especially in the preface to Luke's Gospel and the audience of Luke.

K.D. Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: T & T Clark, 2005); F. Bovon, "The Reception and Use of the Gospel of Luke in the Second Century," in ed., Craig Bartholomew et al., *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 379-400.

2. The confirmation of the gospel as the purpose of Luke's Gospel

2-1. The Preface to Luke's Gospel (1:1-4)

2-1-1. The Structure of Luke's Prologue and Hellenistic-Jewish Writings

In comparison with both Matthew and Mark's prologue, Luke's preface is obviously the other part in which he spells out to us why and how he writes, and even reveals the tradition about Jesus at the time when he wrote. What is more, special attention is given to its literary style because of its close similarity to contemporary secular writings of the period, such as Josephus, Diodorus or Dionysius, and the like.

As for the structure, the extended sentence is one long Greek sentence, the so-called "period" which is "the organization of a considerable number of clauses and phrases into a well-rounded unity."[1] The structure which includes a protasis (1:1-2) and an apodosis (1:3-4) has three parallel phrases: "many" in verse 1 is parallel to "also to me" in verse 3, "to compose a narrative" in verse 1 goes with "to write for you" in verse 3, and "even as eyewitnesses and servants handed down" in verse 2 corresponds to "in order that you might have assurance" in verse 4. According to Tiede, the parallelism of Luke 1:1-4 goes as follows:[2]

a) Inasmuch as many have undertaken (v. la)
  b) to compile a narrative of the things… (v. 1b)

---

1. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961), §§458, 464; Green, *Luke*, 36, also sees Luke's prologue as periodic, one complete sentence made up of five clauses organized into a balanced unity:

many have undertaken—I too decided
to set down an orderly account —to write an orderly account
the events that have been fulfilled among us—everything
from the beginning—from the very first
just as they were handed down to us—so that you may know.

2. D. Lenz Tiede, *Luke* (ACNT, Minneapolis, Minn: Augsburg Pub House, 1988), 33. On the other hand, Paul W. Felix, "Literary Dependence and Luke's Prologue," *MSJ* 8/1 (1997), 61-82, here 66, divides Luke's preface as follows:

1. The context of Luke's writing project (1:1-2)
  A. The activity of his contemporaries (1:1)
  B. The activity of the eyewitnesses (1:2)
2. The commentary on Luke's writing project (1:3-4)
  A. The credentials of the writer (1:3)
  B. The purpose of the work (1:4)

c) just as they were delivered to us by… (v. 2)
a') it seemed good to us also… (v. 3a)
b') to write an orderly account for you… (v. 3a)
c') in order that you may know the truth (v. 4)

The structure of Luke's prologue closely resembles that of many introductions used by ancient writings. Above all, Luke's preface parallels Hellenistic-Jewish writings. The author of 2 Maccabees presents what his own goal is in writing a new summary work in verse 24, and hopes to provide facts for the benefit of the reader in verse 25. In addition, he, as an epitomator, who is likened to a house-decorator, compares his work to embellishing an already constructed house in verse 28-29, in contrast with the builder who is responsible for the fundamental structure of the new house.[3] According to the author of Ben Sira's wisdom, Jesus ben Sira who is the author's grandson, added a Greek preface to the text to illustrate not only his reasons for publishing the work, but also the difficulties encountered in translation. The first sentence (1-14) begins with a laudation of the magnitude of the biblical wisdom tradition and its usefulness for all. In the second sentence (15-26), he solicits his readers for goodwill and attention, pleading for tolerance for failures and shortcomings in translating from Hebrew to Greek. The author in a final sentence (27-35) explains his impetus for taking up the work of translation, the purpose of the task, his recent condition, and so forth. Ben Sira's prologue in some respects is parallel to Luke 1:3, 4 in the sense that it has two "decision" sentences in 12 and 30, and also each sentence involves the clause "so that you may know" which gives us an enhanced understanding of the dedicatee of the book. Josephus, in the *Bellum Judaicum*, which has a general preface (I 1-16), followed by summary of contents (I 17-30), claims to qualify his writing in his own experience, and in a polemical form this is also repeated in *Antiquities* I 4 (cf. I 1-26), in *Contra Apionem* I 53-6 (cf. I 1-5, II 1-7), and in *Life* 357-67. With respect to his predecessors, Josephus, in the *Antiquities* I 4, mentions those who attempt to write histories in general statement. The sentence of the author's decision is found in the *Bellum Judaicum* in the writer's statement that "since others have written about the war of the Jews against the Romans, I decided (προυθέμην ἐγώ) to tell the tale (ἀφηγήσασθαι)…" (I 1-3), and likewise in *Contra Apionem* in the author's claim that

3. *2 Macc*. 2:19-31. For more on this, see L. Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*, SNTSMS 78 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 147-67, here 148-51. She mentions that the writer of 2 Maccabees, in contrast to Luke, does not conceal the religious character of his work in verse 22, whereas Ben Sira's preface openly extols the biblical wisdom traditions of Israel especially in verse 1.

"since I observe that since a considerable number of persons (ἐπεὶ δὲ συχνοὺς ὁρῶ)…, I consider it my duty to devote a brief treatise to all these points…" (I 2-3).[4]

There are also Greek parallels to the preface of Luke's Gospel. Thucydides (I, I-23) had established the convention of a preface including the subject matter of the work, its usefulness for the present, and the historian's need for accurate investigation and truthful presentation. His convention had been followed by historians (e.g. Polybius, Dionysius, Lucian, Diodorus Siculus, Dio Cassius, Tacitus, Josephus and so on)[5] since the first century A.D. stressing the value of history's education and a record of the past.[6] Given the fact that Luke's preface includes the character of narrative and a sequence of events, and his use of historiographical conventions, his introduction has been considered to belong to the historiographical genre.[7] A later work, *How to Write History* 53-55 by Lucian of Samosata (A.D. 125-180) especially belongs here. Lucian claims that if what is said is evidently important, essential, personal, or useful, audiences will give their full attention to historians. He also remarks that, like the orator, the historian is responsible for giving the audience "what will interest and instruct them."[8] On the other hand, L.C.A. Alexander claims that the so-called 'scientific works' provide better parallels to Luke's prologue than the conventions

4. Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*, 163. See also D.L. Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," *CTR* 5.2 (1991), 183-202, here 185. Except these, the Letter of Aristeas 1:1-8 and *Quod omnis probus* and *De vita Mosis* of Philo of Alexandria can also be mentioned.

5. See Polybius (*Hist*. I,3.1-6; ect), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom*. I,5.3; 8.1.4), Josephus (*BJ*. I,18.30), Diodorus (*Hist*. I,4.5), Tacitus (*Hist*. I,1) and Sallust (*Cat*. 4,5; *Jug*. 5,3).

6. C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 118.

7. See W. den Boer, "Some Remarks on the Beginnings of Christian Historiography," *Studia Patristica* 4 (1961), 348-62; Kurz, W.S. 'The Function of Christological Proof from Prophecy for Luke and Justin,' (PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1976), 11-12; idem, "Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible," *SBLSP* 19 (1980) 283-300; D.J. Sneen, "An Exegesis of Luke 1:1-4 with Special Regard to Luke's Purpose as a Historian," *ExpTim* 83 (1971) 40-43; W.C. van Unnik, "Remarks on the Purpose of Luke's Historical Writing (Luke 1:1-4)," *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 6-15; I.J. Du Plessis, "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk 1:1-4)," *NovT* 16 (1974), 259-71; T. Callan, "The Preface of Luke-Acts and Historiography," *NTS* 31 (1985), 576-81; D.P. Moessner, "The Triadic Synergy of Hellenistic Poetics in the Narrative Epistemology of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Authorial Intent of the Evangelist Luke (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1-8)," *Neotestamenica* 42.2 (2008), 289-303, contends that "Dionysius of Halicarnassus' critique of Thucydides' prose 'arrangement' provides the closest parallel in thought and rationale to Luke's opening assertions regarding the clear certainty of the significance of all the events that he will configure in the sequence of his narrative." See also idem, "Dionysius' Narrative 'Arrangement' (οἰκονομία) as the Hermeneutical Key to Luke's Re-vision of the 'Many'," in ed., A. Christophersen, C. Claussen, J. Frey and B. Longenecker, Paul, *Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J.M. Wedderburn* (SNTSup 217, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 149-64 and "The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1:1-4)," in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel* (Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999), 84-123.

8. Lucian, *De Hist. Conscrib*. §53.

of Greek historiography, both in general and in detail. These scientific works are as technical treatises on crafts including medicine, engineering, architecture and philosophy. Scientific works generally compose of one or two sentences, and by convention have a reference to the work of predecessors, to the tradition of the subject and to eyewitnesses. In addition, they are couched in periodic sentences and expressed to some extent in ponderous phraseology with periphrasis and compound words. In view of the fact that the author's decision to write is represented in the vocative, the insertion of the personal pronoun and the final clause with 'so that you… ', the content of Luke's introduction is typical of scientific tradition.[9] From another angle, D.P. Moessner argues that, when Hellenistic writers produce alternative versions of traditions, themes, or periods of history and the like, their references to their own superior credentials provide the closest parallel to Luke's preface. Therefore, on the criteria of contemporary poetics regarding what constitutes good narrative, Luke expresses his narratives as a worthy and legitimate reconfiguration of many other attempts. In order to demonstrate these, Moessner focuses only on two terms, παρηκολουθηκότι as Luke's superior credentials and καθεξῆς as narrative sequence in Luke 1:3. Ancient Greek authors of historiography, philosophical essays, and scientific or technical prose and treatises generally use παρηκολουθηκότι in their prologue to denote a rationale for and legitimation of their undertaking. Moreover, Dionysius of Halicarnassus takes note of the role of a narrative's sequence (καθεξῆς) in enhancing clear understanding. That is to say, a narrative sequence provides a firm understanding of the significance of the events. Just as Hellenistic authors link the author's qualifications (παρηκολουθηκότι) for the benefit of the reader, who follows the superior text to a narrative sequence (καθεξῆς) for offering a clear understanding, so Luke also ties his credentials (παρηκολουθηκότι) to a narrative sequence (καθεξῆς) providing a better grasp of the events.[10]

In conclusion, it is to some extent clear that Luke employs a literary convention already widespread in the Greco-Roman world. He seems to follow a well-paved path, embedding a Greek-style prologue in the introduction of his narrative.[11]

---

9. Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*, 42-101, especially 103-106. On the other hand, V.K. Robbins, "Prefaces in Greco-Roman Biography and Luke-Acts," *SBLSP* 14 (1978), 193-207, compares Luke's introduction with those of Hellenistic biographies. For more on argument of Hellenistic biography, see Talbert, Literary Patterns, *Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*; idem, *What Is A Gospel?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

10. Moessner, "The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1:1-4)," in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel* (Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999), 84-123, here 85, 88, 97-98, 109, 112-113.

11. Against this claim, see Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4),"

2-1-2. The Context of Luke's Preface (1:1-2)

Luke begins by explaining the historical context for his writing, with a causal clause, ἐπειδήπερ ('inasmuch as' or 'since') which occurs in classical Greek, but does not occur elsewhere in the LXX and the NT.[12] Luke mentions other attempts in the literary activity of people living during Luke's time and a generation before him, so as to locate his design as an extension of their work, but containing his own interpretation of the tradition. If Luke has not disparaged earlier efforts to record the words and works of Jesus, his purpose in writing his gospel will have identified and re-presented previous narratives about Jesus as in keeping with his project, rather than competing with them.

Rather than identifying the earlier writers by name, Luke, by means of the term πολλοί refers only to the existence of these literary predecessors. Felix argues here that it is right to understand the term "many" as a reference to a definite number of individuals, since the usages of the NT (Acts 1:3; Heb. 1:1) represent a clear-cut emphasis on specific numbers.[13] Some hold that 'many' is employed for its rhetorical effect, irrespective of it virtually expressing a great number, on the grounds that the term was frequently employed at beginnings of speeches and documents in ancient discourses. In such cases, its emphasis is not so much put on the number of a writer's predecessors, as on the legitimacy of Luke's undertaking to be associated with the tradition.[14] Unfortunately, the readers are left with no hint as to whether the predecessors included one or more of the Gospels, although there is a contention that Mark, Q, and Luke's *Sondertradenten* belong to his predecessors, and he used their work "positively to justify his own venture," rather than to devaluate or rival them.[15]

Luke describes the literary activity of his forerunners in writing about Jesus as ἐπεχείρησαν which literally means "to put the hand to," "take in hand," and "attempt." The idea of the term implies the presence of written materials beyond organized oral reports. The question arises as to whether this term is neutral or pejorative. Some interpreters see the term

---

200-201.

12. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 290-91.

13. Felix, "Literary Dependence and Luke's Prologue," 67. For usage of in Acts 1:3 and in Heb. 1:1, see Richard N. Longenecker, "The Acts of the Apostles," in ed., Frank E. Gaebelein, *Expositor's Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 9: 207-573, here 254; Marcus Dods, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," in ed., W. Robertson Nicoll, *Expositor's Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 221-381, here 247-48.

14. J.B. Bauer, "ΠΟΛΛΟΙ Luke 1,1" *NovT* 4 (1960), 263-66; Marshall, *Luke*, 41; R.H. Stein, "Luke 1:1-4 and *Tradionsgeschichte*," *JETS* 26 (1983), 421-30, here 422; Green, *Luke*, 38.

15. Marshall, *Luke*, 41.

as a neutral force for various reasons:[16] First, through the use of κἀμοί ('and I also,' 'for me as well') in verse 3, Luke identifies himself with the contemporary literary activities of his predecessors. Second, in composing an account, it is natural to use the term. Third, the term is in the main used in the papyri for undertaking a project, and has no allusion to failure in its usages. On the other hand, others hold that the term is pejorative, and give several evidences:[17] First, the term occurs in Acts 9:29 and 19:13 with a negative sense which express unsuccessful attempts. Second, Luke's emphasis on accuracy and research seems to denote that previous works, to a certain extent, needed some improvement. Third, the church fathers like Origen and Jerome,[18] and Eusebius[19] also took the term in a negative sense. Though it is difficult to decide between the two views, taking all into consideration, it seems inevitable that Luke at least in some respects saw a need to improve upon earlier reports of his forerunners about Jesus.

In describing the previous accounts, Luke employs ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν, which means to compile an orderly account. It is most likely that the verb ἀνατάξασθαι, in contrast to oral tradition, means to draw up an orderly account in writing. G. Delling mentions that the verb presents the movement from oral to written tradition.[20] Still the term itself cannot also exclude a reference to oral tradition. Since the term was used by ancient historians as a technical expression for different kinds of recounting, it is broad enough to refer to oral or written accounts.[21] As regards the term διήγησις ('an orderly account'), Green argues that for Luke "narrative" διήγησις is "proclamation" beyond simply a rhetorical device or a technical term on the grounds that Luke employs the cognate verb "for the act of describing God's mighty deeds" in Acts 9:27, 12:17, 8:33 and Luke 8:39, 9:10. Luke bears the use of history in mind to persuasively convey understanding of God's work in Jesus and the early church. In line with this, Luke uses the narrative account as the medium of proclamation, in

16. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 250-51; Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, 4-6; Stein, "Luke 1:1-4 and *Tradionsgeschichte*," 423; Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 188.

17. Godet, *Luke*, 1:55; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 123; Hendriksen, 54-55; Creed, *Luke*, 3; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 292; Felix, "Literary Dependence and Luke's Prologue," 70.

18. Origen, *Homily on Luke, I*. See also C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 123.

19. Eusebius *H.E*. 3.24.15.

20. G. Delling, "ἀνατάσσω," *TDNT*, VIII, 32-33.

21. W.C. van Unnik, "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography," in ed., J. Kremer, *Les Actes des Apôtres: traditions, redaction, theólogie* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979), 37-60, here 40-42; idem, "Once More St. Luke's Prologue," *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973), 7-26; I.J. Du Plessis, "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk 1:1-4)," 262-63; Marshall, *Luke*, 41; Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 189.

which case the narrative's order is crucial for his readers to understand God's work in Jesus and the early church.[22]

Even though there are some suggestions for the meaning of πεπληροφορημένων, as "completed events,"[23] "assured events,"[24] and "fulfilled events,"[25] given the fact that Luke puts his emphasis on the fulfillment of God's plan in both Luke and Acts (Luke 1:20, 57, 2:6, 21-22; 4:21; Acts 9:23; 13:25; 24:27), "fulfilled" is suitable for the meaning of the term πεπληροφορημένων. The events Luke will narrate, means God's design is evident in the OT and the history of God's people, and is continuously affirmed in Jesus' life, death and resurrection and the Christian mission in Luke-Acts. In other words, it is in the very events that God achieves his purpose. Here, ἐν ἡμῖν is not restricted to the first generation that participated in Jesus' ministry or saw the time of salvation history's initiation, but is extended to the second and third generations who came to believe, namely, the Christian community, since the perfect tense of the participle "fulfilled" denotes the continuance of a completed action.[26]

In verse 2, Luke directs attention away from the activity of compilers to that of eyewitnesses. The conjunction καθώς ('just as') explains the origin of the accounts by comparing the previous accounts about Jesus to their point of origin. Luke, by means of the term, stresses the reliable grounds on which these accounts rested. That is to say, the accounts of verse 1 are based on traditions which were handed down by eyewitnesses and ministers of the word. Here, Luke finds a parallel between his predecessors and these eyewitnesses and ministers of the word. To put it another way, "just as" the eyewitnesses and ministers of the word had passed on the tradition of these "fulfilled events," so the forerunners had compiled accounts of those events, molding them into a consistent and coherent unity.[27] In so doing, Luke builds the general reliability and soundness of the previous narratives.

The terms αὐτόπται and ὑπηρέται mean one group that has a twofold role,[28] not two

22. Green, *Luke*, 38.
23. H.J. Cadbury, "Commentary on the Preface of Luke," *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part 1. The Acts of Apostles, F.J.F. Jackson and K. Lake (eds.). Vol. II. (London: MacMillan, 1922), 489-510, here 495-96.
24. K. Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1937), 14.
25. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 293; Marshall, *Luke*, 41; Schweizer, 11; Du Plessis, "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk 1:1-4)," 263-64; Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 190; Felix, "Literary Dependence and Luke's Prologue," 72; Green, *Luke*, 39-40.
26. R.J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* (AnBib 82; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 271, n. 115; Green, *Luke*, 40.
27. C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 125; Green, *Luke*, 40.
28. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 294; Nolland, *Luke*, 7.

separate groups, since according to Greek grammar, a single article (οἱ) governing two nouns connected by καὶ may or may not constitute a single entity.[29] What is more, the position of the participle (γενόμενοι) after the second noun (ὑπηρέται) also supports this interpretation, because the participle does not separate the two nouns. Dillon goes so far as to claim that Luke's language presents a process by which original eyewitnesses gradually became servants of the word.[30] His contention is refuted, however, by Nolland who says that the disciples in Acts are to be witnesses, not graduates from being eyewitnesses.[31] Who were these "eyewitnesses" and "servants"? It is obvious that it includes at least some of the apostles, for Luke gives attention to eyewitness from the beginning (Acts 1:21-22) as one of the qualifications for apostleship. Furthermore, it is most likely that the group includes others besides apostles, but their identity is unknown to us. According to Ellis, there are three stages of history in the tradition: 1) the experienced events; 2) the witnesses' formulation of the events' tradition; and 3) the recording of that tradition and the reflection upon those events.[32] In so doing, it is clear that Luke is not one of their number, but second generation. The reference to the word is to the Christian message, the good news which is based on the coming of Jesus and his missionary activity as a message about divine events.

The verb παρέδοσαν is a technical term that describes the passing on of an official tradition, either orally or in writing, in which case it is a strong allusion to apostolic oral tradition.[33] Eyewitnesses and servants by nature of their activity pass it on to "us" (verse 2) which implies not only those of Luke's time including himself, but also his literary predecessors and other unidentifiable Christians, probably the tradition's transmission to a later generation of the church.[34]

2-1-3. Luke's Purpose according to the Preface (1:3-4)

Luke here describes his own view concerning his work in verse 3 as the major clause of the preface. ἔδοξεν κἀμοι is interpreted as "it seemed well to me also," in which case κἀμοι as crasis for καί plus μοι means "and to me" or "also to me."[35] Luke wants to join himself to

29. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 278.
30. R. Dillon, "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4), *CBQ* 43 (1981), 205-227, here 214-15.
31. Nolland, *Luke*, 7-8.
32. Ellis, *Luke*, 65.
33. Creed, *Luke*, 4.
34. Felix, "Literary Dependence and Luke's Prologue," 75.
35. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 296; Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on

those who have recorded Jesus' life on the grounds of the apostolic tradition for these accounts, and also to add something, so as to contribute to this tradition of writing.

The term παρηκολουθηκότι can basically mean "followed up," "traced," "investigated," "informed himself about," "going back and familiarized himself with," and so on. But its precise meaning has been very much debated. The dispute can boils down to two options: 1) The verb refers "to following closely the progress of certain events," in which case it means "to keep up with a movement."[36] This interpretation also implies that Luke simply followed along as events unfolded, rather than investigated anything, thereby suggesting that Luke was one of the eyewitnesses and servants of the word. 2) The verb refers to the investigation of past events.[37] Here, the meaning is 'to follow an account or events in order to understand them'. In other words, because Luke did not experience all the events, he pays careful attention to them. In which case Luke is not one of the eyewitnesses and servants of the word, so he has no choice but to rely on the result of investigation, in order to follow the events carefully.[38] The former point of view has a weakness in that Luke was not an eyewitness of Jesus' life, since "from the beginning" (ἄνωθεν) (verse 3) dismisses the meaning of "a long time" which the advocates of the former view assign to the phrase. Furthermore, Luke makes it clear that he is not an eyewitness, but rather relies on them, distinguishing himself from the eyewitnesses in the immediate context.[39] On the other hand, the latter view has firmer support in the sense that the idea fits with Luke's remarks about his investigation in the remainder of verse 3, and is also upheld by ancient writers such as Josephus and Nicomachus.[40] However, in recent years, D.P. Moessner contends that in Josephus' *Against Apion* I.53-56, as opposed to "investigate" it means "a historian's ability to follow (παρακολουθέω) ancient events of Israel as depicted in their scriptures". That is to say, the term παρακολουθέω as a credentialing term, joins "the author's superior qualifications to the

---

Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 193, n. 51.

36. Cadbury, "The Knowledge Claimed in Luke's Preface," *ExpTim* 24 (1922), 401-22; idem, "The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface," *Exp* 8/21 (1921), 431-41; idem, "Commentary on the Preface of Luke," 489-510; idem, "'We' and 'I' Passages in Luke-Acts," *NTS* 3 (1956-57), 128-32.

37. Dillon, "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4)," 218-19; Du Plessis, "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Luke 1:1-4)," 266-67; A.J.B. Higgins, "The Preface to Luke and the Kerygma in Acts," in ed., W.W. Gasque and P.P. Martin, *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1970), 78-91, here 79-82; F.H. Colson, "Notes on St. Luke's Preface," *JTS* 24 (1923), 300-309, here 304, 309; Marshall, *Luke* 42-43; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 296-97; Schweizer, *Luke*, 12; Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 193.

38. Plummer, *Luke*, 4; A.T. Robertson, "The Implications in Luke's Preface," *ExpTim* 35 (1924), 319-21.

39. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 297.

40. Nolland, *Luke*, 9.

desired impact of his works on readers." Therefore, in his view, παρηκολουθηκότι in verse 3 means "one who has followed with the mind" and the traditions of the πράγματα ('all the events or matters') that have been "delivered over from those tradents of the word from the beginning."[41]

As for the extent of the investigation, Luke employs the term ἄνωθεν in the phrase ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς which could be interpreted as "from the beginning all events carefully." In which case, the term ἄνωθεν can mean either "from the beginning"[42] or "for a long time."[43] In view of the Lukan usage in Luke 1:1 and Acts 26:4-5 with ἄπ' αρχῆς, the former translation fits the phrase. On the other hand, Fitzmyer raises the question whether the beginning referred to here is the start of Jesus' life, or the beginning of the apostolic tradition. Given the emphasis of Luke on fulfillment in the infancy material and this period of Jesus' life, his investigation would seem to go back to the very beginning of his life.[44] In this vein, it is most natural to view πᾶσιν as a reference to events that in the masculine point to the study of all the sources, not merely to apostolic tradition. Luke investigates the material "carefully" (ἀκριβῶς) from the beginning of Jesus' life, so that his study can be brought to fruition. As Green claims, if the adverb ἀκριβῶς could modify the main verb "to write," then it presents a claim for "accuracy" for Luke's literary product.[45] On the other hand, D.L. Balch argues that the term ἀκριβῶς means "fully," not "accurately," and is governed by the infinitive γράψαι, not by the participle παρηκολουθηκότι, in which case the interpretation is not so much "to have followed accurately," as "to write a full narrative." Balch claims that Luke, in contrast to his forerunners who wrote briefly, wanted to write a more complete form. Therefore, with types and purposes of speeches in Hellenistic historiography in mind, he accomplished this goal by constructing speeches that denote "the causes and consequences of the events of salvation history."[46]

---

41. Moessner, "The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1:1-4)," 85-88.
42. Büchsel, F. "ἄνωθεν," *TDNT*, I, 378; *NKJV* (from the first); *NIV*; *NASB*.
43. Cadbury and Marshall; BDAG, 77; *RSV*.
44. Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 194-95.
45. Green, *Luke*, 42.
46. David L. Balch, "ἀκριβῶς…γράψαι (Luke 1:3): To Write the Full History of God's Receiving All Nations," in ed., D.P. Moessner, *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel* (Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999), 229-50, here 238-39. According to him, a full translation of verse 3 is as follows: "I, too, having mentally followed all things from the beginning with respect to cause and effect, decided to write you in a full and orderly manner, most excellent Theophilus." For understanding Luke's method of presenting speeches analogous to that of Thucydides, Polybius, Julius Caesar and Sallust, see Conrad Gempf, "Public Speaking and Published Accounts," in ed., Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, *The Book of Acts in Its First-Century Setting*, vol 1: *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993), 259-303.

Luke portrays his task with καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι which is interpreted as "to write an orderly account for you." The term καθεξῆς which goes with γράψαι means "it seemed good to write an orderly account for you", showing the nature of the accounts. To what then does καθεξῆς, "an orderly account," refer? The suggestions with respect to this are as follows: The order is 1) broadly chronological,[47] 2) a literary systematic presentation,[48] 3) bringing out continuity,[49] 4) a salvation-historical linkage,[50] 5) narrative order,[51] 6) coherence with respect to the purpose of the narrative,[52] 7) logical or idea-sequence,[53] 8) the succession or the linear progression,[54] or 8) persuasive order.[55]

The term καθεξῆς is a molded form of ἐξῆς which means "one after another," "in order," or "in a row." Moreover, it is usually equated with the more common ἐφεξῆς which has the following meanings: "in order," "one after another," "continuously" and "successively."[56] The term καθεξῆς does not appear elsewhere in Luke-Acts, except in Luke 1:3, 8:1, Acts 3:24, 11:4 and 18:23. In Luke 8:1 and Acts 3:24 its meaning is "following," while in Acts 18:23 it indicates "successively" or "one after another."[57] Its use in Acts 11:4 with Peter's speech is all the more important for the context of verse 3. The adverb in Acts 11:4 may convey the implications of a traditionally arranged and well ordered speech, with a suitable beginning and end, since its narrative recounts a continuous sequence of events relevant to Peter's defense. If this is the case for the term in verse 3, it then can be interpreted as "following a

47. Plummer, *Luke*, 5; Godet, *Luke*, 1:65; Marshall, *Luke*, 43; Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 197; Felix, "Literary Dependence and Luke's Prologue," 78.

48. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 299; M. Völkel, "Exegetische Erwägungen zum Verständnis des Begriffs καθεξῆς im lukanischen Prolog," *NTS* 20 (1973-74), 289-99, here 294, claims that the term καθεξῆς presents the modality of a literary presentation which refers not to the events recorded by way of chronological exactitude, but to that which constitutes the correct understanding of the events.

49. G.H. Whitaker, "The Philology of St. Luke's Preface," *Exp* 7 (1920), 262-72, 380-84.

50. G. Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Ökumenischer Taschenbuch Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3; 2 vols; Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1977), 128-31.

51. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, vol. 2., 144-45; Stein, *Luke*, 65; idem, "Luke 1:1-4 and *Traditionsgeschichte*," *JETS* 26 (1983), 421-430, here 427; Moessner, "The Appeal and Power of Poetics," 97-112.

52. D. Lenz Tiede, *Luke*, 37.

53. Dillin, "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4)," 219-223.

54. Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*, 131-32, 136.

55. Green, *Luke*, 44. For more on this debate, see G.J. Lockwood, "The Reference to Order in Luke's Preface," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 59 (1995), 101-104; Fearghail, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts: A Study of the Role of Lk 1:1-4:44 in the the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work*, 102- 110.

56. H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1977), 594, 742.

57. Cadbury, *Luke*, 504-505; Marshall, *Luke*, 43.

traditional arrangement of the material found in his predecessors' narratives."[58]

The term καθεξῆς is broadly chronological, geographic, logical and salvation historical in the sense that the events, though they show little interest in strict chronology, are recounted in something of a chronological order, and Luke strives to give assurance about what is still to be fulfilled from what has been fulfilled, showing the presence of a divine, guiding hand in the course of events narrated. Furthermore, the term καθεξῆς, as found in Hellenistic historiography,[59] also has a concept of order or continuity of narrative in what follows, to impress on the readers the good order or arrangement, with a suitable beginning and a fitting conclusion for his narrative.[60]

The recipient of this work is described as "most excellent Theophilus" (κράτιστε Θεόφιλε), the epithet of which, as reserved for Roman political officials, is found in reference to Felix (Acts 23:26; 24:3) and Festus (Acts 26:25). This epithet at the very least signifies the recipient's social standing, though it is not necessarily due to a person of rank like Felix and Festus. Who is Theophilus? In seeking to identify him, an attempt to see "Theophilus", which means "dear to God" or "lover of God" as a symbolic audience for pious Christians[61] is highly unlikely, since Theophilus is a common name for both Jews and Greeks from the third century B.C onwards, as found in the papyri and inscriptions of the time. Ellis suggests that Theophilus is Luke's patron who bears the expense of composing and publishing Luke-Acts.[62] There is, however, no acknowledgement of monetary aid in Luke's dedication of Luke-Acts to Theophilus. Most view Theophilus as a real person, since there is no evidence of a name taking symbolic meaning in similar literary prologues.[63] Another contentious question relates to whether Theophilus is a believer, or an interested unbeliever. Caird contends that he is an unbeliever, since "the dedication is too formal for a

58. Fearghail, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts: A Study of the Role of Lk 1:1-4:44 in the the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work*, 110.

59. *De Thuc.* §§9.10; Lucian *De Hist. Conscrib.* §§48, 50-51. For more on this, see Moessner, "The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1:1-4)," 109-112.

60. Green claims that "while the Christian message here is bound with the historical events related to its origins and progression, and Luke must therefore necessarily be concerned with 'what happened,' it is the question of interpretation that is vital for him." In so doing, these events, after all, goes forward this interpretation that Luke will denote in his narrative. Green, *Luke*, 45.

61. Nolland, *Luke*, 10.

62. Ellis, *Luke*, 66. See also Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*, 131-32, 52-57, 190-97. On the other hand, R.H. Anderson, "Theophilus: A Proposal," *EvQ* 69 (1997), 195-215, even suggests that Luke wrote to Theophilus the Jewish High Priest from 37 to 41 CE.

63. C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 134.

reference to a believer," whilst also saying that "Luke's work is apologetic in character."[64] In contrast to his claim, however, the fact that Luke uses such a formality as a literary character, and that Luke-Acts is a proclamation of Jesus rather than an apologetic of the gospel, has strong support. The issue as to whether Theophilus is a believer or an unbeliever is closely related to understanding κατηχήθης in verse 4. The term can mean "teach or instruct" (Luke 1:20; 6:47; Acts 18:25[65]), and also in general sense can mean "report or inform" (Acts 21:24)[66]. The former then can apply to a Christian, and the latter to a non-Christian.[67] That the work is dedicated to Theophilus can mean that through his influence Luke's work would have gained a wider audience than just the one individual. We can also view Theophilus as representative of Luke's community.[68]

In verse 4, Luke states the purpose of his work, with the term ἀσφάλειαν which occupies the emphatic position at the end of this long sentence. The term ἀσφάλειαν is usually understood to refer to the certainty of these things that he has been taught or has heard. However, the meaning of the term ἀσφάλειαν has been disputed, as either 'correctness', 'reliability', or 'certainty-assurance'. Given the Lukan usage of the term in Acts 2:36, 21:34, 22:30 and 25:26, he consistently uses the term to convey certainty.[69] Dillon argues that the 'security' is more concerned with *the words* you have been taught than the facts or events.[70] Rick Strelan also holds that the term refers to the sureness of the words and the soundness of their argument, rather than the facts about Jesus, on the grounds that Greek writers in their literature style use the noun and its cognates to signify a moderate, sound, balanced, conservative style of writing and speaking.[71] Furthermore, it is likely that the term ἀσφάλειαν has not merely the sense of historical accuracy,[72] but also that of theological or

64. Caird, *Luke*, 44; Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 197.
65. Green rejects Acts 18:25 as analogy for "instruct" because Apollos in Acts 18:25 had been instructed in the Way of the Lord, but still knows "only the baptism of John." As a result he started showing from the Scriptures that the Messiah is Jesus, after he received further explanation from Priscilla and Aquila (18:24-28). Green, *Luke*, 46.
66. Cadbury, "Commentary on the Preface of Luke," 509.
67. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 300-301.
68. J.B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia, S.C: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 19-41.
69. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 300; Creed, *Luke*, 5; Marshall, *Luke* 44; K.L. Schmidt, "ἀσφάλεια, ἀσφαλής, ἀσφαλῶς, ἀσφαλίζω," *TDNT*, I, 506; Dillon, "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4)," 224; Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 198.
70. Dillon, "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4)," 224.
71. Rich Strelan, "A Note on ἀσφάλεια (Luke 1:4)," *JSNT* 30 (2007), 163-71.
72. Unnik, "Remarks on the Purpose of Luke's Historical Writings," 6-15.

doctrinal correctness.[73] In any event, it seems safe to say that Luke desires that Theophilus, and those like him who have questions, are certain of the teaching or the instruction that has been taught or they have heard.

The word λόγων, as we have seen above, can mean "matter" that refers to the events of salvation (Luke 1:20; Acts 8:21; 15:6), and "instruction" (Luke 4:32; 6:47; 10:39). Since both "events" and "teaching" can fit the context, the difference is negligible. That is to say, the events' significance in particular as fulfillments may be included in the teaching.[74]

Luke states his literary, historical, and theological dimensions of the project in his prologue. The purpose of Luke's preface is to reassure Theophilus and those like him who have been taught or have heard about Jesus and the gospel. In this, Luke's work stands alongside other church materials that have recounted the eyewitness, apostolic testimony about Jesus. While Luke reflects a positive attitude toward his predecessors, as well as approving and admiring the role of the eyewitnesses and servants of the word as mediators, he seeks to go one better with historically reliable information presented in a stylistically correct form. Accordingly, he is not merely careful and thorough in his investigation, but he also takes up Hellenistic theory and practice so as to achieve this goal. The Lukan readers will come to know exactly what the historical events mean through Luke's endeavour that integrates historical "events" (πραγμάτων) into salvation-historical "events fulfilled" (πεπληροφορημένων) among us. Luke's aim of certainty will be consistently unfolded in God's plan of salvation which in the Gospel begins with the story of John the Baptist and Jesus' birth, and in Acts runs through the extension of the church into Rome.

2-2. The Audience of Luke

In order to search for the purpose of Luke, it is imperative that we examine the audience of Luke, since the identity of his target audience will shed further light on the reasons why Luke wrote his Gospel. One of the nagging issues in the modern study of the Gospels is the discussion around the audience of the Gospel. Since a book edited by Richard Bauckham, *The Gospels for all Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*,[75] was published, numerous

73. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 9; Bock, *Luke*, 64-65; Dahl, "The purpose of Luke-Acts," 93; P.S. Minear, "Dear Theo: The Kerygmatic Intention and Claim of the Book of Acts," *Int* 27 (1973), 133-150, here 133-34.

74. Bock, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," 200.

75. Richard Bauckham, *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience* (Grand Rapids, MI:

critics have responded to his theme that the Evangelists wrote for general audiences, not for local communities. I will therefore allow for more space here to deal with the argument of the Christian community. I will deal with the audience of Luke in three parts: The Argument of the Christian community, Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians as a Christian Audience, and a Non-Christian Audience.

2-2-1. The Argument of the Christian Community

The nature of the relationship between the Gospel of Luke and a specific Christian community has been discussed recently by a number of scholars.[76] Having identified Luke as a pastoral theologian who is concerned for the faith of his missionary communities, R.J. Karris takes up the concerns of faith which Luke's missionary communities are experiencing after the Destruction of Jerusalem, such as persecution, harassment, distress, the poor and rich, the search for continuity amidst discontinuity, and Luke's missionary communities. In his view, Luke presents diverse answers to his persecuted community, showing the fact that growth, as the standard of Christian life, follows persecution throughout Acts. For him the Lukan community includes the poor and rich as an actual situation, in contrast to the symbolic and metaphorical expressions by L.T. Johnson who argues that "the expressions rich and poor function within the story as metaphorical expressions for those rejected and

---

Eerdmans, 1998).

76. L.T. Johnson, "On Finding the Lukan Community: A Cautious Cautionary Essay," *SBL 1979 Seminar Papers*. (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 87-100; Robert J. Karris, "Missionary communities: a new paradigm for the study of Luke-Acts," 80-97; P.F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); D. Allison, "Was There a Lukan Community?," *IBS* 10 (1988), 62-70; Vernon Robbins, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," 305-32 and Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts," 241-68; idem, "The Social Context of Luke's Community," 379-89; S.J. Joubert, "The Jerusalem community as role-model for a cosmopolitan group: A socio-literary analysis of Luke's symbolic universe," *Neotestamentica* 29 (1995), 49-59; Pieter J.J. Botha, "Community and Conviction in Luke-Acts," *Neotestamentica* 29 (1995), 145-65. For the nature of the relationships between the Gospels and specific Christian communities, see Richard Bauckham, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?" 9-48 and Richard A. Burridge, "About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences," 113-45 and Stephen C. Barton, "Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?," 173-94, in ed., Richard Bauckham, *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998); Martin Hengel, The *Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000); P.F. Esler, "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's Gospels for All Christians," *SJT* 51 (1998), 235-48; I.J. du Plessis, "The Lukan Audience-Rediscovered? Some Reactions to Bauckham's Theory," *Neotestamentica* 34 (2000), 243-261; David C. Sim, "The Gospels for all Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham," *JSNT* 84 (2001), 3-27; Thomas Kazen, "Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts," *NTS* 51 (2005), 561-78; Margaret M. Mitchell, "Patristic Counter-Evidence to the Claim that 'The Gospels Were Written for All Christians'," *NTS* 51 (2005), 36-79.

accepted because of their response to the prophet."[77] Do the possessions of the rich in the Lukan community prevent them from being genuine Christians? Luke's answers to the question reveal complexity. Furthermore, Luke strives to demonstrate to both Jewish and Gentile converts that they are in continuity with Judaism. To put it another way, Luke seeks to explain how his community, as missionary communities, are in continuity with the Messiah, prophet, the Lord Jesus. In conclusion, Luke's communities, Karris contends, are missionary communities: "They are communities which debate with the Jews that Jesus is the fulfillment of God's promises. They are communities which prove to their Gentile members that they are heir to the promises God made to the Jewish people. They are communities whose missionary work and daily existence are prone to danger and suffering-both from Jew and Gentile, but primarily from the Jewish synagogal authorities."[78]

P.F. Esler examines the interrelationships between Luke's theology and the social and political pressures of his community by means of 'socio-redaction criticism' which combines social science with redaction criticism. According to Esler, this community "needed strong assurance that their desire to convert and to adopt a different life-style had been the correct one."[79] Therefore, Luke's theology results from his desire to legitimate Christianity toward his community which is made up of Jews and Gentiles, especially 'God-fearers,' and the rich and poor. That is to say, Luke claims that Christianity should be treated as a *religio licita* because of the antiquity and correctness of the sect of Jesus. With respect to the diversity of this group and its relationship to Judaism, he deals with table fellowship, the law, the temple, and poor and rich. In his chapter on table-fellowship, Esler puts his emphasis on the crisis in the early church caused by commensality, criticizing scholars who have passed over this important point for a proper understanding of Lukan theology. For him a proper understanding of table-fellowship, that Jews did not eat with Gentiles, is a focal point, since the Lukan community is composed of both Jew and Gentile. In other words, it is important "to appreciate the centrality of this phenomenon, both to Luke's history of Christian beginnings and to the life of his own community"[80] for a proper understanding of Lukan theology.

Through a combination of analysing the social world of Luke's text and its social and historical context known from other sources, H. Moxnes attempts to delineate the social

77. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 166.
78. Karris, "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts," 96.
79. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, 16.
80. Ibid., 71.

location of Luke's first audience. Having discarded a specific setting drawn from P. Esler who argues that the Lukan community situates in tensions within their membership and with the world outside,[81] he presumes that Luke's location is "in an urban setting in the eastern parts of the Mediterranean," namely, "in typical aspects of urban life in a Greco-Roman city."[82] Firstly, he puts forward some distinctive qualities of urban communities and their structures. Power and social relations in the Hellenistic city characterizes the quest for honour, a system of patronage, and reciprocity (generalized reciprocity, balanced reciprocity and negative reciprocity). Secondly, he deals with meals, God-fearers, women, and the rich and poor under the title of 'Luke's community within the Hellenistic city'. Meals at that time represented an expression of honour and status for the city elite, typical forms of benefactions, an integral part of temple worship and offerings, and a Jews' expression. Luke describes meal narratives with cult scenes in which Jesus enters the stage as host or guest (Luke 5:29-32; 7:36-50; 14:1-24; 19:5-10). In the first community in Jerusalem, meals are portrayed as a typical element, and the acceptance of new members into the community (Acts 2:46; 10:17-29; 11:3). On the other hand, meals stir up tensions in social relationships inside and outside that group, thereby starting, sustaining, and destroying the mechanism of sociability.[83] For Moxnes, the Lukan communities were composed of primarily Hellenistic, non-Jewish Christians including a few Jewish Christians, thereby fostering conflicts within the community with law-observant Christian Jews. Moreover, there is also a conflict caused by a competition to win God-fearers who, as their patrons, provided material and social protection (Acts 10:22; Luke 7:1-10).[84] Luke's portrayal of women in Luke-Acts are seen as serving (Luke 4:38-39; 8:1-3) Jesus and the apostles, and providing for missionaries with their property, as patrons. Women, unlike male disciples, do not request honour or privilege, but rather follow Jesus as a model of a serving patron. As ideal disciples, women are restricted in their domestic tasks, and they, at the same time, are located on the fringe of social power. With respect to rich and poor, Jesus not only breaks down the elite system and all its values, but also betrays social sanctions (Luke 14:1-14; 22:24-27), claiming hospitality without a return (Luke 14:12), and being one who serves (Luke 22:26). Therefore, the ideal rich in Luke is to be a person on the fringe of society, not one of the elite. Luke attempts to create a common identity for a mixed group of

81. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, 26.
82. Moxnes, "The Social Context of Luke's Community," 380-81.
83. Ibid., 383.
84. Ibid., 384.

Christians by means of this ethos of his ideal community described above.[85]

On the other hand, Richard Bauckham contends that the four Gospels were written not for local Christians, but for a very broad Christian readership, to be circulated to all churches and to be read by all Christians.[86] Bauckham attempts to refute the current consensus in Gospel scholarship which simply assumes the existence of the four specific Christian communities, namely, the so-called Matthean, Markan, Lukan, and Johannine communities. First of all, he begins with the common view that the four Gospels were written for Christians, not for non-Christians. He claims that if Matthew and Luke used Mark which had circulated widely prior to their Gospels, both authors would have been aware that it was inappropriate to write their own Gospels merely for their own local communities. He criticizes Gospel scholars who are inclined to read the Gospels as if they were Pauline letters which sprung into being from the local community. The Gospels, however, belong to the genre of ancient Greco-Roman biography which have a generally broad readership, and are expected to circulate to readers unknown to its author. This means that a small circle and friends who might initially read it were only the first step to a wider circulation.[87] Moreover, the early Christian movement is not a collection of isolated and independent churches, for the movement presents a network of groups that keep in close communication with one another.[88] Bauckham concludes with a number of hermeneutical observations: 1) The current consensus in the Gospels scholarship, that the so-called Gospel communities function as a key hermeneutical role in interpreting the Gospels, makes a mistake. 2) Bauckham's argument is not intended to broaden the implied audience of the Gospels from a local church to a wider group of churches, but to make the point that the Gospels are composed for any and every church in which their Gospels might

85. Ibid., 387.

86. Bauckham, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?" 9-48.

87. Ibid., 29.

88. For this, Bauckham presents a large amount of relevant evidence: "1) Mobility and communication in the first-century Roman world was exceptionally high. 2) The early Christian movement had a strong sense of itself as a worldwide movement. 3) Most of the Christian leaders whom we know in the New Testament period, moved around. 4) Another feature of the early Christian movement that we can establish as a continuous practice from the time of Paul to the mid-second century is the sending of letters from one church to another. 5) There is concrete evidence for close contact between churches in the period around, or soon after the writing of the Gospels: the fragment of Papias's prologue to his lost work, the letters of Ignatius, and the shepherd of Hermas. 6) The evidence for conflict and diversity in early Christianity supports my picture of the early Christian movement as a network of communities in constant communication." Bauckham, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?" 30-44. For a detailed discussion of the mobility within the Christian movement, see M.B. Thompson, "The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation," in ed., Richard Bauckham, *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 49-70.

circulate. 3) The context of the Gospels is simply the late first-century Christian movement, not its authors' specific community. 4) His argument is in congruence with the way in which the Gospels have always been read. 5) His position does not force us to underestimate the diversity of the Gospels. The diversity of the Gospels reveals that they were not written for specific Christian communities, but rather it merely presents the Evangelists' distinctive theological and christological views to their audiences who come into contact with their texts. 6) The consensus view derives from a misplaced desire for historical specificity. We must read them as 'open texts' which "leave their meaning more open to their real readers' participation in producing meaning,"[89] rather than 'closed texts' which "have a determinate meaning that depends on knowing what the implied reader is supposed to know."[90]

In the same vein, Martin Hengel argues that the four Gospels are written for all churches, not for one particular community. In his view, it is doubtful whether they ever came into existence in only one community, since the missionaries of the early church travelled a lot, and furthermore there could be authoritative teachers in different places. Accordingly, we should stop talking about the communities of the Gospels "as the one really responsible for the composition of a Gospel writing and its theology."[91] In addition, he adds to the fact that the four Gospels differ from letters which were occasioned by a community. Even he casts doubt on the term 'Q community,' namely, the community of the Logia source.[92]

However, Bauckham's hypothesis has encountered serious criticism.[93] At this stage, I will summarize the criticism of David C. Sim against Bauckham's thesis.[94] First of all, his contention as to the nature of the early Christian movement is problematic. His claim that the Gospels were intended for Christians and not for non-Christians suggests that the Evangelists of the Gospels classified the world into Christians and non-Christians. He also mentions "that the early Christian movement had as strong sense of itself as a worldwide movement."[95] The

89. Ibid., 48. See also Umberto Eco, *The Role of the Reader* (London: Hutchinson, 1981), 8-10.
90. Ibid., 48.
91. Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*, 106-115, especially 107.
92. Ibid., 107.
93. See Esler, "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's Gospels for All Christians," 235-48; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 2000) 25-28; Du Plessis, "The Lukan Audience-Rediscovered? Some Reactions to Bauckham's Theory," 243-261; Sim, "The Gospels for all Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham," 3-27; Kazen, "Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts," 561-78.
94. Sim, "The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham," 9-21.
95. Bauckham, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?" 33.

early Christians were divided, however, into two distinct and different groups in view of the intense dispute of Christian identity, rather than into Christian and non-Christian. Secondly, the mobility among the early Christians which he claims is not supported from the evidence relevant to the period of the Evangelists during the first century and the early second century, but it does rather show that there was constant contact between similar churches in restricted areas. Thirdly, he argues that both Matthew and Luke might have written their own Gospels only for their own local communities, since they knew that Mark had circulated broadly in Christian communities. But his contention can equally lead to the opposite conclusion that both Matthew and Luke might have thought that Mark was wrong at a number of significant points.[96] For this reason, they may have changed, omitted from, expanded and added to Mark's text. Fourthly, Bauckham's argument that the Gospel genre assumes a broad readership on the basis of the evidence of the Greco-Roman biographers, encounters an objection from the later Christian Gospel tradition: For example, the Christian Gnostic, including *Gospel of Thomas*.[97] Many of them were made up for specific Christians as a very limited readership. Fifthly, he holds that in the ancient world people communicated orally with their neighbours and wrote texts for wider circulation. The evidence of ancient book production does not provide such a clear distinction between written and oral communication,[98] and certain groups in restricted areas were shown in the Christian Jewish Gospels, such as the Qumran documents, Jewish *Epistle of Aristeas* and *Joseph and Asenath*, and the Christian text *the Teaching of Addai*.[99] In addition, Bauckham's argument continues to be refuted by others, namely Adele Reinhartz and C.L. Blomberg,[100] although Bauckham does have his supporters.[101]

---

96. Esler, "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's Gospels for All Christians," 241-42.

97. Thomas Kazen argues that "extra-canonical gospels are also best understood as intended for a group of churches with similar outlook," in particular through *Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Peter*, Papyrus Egerton 2 and Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 840. See Kazen, "Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts," 561-78.

98. Loveday Alexander, "Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels," in ed., Richard Bauckham, *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 71-105, here 100.

99. Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 27.

100. Adele Reinhartz, "Gospel Audiences: Variations on a Theme," 134-52, and C.L. Blomberg, "The Gospels for Specific Communities and All Christians," 111-33, in ed., Edward W. Klink III, *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity* (New York: T & T Clark, 2010).

101. See Michael F. Bird, "Sectarian Gospels for Sectarian Christians? The Non-Canonical Gospels and Bauckham's The Gospel for All Christians," 27-48, and Justin Marc Smith, "About Friends, by Friends, for Others: Author-Subject Relationships in Contemporary Greco-Roman Biographies," 49-67, in ed., Edward W.

All things considered, it is entirely valid to assume the existence of the Gospel communities, and from the relevant evidence, it is quite plausible to identify the intended readers of the Gospels with the local or regional communities of the evangelists. Along this line, I believe that the Gospel of Luke has a particular target audience, more explicitly than the other Gospels.[102]

2-2-2. A Christian Audience

With respect to arguments for an audience of Luke-Acts, a Christian audience generally has more support than a pagan Gentile audience. This is largely because in Luke's prologue the phrase 'among us' in verse 1 means 'insiders' when using the categories provided by 'outsiders,' and their previous knowledge in verse 4 which they had been taught, clearly rules out a possibility of a pagan Gentile audience.[103] In addition to these reasons, narrative gaps (for example, the OT allusions and patterns, the Son of Man, the Kingdom of God and so forth) require Christian knowledge.[104] Luke expects his readers to understand such expressions on the ground of things that they had already been taught. As a result, such Christian settings, to a certain extent, reveal that Luke has written his work for a Christian audience, not for a pagan Gentile one. Arguments for a Christian audience can be divided into two parts in general: Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians. In the following, I will examine these arguments in detail.

Klink III, *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity* (New York: T & T Clark, 2010).

102. Du Plessis "The Lukan Audience-Rediscovered? Some Reactions to Bauckham's Theory," 244-45, believes that the Lukan audience should be located separately than those of the other evangelists, since Luke, as opposed to the other authors of the Gospels, clearly identifies his first audience, Theophilus. In this respect, J. Riches is right when he says, "Luke's parish seems to be a wider one than that of either of the other two Synoptic evangelists, and his concerns are those of the emerging church with its various settlements scattered across the empire." J. Riches, "The Synoptic Evangelists and their Communities," in ed., J. Becker, *Christian Beginnings: Word and Community from Jesus to Post-Apostolic Times* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 213-241, here 233-34.

103. Ben Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Exeter: Paternoster, 1998), 63-65; Stein, *Luke*, 26-27.

104. According to G.W. Forbes, the main arguments proposed for a Christian audience for Luke-Acts are as follows: "1) certain blocks of teaching, including many parables and various prophecies (Lk. 21:12-19, 27-28, 31-36; Acts 20:29-30; 28:28-30), relate more aptly to Christian disciples; 2) narrative gaps (such as Old Testament allusions/patterns, and Jesus being baptized by John) require Christian knowledge; 3) some of the terms in the preface (fulfilled, delivered, ministers, word, instructed) seem to have already acquired a semi-technical sense; 4) the Hellenistic preface is designed to encourage the church to take itself seriously as people of integrity; 5) the role of Paul, as a model for the Christian life and a bridge between Jesus/the apostles and the church of Luke's day, is more suited to a Christian audience." Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 316.

2-2-2-1. Gentile Christians

Many scholars have considered the audience of Luke-Acts to be predominately Gentile Christians for several reasons:[105] (1) Luke's prologue is very similar to a Greco-Roman preface. Luke in his preface employs a literary convention already widespread in the Greco-Roman world, such as Greek historiography, biography, and scientific works such as technical treatises on crafts, including medicine, engineering, architecture and philosophy.[106] (2) Luke-Acts has an emphasis on the Gentile mission (Acts 10-11; 13:46-48; 18:6; 28:24-28) and the Gentiles. The Gospel of Luke also shows considerable concern for the Gentiles (Lk. 2:31-32; 3:6; 4:25-27; 14:16-24; 24:47), although Luke's concern towards Gentiles intensifies in Acts. The Gentiles appear in Acts especially as the God-fearers (Acts 10:2, 22, 35; 13:16, 26, 43, 50; 17:4, 17; 18:7). (3) Luke avoids Semitic expressions (Lk. 6:14; 8:54; 22:42; 23:45). (4) Luke substitutes non-Palestinian architecture (Lk. 5:19; 8:16), weather, and geography (Lk. 6:48-49) for Palestinian, as well as Greek names for Hebrew or Aramaic terms, for example, the substitution of the term 'lawyer' for 'scribe' (Lk. 10:25; 11:52). (5) Luke explains Jewish customs (Lk. 22:1, 7) and Jewish localities (Lk. 4:31; 8:26; 21:37; 23:51; 24:13). (6) Luke extends Jesus' genealogy from Joseph to Adam (3:38) instead of to Abraham as Matthew does (Mt. 1:16). (7) Luke's use of 'Judea' in generic terminology to describe 'Palestine' may imply that his audience was of a non-Palestinian origin (Lk. 1:5; 4:44; 6:17; 7:17; 23:5; Acts 2:9; 10:37).[107] (8) Luke uses the LXX rather than the MT when referencing the Old Testament.[108]

M. Dibelius argues that Luke-Acts was written for a Gentile audience consisting of uneducated believers and well-educated unbelievers. For him "Luke's Gospel was intended as

105. M. Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1956), 173-4; E. Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1964), 90-91; Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, 49; Frank Stagg, "The Unhindered Gospel," *RevExp* 71 (1974), 451-62; Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 10; Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and The Genre of Luke-Acts*, 135: Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 57-58; Eugene A. Laverdiere and William G. Thompson, "New Testament Communities in Transition: A Study of Matthew and Luke," *TS* 37 (1976), 567-97, here 583.

106. For an argument for a literary convention in the Greco-Roman world, see Moessner, "The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1:1-4)," 85, 88, 97-98, 109, 112-113; Robbins, "Prefaces in Greco-Roman Biography and Luke-Acts," 193-207; Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*; Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*, 42-101, especially 103-106.

107. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 58.

108. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 57-58; Stein, *Luke*, 26-27; Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 318.

a book to be read by the Christian community, but also, at the same time, intended for the private reading of people of literary education."[109] He is convinced that Luke did not write for Jews, since "Christianity was moving away from Judaism."[110] He claims that the purpose of the trial scenes is to educate unbelieving Gentiles that Christians are peaceful, law-abiding citizens.

E. Haenchen holds that Luke did not write for a Jewish audience, since by that time Christian mission was directed solely to the Gentiles.[111] According to him, Luke's major concern is the mission to the Gentiles without the law. On the one hand, Luke's theological argument for the discontinuity between Judaism and Christianity is intended for believing Gentiles. On the other hand, Luke's political argument that Christians no longer can be assured of the toleration promised to Jews is intended for unbelieving Gentiles. In other words, "Not only does the book of Acts point out the triumphal procession of the Word of God from Jerusalem to Rome, but it is also concerned about peaceful coexistence between the pagan state and the Christian church."[112]

As for Luke's intended readers, Fitzmyer states that Luke's obvious concern to link his story of the Christ-event and its sequel to a Greco-Roman literary convention, for example, Luke's prologue (Lk 1:1-4), reveals that Luke-Acts was written for Gentile Christians. He also notes that Luke shows a clear desire to relate the salvation promised to Israel in the OT to Gentiles or non-Jews. In order to spell out that the Gospel has a Gentile destination, Fitzmyer gives at least six reasons with specific examples in the Gospel. Finally, after analyzing the contentions of J. Jervell and M. Moscato related to this theme, Fitzmyer concludes that "the readers envisaged by Luke were not Gentile Christians in a predominately Jewish setting, but rather they were Gentile Christians in a predominately Gentile setting." His discussion, of course, leaves some room that "there may have been some Jews and Jewish Christians among them." At any rate, the audience intended by Luke in Luke-Acts is "one that is predominately Gentile Christian, and Theophilus is one of them."[113]

The major weakness of the argument for Gentile Christians is that the defenders of this claim do not explain in a satisfactory way the Jewish material in Luke-Acts, although they do

109. Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 147.
110. Ibid, 173.
111. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, 102.
112. Haenchen, "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity," in ed., Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1966), 258-278, here 278.
113. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 58. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 318.

offer plausible causes concerning the Jewish concern in Luke-Acts: An apologetic function to meet Jewish criticism, or a defense of Christianity aimed at unbelieving Gentiles, in other words, Christians who have inherited the best Jewish tradition.[114] This weak point is fiercely attacked by champions for Jewish Christians as Luke's audience, on the grounds of the Jewishness of Luke's work.

2-2-2-2. Jewish Christians

While most interpreters have understood Luke's audience to be a Gentile audience, some scholars have proposed that Luke is primarily addressing Jewish Christians.[115] This contention for Jewish Christians started with the work of J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Jervell first criticizes the nearly unanimous view that for years scholars have seen Luke-Acts as "a Gentile Christian document, written by a Gentile Christian for Gentile Christians."[116] He basically supports Jewish Christians as the audience for Luke-Acts on the grounds of the Jewishness of Luke's work: (1) Luke's Christology shows us that "the Messiah of Luke-Acts is the most Jewish Messiah within the New Testament, not only in regard to language but also to content." (2) Luke's ecclesiology shows us that for Luke the word for the church is not 'church', but the people of God as Israel distinguished from all other peoples and nations. There are, throughout Acts, mass conversions of Jews and God-fearers, and yet none of Gentiles. (3) With respect to soteriology, Luke conveys that "all promises of salvation are given to Israel and those belonging to the people," and "the promises are never taken from the people." (4) The law, the *torah* within the church, has full validity not only for all Jewish Christians, but also for non-Jews (God-fearers) in accordance with the apostolic decree. (5) Jewish words,

114. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 308; Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 213.

115. Mattill, "The Purpose of Acts: Schneckenburger Reconsidered," 122; Erwin R. Goodenough, "The Perspective of Acts," in ed., Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1968), 51-59; Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972), 41-74, 174-77, 199; idem, *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 26-51; idem, "Retrospect and Prospect in Luke-Acts Interpretation," in ed., E.H. Lovering, *SBL Seminar Papers 1991* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991), 383-404; idem, "God's Faithfulness to the Faithless People: Trends in Interpretation of Luke-Acts," *WW* 12 (1992), 29-36; D. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 14, 50, 107-108, 120-32; D. Juel, *Luke-Acts: The Promise of History* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1983), 113-23; Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*, 155-59; J.M. Ford, *My Enemy is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke* (New York: Orbis Books, 1984), 136-37; idem, "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Luke's Gospel," in ed., R.J. Cassidy and P.J. Scharper, *Political Issues in Luke-Acts* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983), 80-98.

116. Jervell, "Retrospect and Prospect in Luke-Acts Interpretation," 383.

conceptions, and customs which only a Jew could understand appear in Luke 1 through to Acts 28, and only a few cases are explained by Luke. It is not reasonable to believe that the Gospel was written for Gentiles not familiar with Judaism on the grounds that some cases, about 5%, are explained by Luke in the Gospel. (6) In the Acts of the Apostles, Paul is presented to us as the apostle to the Jews who speaks to the Diaspora, not to the Gentiles. (7) With regards to language, Luke is written mostly in Hellenistic Greek influenced by the Septuagint which is written for Jews, not for Gentiles.[117]

According to D.L. Tiede, Luke's audience is the Jewish Christian in the setting of the Greco-Roman world. Luke reveals an interpretation of Christian origins "that will continue to have paradigmatic value for succeeding generations."[118] He also finds that the interpretative activity in Luke and Acts denotes a Jewish-Christian situation which justifies table-fellowship with Gentiles as Christians, and to defend Paul from the charge of apostasy. In his view, Luke-Acts was written in response to the aftermath of the Jewish war with Rome in A.D. 66-73, with serious questions about God's faithfulness, justice, and His plan of salvation history. Tiede demonstrates that Luke-Acts is one of several competing interpretations of the scriptural promises in the face of God's apparent withdrawal from Jerusalem. In other words, Luke-Acts is a prophetic indictment from within, not an anti-Jewish use of OT traditions to argue for a new people of God replacing Israel.[119] His argument challenges head-on the predominant view that Luke-Acts has given up on conversion of the Jews, and is justifying the mainly Gentile church of his day.

R.L. Brawley also agrees with the view of a Jewish Christian audience, seeking to pull down "the conventional theory that Luke gives up on the Jews as hopelessly hardened against the gospel, and that he views them as providing antecedents for Christianity only as a part of a remote past."[120] He proposes, instead of the conventional theory that Luke-Acts is a product of a struggle for the legacy of Israel as the people of God, that it is written as an apology to the Jews, and as conciliation between Christianity and Judaism. In his view, Luke strives to present how Jesus qualifies as Messiah despite of his rejection by Judaism. Furthermore, for Luke, Paul's behaviour and the mission including the Gentiles as a model are clearly the fulfillment of Israel's destiny. "Therefore, the standard paradigm for

117. Ibid., 384-86; idem, "God's Faithfulness to the Faithless People: Trends in Interpretation of Luke-Acts," 29-30.
118. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*, 14.
119. Ibid., 50, 107-108, 120-32.
120. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*, 155.

understanding Luke's view of the relation between Christianity and Judaism should pivot 180 degrees. That is, rather than setting Gentile Christianity free, Luke ties it to Judaism. And rather than rejecting the Jews, Luke appeals to them."[121]

Having mentioned Josephus' reports that the defeat of the Jews in the great war with Rome (66-74 C.E.) raised repercussions in the Diaspora, J.M. Ford holds that "one of the purposes of the Gospel of Luke was to respond to these postwar conditions,"[122] and to encourage the Jewish Christian communities in Palestinian and the Diaspora that the peace that Christ came to bring is not won through violence but by love, forgiveness, and acceptance of enemies into covenant community. He claims that the year of favour proclaimed by Jesus in Luke 4:16-30 could also be applied to the Christian communities in the Diaspora, namely, "the Jubilee era which, if properly implemented, would solve many of the social, economic, and religious problems within Palestine."[123]

However, they all advance their claims without regard to whether the intended reader of Luke-Acts has "some knowledge of Jewish faith and practice and is familiar with the Jewish scriptures."[124] Moreover, they have "an awareness of Jewish-Samaritan hostilities, as well as a familiarity with the Mediterranean world. However, the Jewish elements in Luke-Acts can be explained in a number of ways, some of which do not require a Jewish audience."

2-2-3. A Non-Christian Audience

Here, a non-Christian audience generally points to a God-fearer, not a pagan Gentile audience. Given, in Luke's prologue, the phrase 'among us' in verse 1, and their previous knowledge in verse 4, a pagan Gentile audience is ruled out of this discussion. In this respect, the audience of Luke-Acts may well be Christian. I will, therefore, deal primarily here with God-fearers as a non-Christian audience of Luke-Acts, not a pagan Gentile audience. God-fearers as the audience for Luke-Acts have been debated by scholars.[125] God-fearers are described as

---

121. Ibid., 159. Brawley believes that Luke uses Hellenistic literary techniques to legitimate Jesus and Peter, showing parallels in Hellenistic literature in six major categories: (1) divine approval, (2) access to divine power, (3) high motivation, (4) benefiting others, (5) possessing a high level of culture, and (6) adhering to an ancient tradition. See also Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*, 51-67.

122. Ford, *My Enemy is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke*, 136-37; idem, "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Luke's Gospel," in ed., R.J. Cassidy and P.J. Scharper, *Political Issues in Luke-Acts* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983), 80-98.

123. Ford, *My Enemy is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke*, 136.

124. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*, 322.

125. K. Lake, "Proselytes and God-Fearers," in ed., F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity.* V. *The Acts of the Apostles* (5 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1933), 74-96; M. Wilcox, "The God-

οἱ φοβούμενοι τόν θεόν (those fearing God, the fearers of God, the God-fearers) in Acts 10:2, 22; 13:16, 26 and οἱ σεβόμενοι(τὸν θεόν), (those worshipping, the worshippers, the devout ones) in Acts 13:43, 50; 16:14 17:4, 17. The expression οἱ φοβούμενοι τόν θεόν as a technical or formal designation for a special group of persons indicates Gentiles who feared the God of Israel and attended synagogue on the Sabbath, as well as gave alms and prayed to the God of Israel, but who stopped short of becoming proselytes to Judaism (including circumcision and observance of the Law).[126]

J. Nolland argues that the intended reader of Luke would be a God-fearer as a Gentile by birth who is drawn into the group on the verges of the synagogue, and who is attracted to the Jewish belief in one true God. A God-fearer would have experienced the ambiguity of his position in terms of Judaism, that is to say, in the case of the crucial divide, they still were reckoned as outside the promises of God. On the other hand, for a God-fearer, Christianity which can fully "embrace him in his Gentile identity" is viewed as "the completion and fulfillment of the Judaism." Furthermore, a God-fearer in Luke-Acts would have been no stranger to the Christian gospel, since he would have touched the gospel through "an evangelistic itineration like those attributed to Paul in Acts."[127]

Fearers in Acts: A Reconsideration," *JSNT* 13 (1981), 102-22; A.T. Kraabel, "The Disappearance of the 'God-Fearers,'" *Numen* 28 (1981), 113-26; idem, "The God-Fearers Meet the Beloved Disciple," in ed., B.A. Pearson, *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 276-284; T.M. Finn, "The God-Fearers Reconsidered," *CBQ* 47 (1985), 75-84; J.J. Gager, "Jews, Gentiles, and Synagogues in the Book of Acts," *HTR* 79 (1986), 91-99; F. Millar, "Gentiles and Judaism: God-Fearers and Proselytes," by E. Schürer; revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, III. 1 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), 150-76; Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, 24-33; J.A. Overman, "The God-Fearers: Some Neglected Features," *JSNT* 32 (1988), 17-26; J. Jervell, "The Church of Jews and Godfearers," in ed., J.B. Tyson, *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988), 11-20; Nolland, *Luke*, p. xxxii; J.T. Sanders, "Who is a Jew and who is a Gentile in the Book of Acts?" *NTS* 37 (1991), 434-55; J.B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*; idem, "Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts: Reading as a Godfearer," *NTS* 41 (1995), 19-38; R. Gagnon, "Luke's Motives for Redaction in the Account of the Double Delegation in Luke 7:1-10," *NovT* 36 (1994), 122-45; M.C. deBoer, "God Fearers in Luke-Acts," in ed., C.M. Tuckett, *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays* (JSNTSup 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 50-71; J.M. Lieu, "The Race of the God-Fearers," *JTS* 46 (1995), 483-501; Gary Gilbert, "The disappearance of the Gentiles: God-fearers and the image of the Jews in Luke-Acts," *Putting body & soul together* (1997), 172-84; D.A. Koch, "The God-Fearers between Facts and Fiction: Two Theosebeis-Inscriptions from Aphrodisias and Their Bearing for the New Testament," *Studia Theologica*, 60 (2006), 62-90.

126. P.R. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 150, 248 n. 24. See also, K.G. Kuhn, "προσήλυτος," *TDNT*, VI, 727-44; S.J.D. Cohen, "Respect for Gentiles in the Writings of Josephus," *HTR* 80 (1987), 409-30, here 30; J. Lieu, "Circumcision, Women and Salvation," *NTS* 40 (1994), 358-70, here 364-67.

127. Nolland, *Luke*, p. xxxii.

P. Esler feels that the primary concern of Luke-Acts is to legitimize relations between Jewish and Gentile Christians in Luke's community, in which the Gentile Christians are composed mainly of God-fearers who were associated with a synagogue. The Cornelius story in Acts 10:1-48 is pivotal for Esler, since the episode shows "essential prerequisites for the conversion of Gentiles to Christianity." This "little-noticed but highly important fact" manifests in Peter's statement in Acts 10:34-35 that "in very nation (ἔθνει) the person who fears God and does righteousness is acceptable to him,"[128] that is, "And Peter opened his mouth and said: Truly I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation anyone who *fears* him and *does* what is *right* is acceptable to him" (Acts 10:34-35). In a similar vein, J. Jervell also contends that Luke did not try to welcome or to convert Gentiles who have no knowledge of the Torah to Christianity, but only God-fearing Gentiles. Along this line, Paul's mission to the Gentiles (τά ἔθνη) becomes, as a matter of fact, a mission to God-fearers, in line with the Cornelius episode, with its conclusion in Acts 11:18, "When they heard this they were silenced. And they glorified God, saying, 'Then to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance unto life'" (Acts 11:18). As a result, Luke's community is composed of Jews and God-fearers who believed in Jesus, and not of pagan Gentiles.[129] However, having examined materials relevant to this theme, J.T. Sanders concludes that there is no evidence supporting that the readers of Luke-Acts would have understood the term τά ἔθνη as a reference to God-fearers. In his view, the term τά ἔθνη in Luke 21:24-25 and 24:47 does not favour the understanding as 'God-fearers', as in Acts, and the term τά ἔθνη in Acts 9:15, 21:21 and 22:21 must be understood as Gentiles as such, not as God-fearing Gentiles.[130]

On the other hand, with a literary approach, Tyson holds that a literate Gentile God-fearer familiar with Jewish literature and practices is suitable for the implied reader of Luke-Acts. He enumerates seven points concerning the implied reader's knowledge: well-educated person, being familiar with some public figures, knowing only the Greek language, having knowledge about public affairs, having an acquaintance of common Greek and Roman measurements and coinage, having a limited knowledge of both pagan and Jewish religions and being familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures in their Greek translation.[131] Luke-Acts may now be approached as an evangelistic text which is addressed to God-fearers: "Positive

128. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, 36-45.
129. Jervell, "The Church of Jews and Godfearers," 11-20.
130. Sanders, "Who is a Jew and who is a Gentile in the Book of Acts?" 434-55, especially 450.
131. Tyson, "Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts: Reading as a Godfearer," 24-25.

images of Judaism are in consonance with the assumed attitudes of a God-fearer as he is first addressed," whereas "negative images which show the inferiority of Judaism to Christianity and help to explain Jewish rejection of the Christian message, urge the God-fearer to abandon the philo-Judaism with which he began."[132] In conclusion, the purpose of Luke-Acts is to persuade God-fearers to embrace Christianity instead of Judaism. Christianity is shown to be the fulfillment of the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish hopes and expectations which the Jews hold and yearn for.[133]

In conclusion, while it is difficult to pinpoint with exact precision Luke's intended audience, it may be that Luke's aim was to reach a wide range of audience in the Greek-speaking world. Even though it is more plausible to view Luke's intended readership as being "primarily" Gentile, it seems safe to say that Luke's intended audience is a mixed audience of both Jews and Gentiles. Along this line, Wenham also argues for a wider readership, namely "diaspora Jews who frequently used the Septuagint in their worship, rather than the Hebrew Scriptures, and Gentile Christians with no synagogue background, but who had become familiar with the Septuagint through it being read in Christian worship."[134] Even F. Bovon argues that Luke has in mind three target groups: educated Gentiles, Hellenistic Jews, and Christians unsettled by rumors, expecting "his rich friend to circulate his two volumes to a broader readership."[135]

2-3. The Plan of God in Luke-Acts

Luke writes to provide his readers with reassurance of the gospel which has already been preached and taught to them, especially under the detailed discussion of God's plan. Therefore, I will examine the role of the Lukan parables in God's redemptive purpose, since

132. Ibid., 38.

133. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*, 182; M.C. deBoer, "God Fearers in Luke-Acts," 68. Except for the scholars mentioned above, for defenders of God-fearers as Luke's audience, see W.A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale, 1983); Juel, *Luke-Acts: The Promise of History*, 120.

134. David Wenham and Steve Walton, *Exploring the NT: A Guide to The Gospel and Acts*, Vol. I (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2001), 294. See also Mary A. Moscato, "Current Theories Reading the Audience of Luke-Acts," *CurTM* 3 (1976), 355-361, here 361; J.C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1961), 173-77; J.D. Kingsbury, *Jesus Christ in Matthew, Mark and Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 95-96; H. Riley, *Preface to Luke* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1993), 9.

135. F. Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*, Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, (trans. Christine M. Thomas: Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 9.

Luke seeks to reassure his readers of the gospel through a pattern of God's plan of salvation. Luke deals with this theme more than the other Synoptic evangelists. As far as his usage is concerned, the term βουλή appears once in Luke and five times in Acts. The plan of God, ἡ βουλὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, in the Gospel is connected with accepting the baptism of John (Luke 7:29), thereby justifying God (τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, Luke 7:30). In Acts the term appears in 2:23 (τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ), 4:28 (ἡ βουλὴ), 5:38 (ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη), 13:36 (τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῇ), and 20:27 (πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ). Along with the term, other indications of God's plan can be found throughout Luke-Acts. That is to say, it is to be noted that references to God's design are also seen in Luke 10:21 (εὐδοκία), 22:42 (πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γενέσθω.), Acts 21:14 (τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου γενέσθω.), and 22:14 (γνῶναι τὸ θέλημα). Moreover, the plan of God frequently occurs not only in the term "it is necessary" (δεῖ),[136] and "it is about to" (μέλλω),[137] but also in presenting that takes the early church as fulfillment according to the scriptures (πληρόω and τελέω)[138] and a cluster of προ-compounds and related verbs[139] which present the design of God and the execution of the plan of God. We can also add here the epiphanies which manifest God, or divine messengers.[140] All these terms are used interchangeably to refer to the same concept. Accordingly, Luke's project is not to simply write the story of Jesus and the early church, but that of the continuation and fulfillment of

136. The term δεῖ is used 18 times in Luke and 24 times in Acts. Of the 42 times the following are noted: Luke 2:29; 4:43; 9:22; 13:33; 17:25; 21:9; 22:37; 24:7, 26, 44 and Acts 1:6, 21; 3:21; 4:12; 5:29; 9:6, 16; 14:22; 16:30; 17:3; 19:21; 20:35; 23:11; 24:19; 25:10; 26:9; 27:24. For more on the term, see C.H. Cosgrove, "The Divine ΔEI in Luke-Acts: Investigations into the Lukan Understanding of God's Providence," *NovT* 26 (1984), 168-90, concludes that the divine δεῖ indicates four aspects: "First, this divine δεῖ points back to God's ancient plan (the βουλὴ τοῦ θεοῦ) and so grounds the kerygmatic history in divine sanction. Second, the divine δεῖ is a summons to obedience. The incentive for such faithfulness is found in the third aspect of the divine δεῖ: God's guarantee of his plan. Fourth, the logic of the divine δεῖ in Luke-Acts involves a dramatic-comedic understanding of salvation-history as a stage set time and again for divine intervention, so that the spotlight of history continuously turns on God's saving miracle."

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

138. πληρόω, Luke 4:21; 9:31; 21:24; 22:16; 24:44 and Acts 1:16; 2:28; 3:18; 12:25; 13:25, 27, 52; 14:26; 19:21. τελέω, Luke 12:50; 18:31; 22:37. See also David Peterson, "The Motif of Fulfilment and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," in ed., B.W. Winter and A.D. Clarke, *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: The Paternoster Press, 1993), 83-104, prefers edification for a Christian audience to a direct apology for unbelievers as the purpose of Luke-Acts.

139. προορίζω (Acts 4:28); προκαταγγέλλω (Acts 3:18; 7:52); πρόγνωσις (Acts 2:23); προχειρίζομαι (Acts 3:20; 22:14; 26:16); προχειροτονέω (Acts 10:41); ὁρίζω (Luke 22:22; Acts 2:23; 10:42; 17:26, 31); τάσσω (Acts 13:48; 22:10); τίθημι (Acts 1:7; 13:47, 48; 19:21; 20:28).

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

God's design which brings salvation to all people, the redemptive purpose of God. God's plan of salvation in Luke-Acts, as will be shown below, has three features.[141]

2-3-1. The Continuation and Fulfillment of God's Plan

By means of the OT citations, Luke wants to express that the divine plan in Luke-Acts is modeled on the old authoritative story of Israel, thereby showing the continuation of God's aim. The same divine design continues in the ministry of Jesus and his followers. In other words, God's plan promised in the Scriptures is not only continuous,[142] but also fulfilled in and through Jesus, as well as his followers.

For Luke, the theme of promise and fulfillment is thus suitable for this discussion. According to Bock, the focal points of Luke's use of the OT are on Christology, Israelite rejection/Gentile inclusion, and eschatological justice. The Gospel of Luke centres on Christology, whereas in Acts the latter two themes become more prominent.[143] In addition, Bock contends that promise and fulfillment are presented in a two-way process in which the Scriptures predict or show the pattern of God's plan for the future, whereas in Luke-Acts,

---

141. J.T. Squire divides these various expressions of the primary theme of the plan of God into five groups: "(1) God is the primary actor throughout Luke-Acts, for the actions of God extend throughout the whole span of history, from creation to final judgement. (2) God directs the life of Jesus and the mission of the church, performing signs and wonders and enabling healings and exorcisms to take place. (3) Epiphanies of God occur in the life of Jesus and throughout the Gentile mission, declaring God's will and guiding the events of history. (4) The life of Jesus, especially his passion, and the mission to the Gentiles, fulfil what had been prophesied. (5) Inherent in the life and passion of Jesus and in the missionary deeds of the apostles, there is a necessity which had been foreordained by Jesus. See J.T. Squire, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 2-3.

142. See Nils A. Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," in ed., L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 139-59; idem, "The purpose of Luke-Acts," in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Pub. House, 1976), 87-98; Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 15-19; Robert J. Karris, *What Are They Saying About Luke and Acts* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979); idem, "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts," 80-97; J.B. Green, "The Problem of a Beginning: Israel's Scriptures in Luke 1-2," 61-86, argues that the framework within which Luke is working in his opening chapters is a self-conscious continuation of the redemptive story, rather than promise-fulfillment, since the beginning chapters of Luke-Acts can be merely placed into God's aim as articulated in the Scriptures of Israel. In other words, the story of God's purpose has not drawn to a close, but is rather still being unmistakably written, and God is now working graciously to bring to his purpose to fruition. The fulfillment is more concerned with God's purpose than with a text-based exegetical maneuver. In conclusion, Luke 1:5-2:52 affirms the direct continuity with God's purpose represented in the Scriptures, and still more presents that God's aim is concretely being realized in these events.

143. D.L. Bock, "Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Luke's Use of the Old Testament for Christology and Mission," in ed., C.A. Evans and W. R. Stegner, *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 104, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 280-307. See also C.A. Evans, "Prophecy and Polemic: Jews in Luke's Scriptural Apologetic," in ed., C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders, *Luke and Sripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 171-211.

Luke looks backwards on the Scriptures to discover the explanation of events.[144]

Such a Lukan motif stands already in the Gospel's opening verse, "an orderly account of *the events* that have been *fulfilled* among us" (1:1). Luke 1:1 represents that "the events" are obviously an extension of some antecedent activity. Moreover, the births of John and Jesus (1:5-2:52) are also rooted in something prior, namely, God's purpose. Lukan presentation of the prologue is beyond a narrow understanding of prophetic-fulfillment.[145] Luke, in the story of the births, seeks to show that the new story of Jesus is linked to the old scriptural story as the realization of God's ancient plan. "He has helped his servant Israel, *in remembrance of his mercy*, as he spoke to *our fathers, to Abraham and to his posterity* forever." (1:54-55). Luke promotes and deepens this motif by numerous references to the Scriptures. The ministry of John the Baptist is grounded in the prophetic words of Isaiah (3:3-6). He who is the forerunner and the greatest prophet of the old era, plays a role as the bridge between promise and inauguration (1:76-79; 7:24-35; 16:16). The inauguration of Jesus' public ministry in 4:21 is proclaimed as the fulfillment of scripture by Jesus. "And he began to say to them, 'Today this scripture has been *fulfilled* in your hearing.'" (4:21). The "today" passages indicate the immediate availability of the promise (2:11; 4:21; 5:26; 13:32-33; 19:5, 9; 19:42; 23:42-43).[146] Furthermore, by the divine δεῖ, Jesus announces that he *must* be in his Father's house (2:49), preach the kingdom (4:43) and heal the woman tormented by Satan (13:16). Jesus must suffer many things, and wars and tumults *must* precede the end (17:25; 21:9). Jesus *must* be numbered among the transgressors (23:35-37). The Christ *must* suffer and be raised, and repentance for the forgiveness of sins *must* be preached. The Christ *must* suffer and enter into glory (24:26). As a result, what the law of Moses, the prophets and the psalms said concerning Jesus, *must be fulfilled* (22:37; 24:25-26).

In Acts 2:23, Peter argues that Jesus' crucifixion took place as a part of God's design. When the apostles were released they went to their friends and reported what the chief priests and the elders had said to them. They proclaim that Herod and Pontius Pilate, along with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel gathered together "to do whatever Thy hand and Thy plan had predestined to take place" (4:28). When the apostles stand before the Sanhedrin, the Pharisee Gamaliel raises a poignant rhetorical question about whether this plan is really of men or of God, saying that one should fear of the latter (5:38-39). Philip says to an Ethiopian

144. Bock, "Scripture and the Realization of God's Promises," in ed., I.H. Marshall and D. Peterson, *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 41-62, here 48.
145. Green, "The Problem of a Beginning: Israel's Scriptures in Luke 1-2," 61-86.
146. Bock, "Luke," in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, 353.

eunuch that Isa. 53:7-8 which the eunuch is reading is one of the scriptural prophecies that is fulfilled by Jesus (8:32-35). Paul understands his missionary work in Gentile regions as a fulfillment of God's aim (13:46-47), namely, the negative response to the gospel is the fulfillment of the word of Hab 1:5, and the positive attitude to the gospel is a fulfillment of Isa. 49:6. Paul states that we must also see Rome as a part of the plan of God (19:21). The angel also says to Paul that he must stand before the emperor, as a part of God's design (19:21). Paul's teaching in 28:23, 25-27 is a summary testifying to the fulfillment of scriptural prophecy both in the life of Jesus and in the failure of many of the Jews to accept the gospel. In conclusion, throughout Luke-Acts, God's plan promised in the Scriptures is not only continuous, but also fulfilled in and through Jesus, as well as his followers.

2-3-2. The Opposition to God's Plan

Opposition in Luke's presentation of God's plan reveals that other purposes contrary to God's design are also at work. Opposition to God's purpose occurs primarily in human and spiritual opponents. In the purpose of God (βουλή), all the people and the tax collectors are contrasted with the Pharisees and the lawyers. "When they heard this all the people and the tax collectors justified God, having been baptized with the baptism of John, but the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected *the purpose of God* for themselves, not having been baptized by him." (Luke 7:29-30; 20:1-8). The Jewish leadership as a whole opposes Jesus and frames a plot to kill him (6:11; 11:53-54; 20:19; 22:1-6, 21; 23:3-5). The competing purposes also appear in the story of Jesus' passion and death (Luke 22-23). Although Pilate wanted (θέλω) to set Jesus free, he still in the end gave Jesus over to the will (θέλημα) of the chief priests, leaders, and the people in Jerusalem (23:20, 25, 13). Joseph, from the Jewish town of Arimathaea who was a member of the council and a good and righteous man, had not consented to their purpose (βουλή) and deeds (23:50-51). In Acts, opposition to God's aim is indicated by the contrast-formula. "But you denied the Holy and Righteous One, and asked for a murderer to be granted to you, and killed the Author of life, whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses." (Acts 3:14-15). The Jews' opposition to the gospel which is proclaimed by the early church appears to be the law,[147] but the Jews' opposition is ultimately against God's purpose as well as in God's plan (Acts 28:25-28). On the other hand, the crowds who are

147. See Blomberg, "The Law in Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 22 (1984), 53-80; Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (SNTMS 50, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

superficial and fickle in their response,[148] are employed as a device to show initial acceptance and final rejection (23:18-25).[149] A turning point occurs in Luke 9-13 where Jesus carries many warnings in his teachings and parables (esp. 13:6-9).

The spiritual forces of evil that aim to frustrate God's plan are evident throughout the Gospel of Luke (4:1-13, 33-37; 8:26-39; 9:1; 10:18; 11:14-26; 22:3, 42, 53).[150] In the wilderness where Jesus was tested by the devil (4:1-13), he experiences the reality of competing aims against God's purpose. In the midst of the test, Jesus confirms that he, as Son of God, would perform his mission in absolute allegiance to God without any compromise of God's redemptive purpose.[151] Jesus perceives and delineates his whole public ministry as having been carried out in the midst of diabolic opposition. Jesus extends his ministry of salvation, driving away demons who cried out 'what have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I beseech you, do not torment me' (4:33-37; 8:26-39). The presence of the kingdom, Jesus says, is shown by the casting out of demons. "But if it is by the finger of

148. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1, 158-66.

149. Tyson, "Jewish Public in Luke-Acts," 574-83; idem, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*, 29-47.

150. See Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 37-99, after dealing with the struggle for Authority in Luke 4:1-13, 11:14-23 and 10:17-20, focuses on the stories about Simon Magus (Acts 8:4-25), Bar Jesus (Acts 13:4-12), and the seven sons of Sceva (Acts 19:8-20). She contends that these passages make a pivotal point primarily on (1) defending Jesus and Christians against charges that they trafficked in magic, (2) showing Jesus' resurrection and exaltation as an apocalyptic event that presents the devil's demise and the ultimate triumph of God's kingdom over that of Satan, and (3) representing Christians who have been liberated from bondage to the devil. Moreover, Luke's story, she teaches, obviously showed those in need of encouragement that Jesus had conquered evil, the unlawfully asserted dominion and authority, and which had long oppressed the peoples of the world. Furthermore, she says that Christian experience also gives proof of the demise of the devil, although the final triumph remains in the future. On the other hand, Todd Klutz, *The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), by means of a sociostylistic reading, analyzes four passages (Luke 4:33-37; 8:26-39; 9:37-43a; Acts 16:16-18). in his discussion of Luke 4:33-37, Klutz shows how this story deviates from its own biblical intertexts, so as to stress the authority of Jesus' own divine power and authority. In Luke 8:26-39, he argues that Jesus' mighty deed of exorcism stems from the same divine power that brought about salvation in the past for the Israelites, as well as fulfills eschatological hopes. In the case of Luke 9:37-43a, the vision-healing sequence has "a certain shamanic quality that goes back to Jesus himself and therefore gives at least a vague sense of this tradition's ideological trajectory over time." In Acts 16:16-18, Klutz notes the status of Jesus and Paul within Luke's community, connecting the exorcist activities of Paul and those of Jesus. According to him, the status of Jesus was probably more secure than that of Paul, yet, unless most, or even all of Luke's first volume was utterly irrelevant to its original context of production, the honour of Jesus himself must also have been under threat. Klutz has shown how an examination of these exorcism stories is indispensable to discerning the christological and ecclesiological emphases of Luke. See also, Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews*, 84-154; Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*, 29-83; Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 41-74; Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*, 19-63, 97-125; Jon A. Weatherly, *Jewish Responsibility for the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 106, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 50-98, 225-242.

151. J.A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (New York: Paulist, 1989), 151, 157, refers to the programmatic nature of the temptation scene for the struggle between God's saving purpose in Jesus and the force of evil in the Gospel of Luke.

God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you." (11:20; cf. 10:18). Satan enters Judas and instigates him to betray Jesus to the chief priest and temple officials (22:3-4). In the same way, Jesus struggles against opposition to God' design when he is in prayer to God in the Mount of Olives. "Father, if thou art willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless not my will, but thine be done." (22:42). On the Mount of Olives, Jesus said to the chief priests and officers of the temple and elders who came to arrest him, that their activity is an extension of the power of darkness (22:53; cf. Acts 26:18). "When I was with you day after day in the temple, you did not lay hands on me. But this is your hour, and the power of darkness." (22:53). Satan enters Ananias and prompts him to lie to the Holy Spirit and betray the fledgling church (Acts 5:3). Satan exploits a magician to cause him to try and buy the power of the Holy Spirit for his own private purpose (Acts 8:9-24), to try to dissuade those interested in the word of the Lord from believing it (Acts 13:6-12), and to put obstacles before those who proclaim the way of salvation (Acts 16:18).[152] Luke therefore clearly shows that there is opposition to God's plan at work.

2-3-3. The Certainty of God's Plan

This theme is naturally connected with the foregoing theme in that God's purpose triumphs over evil forces and the plots of opponents. Luke strives to convey that God's design will be accomplished by any means. The initial disbelief of Zacharias (1:20), war and revolution (21:9), even the death of God's Son (9:22; 17:25; 18:31-33) cannot derail and ruin the plan of God. Luke basically views Jesus' death as the fulfillment of God's redemptive purpose which is grounded in Scripture. "Then he said to them, 'These are my words which I spoke to you, while I was still with you, that everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled.' Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures," (24:45-46).

Of course, the theme of promise and fulfillment in Luke-Acts can convey the certainty of God's plan, as well its continuation. Apart from the theme of promise and fulfillment, I will also focus on the activity of God in Jesus and his followers as the certainty of God's aim. In Acts, the certainty of God's design is plainly shown in the activity of God in Jesus. In Peter's speech at Pentecost and in the portico called Solomon's portico, God has made Jesus both Lord and Messiah (2:36), as well as glorified him (3:13). In addition, according to Peter and

152. Brian Rapske, "Opposition to the Plan of God and Persecution," in ed., I.H. Marshall and D. Peterson, *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 235-256.

Paul's sermons, God has raised Jesus from the dead (2:24, 32, 3:15; 5:30; 10:40; 13:30; 17:31). Beyond the time of Jesus, the activity of God is also at work in the early church (2:16-18). All the growth of the community is due to divine action (2:47; 4:4, 33; 5:14; 6:1, 7). The activity of God appears in miracles (8:10), the divine voice (9:4-6), and the vision (10:9-16). As a consequence, all that God had done for them (14:27; 15:4) reveals the conviction that the activity of God at work guarantees the certainty of His plan.

None of Satan' plots work successfully. During Jesus' ministry, he rebukes demons (4:41), releases those afflicted by evil spirits (8:2; 13:32), drives out demons from those possessed by them (8:32-35), and empowers his disciples to do the same (9:1; 10:1-16). In Acts, Jesus' followers, as Jesus has done, also expel evil spirits (Acts 8:7; 16:18; 19:12).[153] As a result, the spiritual forces of evil against God's saving purpose ultimately cannot frustrate God's power to heal the sick, open the hearts of people to his word, and release people from Satan's bondage. Even hostility to Jesus is employed in service of the will of God. "for truly in this city there were gathered together against thy holy servant Jesus, whom thou didst anoint, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel, *to do whatever thy hand and thy plan had predestined to take place*." (Act 4:27-28). What is more, as Acts closes, Scripture is cited to underscore that the Jewish rejection of Jesus is also a part of the plan to send the God's salvation to the Gentiles (Acts 28:25-28, cf. Isa. 6:9-10). Luke shows that God directs the plan, and that the aim in spite of any opposition is certainly accomplished under God's initiative.

Luke shows clear proof of its divine origin and wants to express that the divine plan in Luke-Acts is rooted in the old authoritative story of Israel, always keeping the continuation of God's aim in his mind. God's plan promised in the Scriptures not only continues, but is also fulfilled in and through Jesus as well as his followers. Luke's presentation of God's plan, of course, indicates that other purposes against God's design are also at work. Indeed, the opposition to God's purpose occurs primarily in both human and spiritual opponents. Nevertheless, Luke strives to convey an assurance that God's design will be accomplished at all costs. God's purpose in reality triumphs over evil forces and plots of opponents. Even hostility to Jesus is employed in the service of the will of God. In conclusion, Luke strives to reassure to his readers, like Theophilus, that God directs the plan, and God's redemptive aim,

153. For more on Satan's fall, see Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*, 75; Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*, 168-69.

in spite of any opposition to the purpose, is certainly accomplished under His initiative. To sum up, Luke strives to convey to his readers reassurance of the gospel in a mould of God's plan of salvation.

3. The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel

Here, I will examine the role of the Lukan parables in God's redemptive purpose, since Luke strives to convey to his readers reassurance of the gospel in a presentation of God's plan of salvation. God's plan of salvation toward a Christian includes newly-changed life in the whole realm of one's life in accordance with Jesus' life and teaching.

Therefore, when Christians live up to Jesus' teaching of the Christians life minutely presented in the Lukan parables, it is in congruence with God's redemptive purpose. What is more, the Christian life concretely presented in the Lukan parables serves to accomplish God's saving purpose. In what follows, I will show that the Lukan parables as perspectives on the Christian life serve to accomplish God's saving aim, which, as has been established above, is the purpose of Luke.

3-1. The Role of the Lukan parables as one facet of embodying God's redemptive purpose

In Luke's wider depiction of God's purpose, the establishment and actualization of God's redemptive purpose emerge obviously in Jesus' ministries, in his life, death, and exaltation, as well as in his followers' commissioned ministries. God's saving aim is also established and materialized clearly in the faith-life of His redeemed people. The pivotal characteristic of God's salvation agenda, which is embodied in the faith-life of Christians, involves the totality of their newly-changed lives, in accordance with Jesus' life and teaching. In this way, by means of parables unique to him, Luke strives to convey to his readers that God's redemptive purpose in the Christian life is necessarily accompanied by a completely changed life, in relationship to God religiously, to possessions economically, and to neighbours socially.

Firstly, the relationship of Christians with neighbours is presented as love and forgiveness in the Parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37), the Parable of the Prodigal Son (15:11-32) and the Pharisee and the Tax-Collentor (18:9-14). Luke gives prominent position to the need to love and forgive all people. Christians should love and forgive their neighbours, including enemies and sinners. It is the right attitude that all Christians should have towards their neighbours.

Secondly, it is taught that Christians should use their own material possessions properly which are entrusted to them for the service of God and the poor, in the Rich Fool (12:13-21), the parable of the Unjust Steward (16:1-13), and the Rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31). The Lukan Jesus repeatedly warns against the danger of attachment to riches as an obstacle to discipleship, and calls for the positive use of wealth, especially in the form of giving alms to

the poor. All Christians are called upon to reflect right relationship with God through the right use of wealth. Lastly, it is especially faith and repentance that Christians ought to exercise in their relationship with God. Two prayer parables, the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8) and the Judge and the Widow (18:1-8), convey that prayer itself is an expression of faith toward God. Indeed, the faithfulness called for in prayer is evidence of constant fellowship with God. With respect to repentance, we can enumerate the following parables: the Barren Fig Tree, the Parable of the Prodigal Son and the Pharisee and the Tax-Collector, including implicitly the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Great Feast (14:15-24) and the parable of the Unjust Steward. These parables are calls for urgent repentance in the light of imminent judgment. They are also descriptions of repentance in these parables: To honestly acknowledge that one has broken the relationship between oneself and God, and fervently desiring the restoration of that relationship. All things considered, what Christians should pursue in their relationship with God is faith and repentance.

The faith-life of Christians, which include newly-changed life in the whole realm of one's life in accordance with Jesus' life and teaching, is further emphasized and supported in the structure of the travel narrative. The Christian life in the Journey can also be explained in the motifs of Jesus' ἔξοδος in 9:31 and a way, ὁδος and δρόμος in the Gospel of Luke and Acts. Lukan travel narrative reminds the reader of the Exodus from Egypt, through the impressions of aimless wandering and the conflict between Jesus and his followers in the Journey, which are parallel to the experience of the wanderings of the people of Israel, and their confrontations with Moses. In this respect, the travel narrative functions as a new Exodus. The teaching then in this 'new Exodus' shows how Christians should serve their God, and how they should live their lives in the world. Likewise, the way, ὁδος, is a preparation of the disciples for the time of Jesus' absence after the ascension.[1] In the course of the Journey, the disciples are prepared for authentic witnesses of Jesus' words and deeds. At the same time, the way in the Journey becomes understood as a manner of living that brings salvation to men, and furthermore demands a responsible attitude from men who try to build a new society and realize salvation for each other. In this respect, Jesus is the Guide who has originated this way of living through his death and resurrection through his journeying among us. The way continues as if it reached Theophilus and us. In this way, Luke clusters his parables on

1. Graham Stanton, *The Gospels and Jesus* (Oxford Bible Series, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 91, also contends that "within the framework of the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, Luke is primarily interested in the way Jesus equips his disciples for carrying on his preaching and teaching after his death."

instruction for the Christian life, making them most prominent in the motif of a new Exodus and the Way in the travel narrative.

The question which arises naturally is why has Luke laid special emphasis on the Christian life? The Lukan emphasis on the Christian life in the Lukan parables appears to stem from his grave, pastoral concern in of the struggle which the early church faces. Given the fact that the instruction in the travel narrative is given by the Lord for the period from his departure until his return at the end of times, Jesus' instruction in the Lukan parables is crucial for the disciples of Jesus' days, and the Christian community in which Luke lives. Obviously at this point, Reicke is partially right: With regards to the internal and external problems in the Christian community, Jesus' instruction of the apostles, and his discussion with opponents serves as an example for the Christian leaders and teachers, namely, more specifically how the Christians live in the world, and how they treat the opponents whom they encounter in their missionary context.

As a consequence, Luke, through the travel narrative, demonstrates how Jesus instructed his disciples and discussed with his adversaries, so that the results serve the Early Church.[2] However, I would like to put forward another possibility for Luke's emphasis on the Christian life of Luke: The early church in Acts is experiencing the vigorous expansion of the gospel, in relation to which Luke would feel a serious and pressing need to emphasize the faith-life of the Christians. What is more, the evangelizing work, especially in the preaching of apostles, focuses primarily on how one is saved, as the initial stage of faith.[3] The ministries of the mission must then be naturally followed by an emphasis on the Christian life. It is, therefore, the next logical step to focus on how God's redeemed people are to live in this world. Therefore, against the background of the energetic evangelizing work and the great expansion of the gospel, Luke lays special emphasis on the faith-life of Christians and the confidence they can have in the gospel, by means of his parables and the travel narrative with the motif of a new Exodus and the Way.

The Lukan parables lay not only special emphasis of the Christian life with the motif of a new Exodus and the Way in the travel narrative, but also give a vivid description of the Christian life to teach Christians how to live in this world, now and in the future. At the same

2. Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," 206-16, especially 207-210.

3. See, C.H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments: three lectures with an appendix on eschatology and history* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1956), especially 7-35. The preaching of apostles in Acts is not related to a didactic teaching which contains ethical instruction, but primarily *Kerygma* which proclaims the gospel to non-Christians.

time, it is a phase affirming God's saving purpose. By means of features which only the parable bears, the Lukan parables portray frankly a range of ambiguous and contradictory values found in the very familiar details of ordinary life, and reverse and subvert the audience's world, as well as challenging them to a new life. In so doing, the Lukan parables effectively help God's redemptive purpose to be realized in the Christian life. In other words, the Christians who were redeemed should live up to their new life in every area of life, according to Jesus' life and teaching. Through the Lukan parables, Luke fervently desires that his readers embody and realize the redemptive purpose of God within them through the faith life concretely presented in the Lukan parables, beyond merely accepting Jesus as savior and positively responding to his Gospel.

3-2. The Role of the Lukan parables as a service in accomplishing God's redemptive purpose

God's saving project necessarily involves the collusion of human actors under His direction and initiation. The realization of God's purpose is made, not only through the ministries of Jesus (his life, death, and exaltation), but also through the commissioned ministries of Jesus' followers and their life of faith. In this respect, the faith-life of Christians which is most effectively described in the Lukan parables ultimately serves to accomplish God's redemptive purpose.

The Christian life in their relationship with their neighbours, as has already been observed in the previous chapter, must be primarily presented as love and forgiveness. At the home of a leader of the Pharisees (esp. Luke 14:12-14) and in the Great Feast (Luke 14:15-24), Jesus teaches to invite the poor, the crippled, the lame and the blind to the banquet. In a similar vein, the three parables about God's joy over the recovery of the lost among his people (Luke 15:1-31), show how Jesus intends to rebuke the Pharisees and scribes over their attitude toward his acceptance of sinners, and to instruct them about what their attitude toward sinners should be. In the Good Samaritan (10:25-37), Jesus makes all the more plain the true sense of love for neighbour with the two greatest commandments. Beyond the boundaries of all ethnic groups and enemies, Christians should show love to those as different from themselves as Samaritans are from Jews, since they qualify as neighbours. Most importantly, the Christian's love and concern toward the marginalized ultimately serve as the good news to the poor which is announced by Jesus' in his inaugural sermon at Nazareth. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach *good news to the poor*. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are

oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." (Luke 4:18-19). If Christians, therefore, follow this example and accept the physically, economically and ethnically vulnerable, as shown in the Lukan parable, then they not only align themselves with God's purpose in Jesus, but also help accomplishment it.

The proper use of possessions for the poor, and God, also promote God's redemptive purpose. Luke believes that the right use of wealth in almsgiving serves, to some extent, God's saving purpose, which probably includes economic equality and good news for the poor. In the Travel Narrative, four parables (12:13-21; 14:15-24; 16:1-13. 19:31) explicitly, and two parables (10:25-37; 15:11-32) implicitly show a proper or an improper use of possessions and attitude toward wealth. In other words, all these parables put their emphasis on caring for the poor, and using one's possessions sensibly, wisely and generously according to God's will. In particular, they warn of dependence on and indulgence in wealth, and underline God's ownership of possessions. The extent of the results of this practice in the early Christian community could be seen clearly (2:45; 4:34-35), "there were no needy persons among them" (4:34a). These practices are virtually continued throughout Acts in various forms. In Acts 10:2, Cornelius who feared God with all his household, "gave alms liberally to the people." Tabitha in Joppa "was full of good works and acts of charity" (9:36). Paul said that he came to Jerusalem "to bring to my nation alms and offerings", when he defended himself before Felix (24:17, cf. 11:28-30; 12:25). In addition, Paul admonished the elders of the church in Ephesus with a saying of Jesus: "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (20:35). In this way, the proper use of possessions for the poor and God in line with God's will, as shown in the Lukan parables, promotes God's redemptive purpose.

Moreover, Luke shows that prayer is not only the means through which God reveals his will to his people, but also a way by which God guides the course of the history of salvation. The three parables (11:5-8; 18:1-8, 9-14) in the travel narrative teach that prayer serves to advance God's redemptive aim in the sense that prayer enables followers of Jesus to remain faithful in the midst of hardship. Luke wants to convey that persistent prayer, based on the certainty of God's response and faithfulness, is the hallmark of faithfulness in the face of opposition, especially in the midst of persecution. "I tell you, he will vindicate them speedily. Nevertheless, when the Son of man comes, will he find faith on earth?" (18:8). It is clear throughout Luke-Acts how faithful prayer which is taught primarily in the prayer parables of Luke assists God's redemptive project. It should go without saying that this is nowhere more plain than in the canticles: Mary's Magnificat (1:46-55), Zechariah's Benedictus (1: 68-79)

and Nunc Dimittis (2:29-32). Furthermore, the following cases cogently bolster the fact that prayer is intimately involved in decisive and important moments in the progress of the salvation history: The baptism of Jesus (3:21-22), the selection of the Apostles (6:12-16), Peter's confession and Jesus' first suffering prediction (9:18-22), the transfiguration of Jesus (9:28-36), the return of the seventy missionaries (10:21-22), the prayer at the Mount of Olives (22:39-46), the early Christian community's prayer (1:14), Pentecost (2:1-4), at the selection, appointment and commission for leadership (1:24-25; 6:6; 13:3; 14:23), and the guidance for missionary work (9:10-12; 10:3-4, 9-16; 30-31; 11:5; 22:17-21). Just as Jesus struggles to know and fulfill God's will, so Jesus' disciples and followers, therefore seek to know the purpose and plan of God and to commit themselves to its service at and through prayer.

The faith-life of the Christian in the Lukan parables shows perspectives of life as the right way that Christians should go, but it goes further in that it serves the redemptive purpose of God. That is to say, through their faith-life, Christians not only align themselves with God's purpose, but also serve to accomplish it. In short, the Lukan parables play a vital role in serving the advancement of God's saving aim as the purpose of the Gospel of Luke.

In summary, God's plan of salvation toward a Christian includes a newly-changed life in the whole realm of one's life in accordance with Jesus' life and teaching. Accordingly, when Christians live up to Jesus' teaching of the Christians life minutely presented in the Lukan parables, it is congruent with God's redemptive purpose, and also concretizes the God's redemptive purpose within their life. The Lukan parables place a special emphasis on the Christian life in the motif of a new Exodus and the Way in the travel narrative. Through the Lukan parables, Luke fervently desires that his readers embody and realize the redemptive purpose of God within them through the faith life concretely presented in the Lukan parables, beyond simply responding to his gospel and positively accepting Jesus as savior. What is more, the Christian life concretely presented in the Lukan parables further serves to accomplish God's saving purpose. The Christian life which involves concern toward the marginalized, the proper use of possessions and prayer, ultimately helps to accomplish God's redemptive purpose. If Christians accept the physically, economically and ethnically weak, as taught in the Lukan parables, then they come to serve as the good news to the poor that is announced in Jesus' inaugural sermon at Nazareth, and help to accomplish of it. Furthermore, the proper use of possessions for the poor and God in line with God's will, as shown in the Lukan parables, promotes God's redemptive purpose. As taught in the Lukan parables about

prayer, Christians must seek to know the purpose and plan of God, and commit themselves to its service at and through prayer.

In conclusion, all things considered, the Lukan parables as perspectives of the Christian life play a vital role in embodying the redemptive purpose of God in the faith-life of the Christian, as well as serving to help accomplish God’s saving purpose.

Chapter 9
Conclusion

The Lukan parables which occur only in the Gospel of Luke have primarily been examined as individual parables, focusing on its form and structure. But I tried to go further by examining the role of the Lukan parables within the purpose of Luke's Gospel, in the hope that the Lukan parables would give us clues as to Luke's overall purpose. For this, my first task was to lay a methodological basis for a study of the parables, after examining the history of research into the Lukan parables. I argued that on the basis of current research it is reasonable to say that the parables must be interpreted within their gospel contexts, that the parables contain allegory and point to referents beyond the story, and that the parables may make more than one point.

With these criteria established for a study of the parables, I embarked upon a detailed analysis of the Lukan parables, examining particularly the literary context of the parables and eliciting the major motifs from each parable. Here, my major goal was to examine each parable on its own merits, and not forcing it into a preconceived framework, while taking into consideration the modern interpretative trends of each parable. In addition, the main thrusts drawn from each parable will serve to establish the theological themes of the Lukan parables.

After synthesizing the findings from the parables, the theological themes of the Lukan parables were subsumed under four broad categories: the marginalized, wealth and possessions, prayer, and conversion. Furthermore, it is self-evident that the theological themes of the Lukan parables are in congruence with, and bolster the themes that are prominent in Luke-Acts. In order to search for a unifying theme of the Lukan parables, it was also indispensable to examine the travel narrative in the Gospel of Luke, since all the parables which we have analyzed in Luke are located in the travel narrative. For this, I examined and evaluated the current scholarly views about the Lukan travel narrative in four categories: historical approach, redaction critical approach, chiastic structure, and Old Testament models. Insights derived from the current scholarly views of understanding the travel narrative converge on the Christological and Ecclesiological purposes.

That is to say, with respect to the Christological purpose, the travel narrative is the way, not only to suffering with an awareness of the necessity of his passion and death, but also to glorification, which is expressed by the ἀνάλημψις motif in 9:51. The imagery of the exodus from Egypt is also used to describe a new exodus to the Promised Land in Jesus' journey to

Jerusalem. Jesus' goal in Luke is Jerusalem where he fulfills his ἔξοδος, his death and exaltation. The journeying Lord brings the gospel of peace, and in so doing, destroys Satan and his arsenal of evil. In addition, from Old Testament models, Luke portrays Jesus' role and destiny in terms of the entire prophetic tradition, such as Moses, Elijah, David and the Suffering Servant. What is more, for Luke, Jesus' approach to, and entrance into Jerusalem have obviously royal and Davidic implications. With respect to the Ecclesiological purpose, Luke, through the travel narrative, also demonstrates how Jesus instructed his disciples and confronted his adversaries, so that the results would serve as the Early Church. The Christian life in the travel narrative can also be explained in the motifs of Jesus' ἔξοδος in 9:31, and a way, ὁδος and δρόμος, in the Gospel of Luke and Acts. The Lukan travel narrative reminds the reader of the Exodus from Egypt, with its impression of the aimless wandering of Israel and the confrontations between Moses and the congregation which parallels the conflict between Jesus and his followers in the Lukan travel narrative. Therefore, the travel narrative functions as a new Exodus. All teaching during the new Exodus teaches Christians how to serve their God, and how they should live their lives in the world. Likewise, the way, ὁδος, is a preparation of the disciples for the time of Jesus' absence after his ascension. In the course of the Journey, the disciples are prepared to be authentic witnesses of Jesus' words and deeds. At the same time, the way in the Journey becomes understood as a manner of living that brings salvation to men, and furthermore demands a responsible attitude from men who try to build up a new society and realize salvation for each other. In this respect, Jesus is the Guide who has originated this living way through his death and resurrection by his journeying among us.

From the theological themes of the Lukan Parables and the results of the examination of the Lukan parables in the travel narrative, I have proposed 'Perspectives on the Christian life' as a unifying motif of the Lukan parables. This is because all of the Lukan parables in the travel narrative are intimately related to instruction on the Christian life. Up until now, research into the theme of the Christian life concerning the Lukan parables was made in passing and it contributed little to an understanding of the role played by the Lukan parables in the purpose of the Gospel of Luke as a whole. I have therefore, concretely delineated the 'Perspective on the Christian Life' by examining how Christians should live in the world according to Jesus' instruction, which emerges from the Lukan parables, especially in three categories described in terms of relationships: The relationship with neighbours, the relationship with material possessions, and the relationship with God. In the first place, the

relationship of the Christian with neighbours is presented as love and forgiveness. Luke has a prominent emphasis on the need to love and forgive all people as shown clearly in the Parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37), the Parable of the Prodigal Son (15:11-32), and The Pharisee and The Tax-Collector (18:9-14). Christians should love and forgive their neighbours, including enemies and sinners. It is the appropriate attitude that all the Christians should have towards their neighbours. Secondly, it is emphasized that Christians should use their material possessions that are entrusted to them properly for the service of God and the poor, as presented clearly in The Rich Fool (12:13-21), The parable of the Unjust Steward' (16:1-13), and The Rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31). The Lukan Jesus repeatedly warns of the danger of attachment to riches as an obstacle to discipleship, and calls for the positive use of wealth, especially in the form of giving alms to the poor. In their relationship to material possessions, Christians should pursue the right use of wealth. Lastly, in relationship with God, it is especially faith and repentance that the Christians must bear in mind. Two prayer parables, The Friend at Midnight (11:5-8) and The Judge and the Widow (18:1-8), convey that prayer itself is an expression of faith towards God. Indeed, the evidence of faithfulness must be seen in prayer that shows constant fellowship with God. As regards repentance, the following Lukan parables are related to the theme of repentance: The Barren Fig Tree (13:6-9), The Parable of the Prodigal Son (15:11-32) and The Pharisee and the Tax-Collector (18:9-14), including, implicitly, The Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19-31), The Great Feast (14:15-24) and The Parable of the Unjust Steward (16:1-13). The parables related to repentance call for urgent repentance with a warning of imminent judgment, and furthermore describe that repentance as honestly acknowledging that one has broken the relationship between oneself and God, and fervently desiring the restoration of that relationship. All things considered, what Christians should pursue in relationship with God is faith and repentance.

To sum up, in view of the fact that the Christian life is one of the two pivotal themes of the travel narrative, and that the Lukan parables' theological themes converge in the Christian life, the Lukan parables clearly function as instruction of the Christian life. Lukan parables were evidently intended by Luke to teach what it means to follow Jesus and how Christians should live in the world. Accordingly, a unifying motif of the Lukan Parables is 'perspectives on the Christian life.'

In order to identify the role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of Luke's Gospel, I, first of all, have surveyed the purpose of Luke's Gospel. In so doing, I have found that each suggestion concerning the purpose of Luke-Acts has methodological, textual, and historical

problems, and that it is fairly hard to accept the following proposals as the purpose of Luke-Acts as a whole: A defense of Paul, an anti-Gnostic concern, evangelism, an explanation of the parousia's delay, an apologetic for *religio licita* status, a political *apologia pro ecclesia*, an *apologia pro imperio*, a theodicy of God's faithfulness to Israel, an effort at conciliation with Judaism. To put it differently, even though these can be one of the key aspects of Luke's agenda, it fails to fit Luke's principle, conscious aim, since there is a lot more to it in Luke-Acts. Most importantly, it can be pointed out that some of them ignore the unity of Luke-Acts in attempting to determine the purpose of Luke. Therefore, as an alternative option for the purpose of Luke's Gospel, I have proposed that Luke wrote to reassure, especially under the detailed discussion of God's plan, his readers of the gospel that has already been preached and taught to them. Luke's aim for certainty is consistently unfolded in God's plan of salvation which in the Gospel begins with the story of the Baptist's and Jesus' birth, and in Acts continues with the extension of the church into Rome. Luke's project is not to simply write the story of Jesus and the early church, but that of the continuation and fulfillment of God's design which brings salvation to all people, the redemptive purpose of God. In short, Luke strives to reassure his readers of the gospel by presenting God's plan of salvation.

God's plan of salvation in Luke-Acts has three features: The continuation and fulfillment of God's plan, the opposition to God's plan, and the certainty of God's plan. Firstly, Luke gives clear proof of its divine origin and desires to show us that the divine plan in Luke-Acts is rooted in the old authoritative story of Israel, always keeping the continuation of God's plan in his mind. God's plan foretold in the Scriptures is not only continuous, but also fulfilled in and through Jesus, as well as in his followers. Secondly, of course, Luke's presentation of God's plan indicates that other purposes against God's design are also at work. The opposition to God's purpose occurs primarily in human and spiritual opponents. Nevertheless, thirdly, Luke strives to assure us that God's design will be accomplished at all costs. God's purpose, in reality, triumphs over evil forces and the plots of opponents. Even hostility to Jesus is employed in the service of God. In conclusion, Luke strives to reassure his readers, like Theophilus, that God directs his plan, and redemptive aim, in spite of opposition, and that his plan will certainly be accomplished under His initiative.

Finally, I have proposed two aspects for the role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of Luke's Gospel: The role of the Lukan parables as one facet of concretizing God's redemptive purpose, and the role of the Lukan parables in serving to accomplish God's redemptive purpose. Here, I have examined the role of the Lukan parables in God's redemptive purpose,

since Luke strives to reassure his readers of the gospel in a pattern of God's plan of salvation. Firstly, God's plan of salvation toward for the Christian includes a newly-changed life in every realm of life, according to Jesus' life and teaching. The Lukan parables in the motif of a new Exodus and the Way in the travel narrative place special emphasis on the whole realm of Christian life, as shown in their relationship with neighbours, their relationship to material possessions, and their relationship with God. Accordingly, when Christians live up to Jesus' teaching of the Christian life that is presented in the microcosm of the Lukan parables, it is not only in exact congruence with God's redemptive purpose, but also concretizes God's redemptive purpose within their lives. Through the Lukan parables, Luke fervently desires that his readers embody and realize the redemptive purpose of God within them through the faith-life clearly presented in the parables, beyond simply responding to his Gospel positively and accepting Jesus as Savior. Secondly, the Christian life concretely presented in the Lukan parables further serves to accomplish God's saving purpose. The Christian life which includes a concern toward the marginalized, the proper use of possessions, and prayer, ultimately helps to accomplish God's redemptive purpose. If Christians accept the physically, economically and ethnically weak, as taught in the Lukan parables, then they serve as the good news to the poor that is announced in Jesus' inaugural sermon at Nazareth, and help accomplishment it. Furthermore, the proper use of possessions for the poor and God, in line with God's will, as shown in the Lukan parables, function to promote God's redemptive purpose. With respect to prayer, as taught in the Lukan parables, Christians must seek to know the purpose and plan of God and commit themselves to its service in and through prayer. In conclusion, all things considered, the Lukan parables, as perspectives of the Christian life, play a vital role, not only in concretizing God's redemptive purpose in the faith-life of the Christian, but also in serving to accomplish God's saving purpose.

To sum up, my goal in this dissertation was to show, particularly through the Lukan parables in the light of Luke's purpose, that he as a pastoral theologian has a special concern for the faith-life of the Christian, and seeks to reassure his readers of the gospel that had already been preached and taught to them. In the first place, the early Church had both internal and external problems in their mixed community: On the one hand, it was comprised of the Jews and Gentiles, the wealthy and the poor, male and female, and the like. On the other hand, in their missionary context, they encountered many opponents. Apart from the explicit confirmation of the gospel in Luke's preface, one of the main problems would very

likely challenge the faith-life of the Christians, especially in the situation that the early church in Acts is experiencing the vigorous expansion of the gospel. Therefore, Luke would feel a pressing need, as the next logical step, to emphasize the faith-life of Christians and how, as God's redeemed people, they are to live in this world. This emphasis would, as a result, cause Luke to take up this theme with great care.

To do this, Luke used the particular parables which primarily contain instruction in the Christian life, to emphasize the need for a completely transformed life in the whole realm of one's life in accordance with Jesus' life and teaching. Furthermore, in order to lay great emphasis on the faith-life of Christians, Luke located the parables in the travel narrative of Luke's Gospel with the motif of a new Exodus and the Way. In short, Luke places special emphasis on the faith-life of Christians and the confidence they can have in the gospel, by means of his particular parables with instruction of the Christian life, and locating the parables especially in the travel narrative with the motif of a new Exodus and the Way.

Moreover, Luke's parables help God's redemptive purpose that we identified as the purpose of Luke's Gospel, since the newly-changed life in the whole realm of one's life that the Lukan parables predominantly teach, promotes God's saving purpose. That is to say, the Christian life described in the Lukan parables establishes and embodies the redemptive purpose of God within their lives, as well as help accomplish God's saving purpose. In this way, the Lukan parables play a vital role in concretizing and accomplishing God's redemptive purpose.

Taking all that into consideration, we can say that Luke wrote his Gospel with special concern for the faith-life of the Christian, although Luke's major purpose is confidence in the gospel in shaping God's plan of salvation. Therefore, when examining Luke-Acts, we are called to give more attention to Luke's pastoral concern for the faith-life of Christians than any other theological themes in the Gospel. As a result, Luke's great concern for the faith-life of Christians answers the question as to why Luke chose these particular parables that the rest of the synoptic writers did not, and incorporated them within his Gospel in the way that he did.

In short, by means of features which only the parable bears, the Lukan parables give a vivid description of the Christian life, showing how Christians should live in this world, and vividly portray a range of ambiguous and contradictory values found in the familiar details of ordinary life, and reverse and subvert the audience's world, as well as challenge them to a new life presented in the parables.

Bibliography

Aalen, Sverre, “Revisiting the Rich and the Poor in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel According to Luke,” in *SBL Seminar Papers 37*. Vol. 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998, 579-605.

——, “St Luke’s Gospel and the Last Chapters of 1 Enoch,” *NTS* 13 (1967), 1-13.

Abesamis, Carlos, “Good News to the Poor,” *Concilium* 198 (1988), 26-27.

Abraham, M.V. “Good News to the Poor in Luke’s Gospel,” *Bible Bhashyam* 14 (1988), 65-77.

Agnew, Francis H. “The Parables of Divine Compassion,” *BibTod* 27 (1989), 35-40.

Alexander, L. “Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels,” in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience*, Richard Bauckham (ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998, 71-105.

——, *The Preface to Luke’s Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*. SNTSMS 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Allison, D.C. “Jesus and the Covenant: A Response to E.P. Sanders,” *JSNT* 29 (1987), 57-78.

——, “Was There a Lukan Community?” *IBS* 10 (1988), 62-70.

Amalorpavadass, D.S. “The Poor with no Voice and no Power,” *Concilium* 146 (1981), 51-52.

Anderson, R.H. “Theophilus: A Proposal,” *EvQ* 69 (1997), 195-215.

Arndt, W.F. *The Gospel According to St Luke*. St Louis: Concordia, 1956.

Aune, D.E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1983.

——, *The New Testament in its Literary Environment*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987.

Aus, R.D. “Luke 15:11-32 and R. Eliezer Ben Hyrcanus’s Rise to Fame,” *JBL* 104 (1985), 443-469.

——, *Weihnachtsgeschichte, Barmherziger Samariter, Verlorener Sohn. Studien zu ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund*. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1988.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Austin, M.R. “The Hypocritical Son,” *EvQ* 57 (1985), 307-15.

Baergen, Rene A. “Servant, manager or slave? Reading the parable of the rich man and his steward (Luke 16:1-8a) through the lens of ancient slavery,” *Studies in Religion /Sciences Religieuses* 35 (2006), 25-38.

Bailey, J.N. ‘Repentance in Luke-Acts,’ PhD dissertation, The University of Notre Dame, 1993.

Bailey, K.E. “Jacob and the Prodigal Son: A New Identity Story: A Comparison between the Parable of the Prodigal Son and Gen. 27-35,” *Theological Review* 18 (1997), 54-72.

——, “Psalm 23 and Luke 15: A Vision Expanded,” *IBS* 12 (1990), 54-71.

——, “The New Testament Job: The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man An Exercise in Middle Eastern New Testament Studies,” *Theological Review* 29 (2008), 12-30.

——, *Finding the Lost: Cultural Keys to Luke 15*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1992.

——, *Jacob and the Prodigal: A Study of the Parable of the Prodigal Son in the Light of the Saga of Jacob*. Downers Grove: Illinois: InterVarsity, 2003.

——, *Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes*. Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 2008.

——, *Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

——, *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, *The Dialogic Imagination*, Michael Holquist (ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Balch, David L. “ἀκριβῶς…γράψαι (Luke 1:3): To Write the Full History of God’s Receiving All

Nations," in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel*, Moessner, D.P. (ed.). Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999, 229-250.
Balentine, Samuel E. *Prayer in the Hebrew Bible: The Drama of Divine-Human Dialogue*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
Ball, Michael, "The Parables of the Unjust Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus," *ExpTim* 106 (1995), 329-330.
Ballard, P.H. "Reasons for Refusing the Great Supper," *JTS* 23 (1972), 341-350.
Bammel, E. "πτωχός, πτωχεύω" *TDNT*, VI, 888-915.
Barrett, C.K. "The Third Gospel as a Preface to Acts?" in *The Four Gospels 1992*, F. van Segbroek et al. (eds.). II. (3 vols.; BETL, 100; FS Frans Neirynck; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1451-1466.
——, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, I. ICC; Edinburgh: T &T Clark, 1994.
——, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*. London: Epworth Press, 1961.
Bartholomew, Craig G. and Holt, Robby, "Prayer in/and the Drama of Redemption in Luke: Prayer and Exegetical Performance," in *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*, Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton (eds.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2005, 350-375.
Barton, Stephen C. "Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?" in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience*, Richard Bauckham (ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998, 173-194.
——, "Parables on God's Love and Forgiveness (Luke 15:1-32)," in *The Challenge of Jesus Parables*, R.N. Longenecker (ed.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000, 199-216.
——, *The Spirituality of the Gospels*. London: SPCK, 1992.
Batten, A. "Dishonour, Gender and the Parable of the Prodigal Son," *TJT* 13 (1997), 187-200.
Bauckham, Richard, (ed.), "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?" in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998, 9-48.
——, "The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and The Parallels," *NTS* 37 (1991), 225-246.
——, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. NovTSup 93, Leiden: Brill, 1998.
——, *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
Bauer, J.B. "ΠΟΛΛΟΙ Luke 1,1" *NovT* 4 (1960), 263-266.
Baum, A.B. 'Lukas als Historiker der letzten Jesusreise,' PhD dissertation, Kampen, 1993.
Beavis, M.A. (ed.), "Joy in Heaven, Sorrow on Earth: Luke 15:10," in *The Lost Coin: Parables of Women, Work and Wisdom*. Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 39-45.
——, (ed.), "Making Up Stories: A Feminist Reading of the Parable of the Prodigal Son," in *The Lost Coin: Parables of Women, Work and Wisdom*. Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 98-123.
——, "Ancient Slavery as An Interpretive Context for the New Testament Servant Parables with Special Reference to the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-8)," *JBL* 111 (1992), 37-54.
——, "Expecting Nothing in Return: Luke's Picture of the Marginalized," *Int* 48 (1994), 357-368.
——, "Parable and Fable," *CBQ* 52 (1990), 473-498.
——, "The Foolish Landowner (Luke 12:16b-20)," in *Jesus and His Parables*, V. George Shillington (ed.). Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1997, 55-68.
——, "The Power of Jesus' Parables: Were They Polemical or Irenic?," *JSNT* 82 (2001), 3-30.
Beck, B.E. *Christian Character in the Gospel of Luke*. London: Epworth Press, 1989.
Behm, J. 'μετανοέω, μετάνοια', *TDNT*, IV, 975-1008.

Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.
Binder, Hermann, "Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter," *TZ* 15 (1959), 176-94.
Bird, Michael F. "Sectarian Gospels for Sectarian Christians? The Non-Canonical Gospels and Bauckham's The Gospel for All Christians," in *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*, Edward W. Klink III (ed.). New York: T & T Clark, 2010, 27-48.
Bishop, E.F.F. "Down from Jerusalem to Jericho," *EvQ* 35 (1963), 97-102.
——, "The Parable of the Lost or Wandering Sheep: Mattew 18:10-14; Luke 15:3-7," *ATR* 44 (1962), 44-57.
Black, Matthew, "The Parables as Allegory," *BJRL* 42 (1960), 273-287.
——, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
Black, Max, *Models and Metaphors*. Ithaca: Cornell, 1962.
Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.
Bligh, John, *Christian Deuteronomy (9-18)*. New York: St. Paul Publications, 1970.
——, *Galatians in Greek: A Structural Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1966.
Blomberg, C.L. 'The Tradition History of the Parables Peculiar to Luke's Central Section,' PhD dissertation, University of Aberdeen, 1982.
——, "Interpreting the Parables of Jesus: Where Are and Where Do We Go from Here" *CBQ* 53 (1991), 50-78.
——, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and The Outline of Luke's Central Section," in *Gospel Perspectives III*, R.T. France and D. Wenham (eds.). Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983, 217-261.
——, "The Gospels for Specific Communities and All Christians," in *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*, Edward W. Klink III (ed.). New York: T & T Clark, 2010, 111-133.
——, "The Law in Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 22 (1984), 53-80
——, "Tradition and Redaction in the Parables of Jesus," in *The Jesus Tradition outside the Gospels*, David Wenham (ed.). Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985, 177-205.
——, *Contagious Holiness: Jesus' Meals with Sinners*. NSBT 19; Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 2005.
——, *Interpreting the Parables*. Downers Grove, Inter Varsity Press, 1990.
Bock, D.L. "Luke," in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, S. Mcknight and G.R. Osborne (eds.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2004, 349-372.
——, "Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Luke's Use of the Old Testament for Christology and Mission," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, C.A. Evans and W.R. Stegner (eds.). JSNTSup 104, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, 280-307.
——, "Scripture and the Realization of God's Promises," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* I.H. Marshall and D. Peterson (eds.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998, 41-62.
——, "The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus and the Ethics of Jesus," *SJT* 40 (1997), 63-72.
——, "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts: Christology and Mission," in *SBL 1990 Seminar Papers*, D.J. Lull (ed.). Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990, 494-511.
——, "Understanding Luke's Task: Carefully Building on Precedent (Luke 1:1-4)," *CTR* 5.2 (1991), 183-202.
——, *Luke 1:1-9:50, 9:51-24:53*. BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994/1996.
——, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern, Lucan Old Testament Christology*. JSNTSup, 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

Bockmuehl, Markus, “Why not Let Acts Be Acts? In Conversation with C. Kavin Rowe,” *JSNT* 28 (2005), 163-66.
Booth, Wayne C. “Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation,” *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1978), 437-468.
Borgman, Paul, *The Way According to Luke: Hearing the Whole Story of Luke-Acts*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing, 2006.
Borsch, F.H. *Many Things in Parables: Extravagant Stories of New Community*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
Botha, Pieter J.J. “Community and Conviction in Luke-Acts,” *Neotestamentica* 29 (1995), 145-165.
Boucher, M.I. *The Mysterious Parables: A Literary Study*. CBQMS, 6; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1977.
——, *The parables*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1981.
Bovon, F. “Apocalyptic Traditions in the Lukan Special Material: Reading Luke 18:1-8,” *HTR* 90 (1997), 383-391.
——, “The Reception and Use of the Gospel of Luke in the Second Century,” in *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*, Craig Bartholomew et al. (eds.). Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005, 379-400.
——, “The Role of the Scriptures in the Composition of the Gospel Accounts: The Temptations of Jesus (Lk4:1-13 par.) and the Multiplication of the Loaves (Lk 9:10-17 par.),” in *Luke and Acts*, G. O’Collins and G. Marconi (eds.). New York: Paulist Press, 1991, 26-31.
——, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 15:1-19:27)*. EKKNT 3/3; Düsseldorf: Benziger, 2001.
——, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*, Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, trans. Christine M. Thomas: Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
Bowen, C. Edward, “The Parable of the Unjust Steward *Oikos* as the Interpretative Key,” *ExpTim* 112 (9, 2001), 314-315.
Boyd-Luter, A. “Repentance, New Testament,” *ABD*, V, 672-674.
Boyd, W.J.P. “Gehenna-According to J. Jeremias,” in *Studia Biblical 1978: II. Papers on the Gospels*, E.A. Livingstone (ed.). Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980, 9-12.
Braun, W. “Symposium or Anti-Symposium? Reflections on Luke 14:1-24,” *TJT* 8 (1992), 70-84.
——, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*. SNTSMS 85; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
Brawley, R.L. ‘The Pharisees in Luke-Acts: Luke’s Address to Jews and His Irenic Purpose,’ PhD dissertation, Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1978.
——, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. SBL MS, 33, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987.
——, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995.
Breech, J.E. *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
Brendan, Byrne, *Romans*. Sacra Pagina 6; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
——, *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke’s Gospel*. Minnesota, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000.
Brewer, Samantha R. “Wealth and Poverty in Luke’s Gospel and Acts: A Challenge to the Christian Church,” *Encounter: Journal for Pentecostal Ministry* 6 (2009), 1-27.
Brigid, C. Frein, “Narrative Predictions, Old Testament Prophecies and Luke’s Sense of Fulfillment,” *NTS* 40 (1994), 22-37.
Brodie, T.L. “Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative,” in *New Views*

on Luke and Acts, Earl Richard (ed.). Collegeville: MN: Liturgical Press, 1990, 78-85.
——, "The Departure for Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-56) as a Rhetorical Imitation of Elijah's Departure for the Jordan (2 Kgs 1:1-2:6)," *Bib* 70 (1989), 96-109.
Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.
Brown, S. *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*. Rome: Pontifical Bible Institute, 1969.
Bruce, A.B. *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ: A Systematic and Critical Study of the Parables of Our Lord*. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1886.
Bruce, F.F. "Justification by Faith in the Non-Pauline Writings of the New Testament," *EvQ* 24 (1952), 66-77.
——, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. London: The Tyndale Press, 1952.
——, *The Apostolic Defence of the Gospel: Christian Apologetics in the New Testament*. Lodon: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1959.
Büchsel, F. "ἄνωθεν," *TDNT*, I, 378.
Buckwalter, H. Douglas, *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology*. SNTSMS 89; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
Bultmann, R. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Oxford: Blackwell; New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
Burridge, Richard A. (ed.), "About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998, 113-145.
——, *Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
Bussby, F. "Did a Shepherd Leave Sheep upon the Mountains or in the Desert? A Note on Matthew 18:12 and Luke 15:4," *ATR* 44 (1963), 93-94.
Buttrick, David, *Speaking Parables: A Homiletic Guide*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000.
Byrne, B. "Forceful Stewardship and Neglected Wealth: A Contemporary Reading of Luke 16," *Pacifica* 1 (1988), 1-14.
Cadbury, H.J. "'We' and 'I' Passages in Luke-Acts," *NTS* 3 (1956-57), 128-132.
——, "Commentary on the Preface of Luke," *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part 1. The Acts of Apostles, F.J.F. Jackson and K. Lake (eds.). Vol. II. London: MacMillan, 1922, 489-510.
——, "The Knowledge Claimed in Luke's Preface," *ExpTim* 24 (1922), 401-422.
——, "The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface," *Exp* 8/21 (1921), 431-441.
——, *The Making of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1968.
——, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*. New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969.
Cadoux, A.T. *The Parables of Jesus: Their Art and Use*. London: J. Clarke, 1930.
Cadoux, C.I. "The Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem," *Exp* 9/3 (1925), 175-192.
Caird, G.B. *The Gospel of St. Luke*. London: A & C. Black, 1968.
Callan, T. "The Preface of Luke-Acts and Historiography," *NTS* 31 (1985), 576-581.
Carey, Greg "Luke and the Rhetorics of Discipleship: The L Parables as Case Study," in *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and His Influence*, James D. Hester and J. David Hester (eds.). New York: T&T Clark International, 2004, 145-174.
Carlston, C.E. "Parable and Allegory Revisited: An Interpretive Review," *CBQ* 43 (1981), 228-242.
——, "Reminiscence and Redaction in Luke 15:11-32," *JBL* 94 (1975), 368-390.
Carroll, John T. "Luke's Portrayal of the Pharisees," *CBQ* 50 (1988), 604-621.
Carter, Warren and Heil, John Paul, *Matthew's Parables*, CBQMS 30. Washington, DC: The Catholic

Biblical Association of America, 1998.
Cassidy, R.J. *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1978.
Catchpole, D.R. "Q and 'the Friend at Midnight' (Luke 11:5-8/9)," *JTS* 34 (1983), 407-424.
——, "The Son of Man's Search for Faith (Lk 18:8b)," *NovT* 19 (1977), 81-104.
Cave, C.H. "Lazarus and the Lukan Deuteronomy," *NTS* 15 (1968-69), 319-325.
Charles, R.H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, with introductions and critical and explanatory notes to the several book*. London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1963.
Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepighrapha*, Vol 2, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.
——, *The Pseudegrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement*. SCSS 7; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981.
Chester, S. *Conversion at Corinth*. London: T & T Clark, 2003.
Chilton, B.D. "Jesus and the Repentance of E.P. Sanders," *TynBul* 39 (1988), 1-18.
——, "The Gospel according to Thomas as a Source of Jesus' Teaching," in *The Jesus Tradition outside the Gospels*, David Wenham (ed.). Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985, 155-176.
Cohen, H. "Bet Din and Judges," *Encyclopedia Judaica* 2, 721-23.
Cohen, S.J.D. "Respect for Gentiles in the Writings of Josephus," *HTR* 80 (1987), 409-30.
Coleridge, Mark, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narratives as Christology in Luke 1-2*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
Colson, F.H. "Notes on St. Luke's Preface," *JTS* 24 (1923), 300-309.
Combrink, H.J.B. "A Social-Scientific Perspective on the parable of the 'unjust' steward (Lk 16:1-8a)," *Neotestamentica* 30 (1996), 281-306.
——, "Multiple meaning and/or multiple interpretation of a text," *Neotestamentica* 18 (1984), 26-37.
Conn, Walter E. "Conversion: A Developmental Perspective," *Cross Currents* 32 (1982), 323-328.
Conzelmann, H. *The Theology of St Luke*. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
Cook, E.J. "The Synoptic Indications of the Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem," *ExpTim* 41 (1929/30), 121-123.
Corlett, T. "This Brother of Yours," *ExpTim* 100 (1988), 216.
Cortés Juan B. and Gatti, Florence M. "On the Meaning of Luke 16:16," *JBL* 106 (1987), 247-259.
Cortés, Juan B. "The Greek Text of Luke 18:14a: A Contribution to the Method of Reasoned Eclecticism," *CBQ* 46 (1984), 255-273.
Cosgrove, C.H. "The Divine ΔEI in Luke-Acts: Investigations into the Lukan Understanding of God's Providence," *NovT* 26 (1984), 168-90.
Cotter, Wendy "The Parable of the Feisty Widow and the Threatened Judge (Luke 18:1-8)," *NTS* 51 (2005), 328-43.
Cranfield, C.E.B. "The Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts," *SJT* 16 (1963), 297-301.
Creed, J.M. *The Gospel according to St. Luke: The Greek Test with Introduction, Notes, and Indices.* London: Macmillan, 1930.
Crossan, J.D. 'Structuralist Analysis and the Parables of Jesus: A Reply to D.O. Via, "Parable and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach,'" *Semeia* 1 (1974), 50-54.
——, "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus," *NTS* 18 (1972), 285-307.
——, "Parable, Allegory, and Paradox," in *Semiology and Parables: An Exploration of the Possibilities Offered by Structuralism for Exegesis*, Daniel Patte (ed.). Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1976, 264-277.

——, *Cliffs of Fall: Paradox and Polyvalence in the Parables of Jesus*. New York: Seabury, 1980.
——, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1973.
Crossley, James G. "The Semitic Background to Repentance in the Teaching of John the Baptist and Jesus," *JSHJ* 2.2 (2004), 138-57.
Crown, A.D. *The Samaritans*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1989.
Crump, D.M. *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts*. WUNT 2/49. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992.
Culpepper, R. Alan, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
Curkpatrick, Stephen, "A Parable Frame-up and Its Audacious Reframing," *NTS* 48 (2003), 22-38.
——, "Dissonance in Luke 18:1-8," *JBL* 121 (2002), 107-121.
——, "Parable Metonymy and Luke's Kerygmatic Framing," *JSNT* 25 (2003), 289-307.
D'Sa, T. "The Salvation of the Rich in the Gospel of Luke," *Vidyajyoti* 52 (1988), 170-180.
Dahl, Nils A. "The purpose of Luke-Acts," in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Pub. House, 1976, 87-98.
——, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn (eds.). Nashville: Abingdon, 1966, 139-159.
Danby, H. *The Mishnah*. London: Oxford University Press, 1985.
Danker, F.W. *Benefactor. Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*. St Louis, Clayton Publishing House, 1982.
——, *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
Daube, D. "Inheritance in Two Lukan Pericopes," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichgte* 72 (1995), 326-34.
David Wenham and Steve Walton, *Exploring the NT: A Guide to The Gospel and Acts*, Vol. I. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2001.
Davids, P.H. "Poverty and Wealth," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, J.B. Green and S. McKnight (eds.). Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity, 1992, 701-10.
Davies, J.H. "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in *Studia Evangelica II*. F.L. Cross (ed.), TU, 87, Berlin, 1964, 164-69.
Davis, Patricia M., and Rambo, Lewis R. "Converting: Toward a Cognitive Theory of Religious Change," in *Soul, Psyche, Brain: New Directions in the Study of Religion and Brain-Mind Science*, Kelly Bulkeley (ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, 159-73.
Dawsey, J. "The Literary Unity of Luke-Acts: Questions of Style-A Task for Literary Critics," *NTS* 35 (1989), 48-66.
Dean R. Wickes, *The Sources of Luke's Perean Section*. Chicago: UCP, 1912.
DeBoer, M.C. "God Fearers in Luke-Acts," in *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays*, C.M. Tuckett (ed.). JSNTSup, 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, 50-71.
Degenhardt, H.J. *Lukas Evangelist der Armen: Besitz und Besitzverzicht in den lukanischen Schriften*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1965.
Delling, G. "Das Gleichnis vom gottlosen Richter," *ZNW* 53 (1962), 1-25.
——, "ἀνατάσσω," *TDNT*, VIII, 32-33.
Den Boer, W. "Some Remarks on the Beginnings of Christian Historiography," *Studia Patristica* 4 (1961), 348-362.
Denaux, A. "Het lucaanse reisverhaal (Lc. 9:51-19:44)," *CBG* 14 (1968), 214-242; 15 (1969), 464-501.
——, "Old Testament Models for the Lukan Travel Narrative. A Critical Survey," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, C.M. Tuckett (ed.). Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997, 271-305.

——, “The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Luke,” in *The Synoptic Gospels*, C. Focant (ed.). Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1993, 357-92.
——, “The Parable of the King-Judge (Lk 19:12-28) and its Relation to the Entry Story (Lk 19:29-44),” *ZNW* 93 (2002), 35-57.
——, “The Theme of Divine Visits and Human (In)hospitality in Luke-Acts. Its Old Testament and Graeco-Roman Antecedents,” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, J. Verheyden (ed.). Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999, 255-279.
Denova, Rebecca I. *The Things Accomplished among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts*. JSNTSup, 141; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
Derrett, J.D.M. “Fresh Light on St. Luke XVI: I. The Parable of the Unjust Steward,” *NTS* 7 (1961), 198-219.
——, *Law in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970.
——, “‘Take Thy Bond… and Write Fifty’ (Luke 16:6): The Nature of the Bond,” *JTS* 23 (1972), 438-440.
——, “Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Saying,” in *Law in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970, 78-99.
——, “Fig Trees in the New Testament,” *in Midrash in Action and As A Literary Device Vol. 2 of Studies in the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1978, 249-65.
——, “Fresh Light on St. Luke XVI: II. Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings,” *NTS* 7 (1964-61), 364-80.
——, “Fresh Light on the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin,” *NTS* 26 (1979), 36-60.
——, “Fresh Light on the Parable of the Good Samaritan,” *NTS* 11 (1964), 22-37.
——, “The Friend at Midnight: Asian Ideas in the Gospel of St. Luke,” in *Donum Gentilicium*, C.K. Berrett (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978, 78-87.
——, “The Parable of the Great Supper,” in *Law in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970, 126-55.
——, “The Parable of the Prodigal Son,” in *Law in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1976, 100-125.
——, “The Rich Fool: A Parable of Jesus Concerning Inheritance,” in *Studies in the New Testament*. II. Leiden: Brill, 1978, 99-120.
Dibelius, M. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. London: SCM Pres, Ltd., 1956.
Dillon, R. “Previewing Luke’s Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4), *CBQ* 43 (1981), 205-227.
——, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*. AnBib 82; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
Dodd, C.H. *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments: three lectures with an appendix on eschatology and history* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1956).
——, *The Parables of the Kingdom*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1961.
Donahue, J.R. “Tax Collector,” *ABD*, vol. 6, 337-338.
——, “Tax Collectors and Sinners: An Attempt at Identification,” *CBQ* 33 (1971), 39-61.
——, “The Parables of Luke,” *BibTod* 41 (2003), 283-288.
——, “Two Decades of Research on the Rich and the Poor in Luke-Acts,” in *Justice and the Holy: Essays in Honor of Walter Harrelson*, D.A. Knight and P.J. Paris (eds.). Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989, 129-144.
——, *The Gospel in Parable: Metaphor, Narrative and Theology in the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadephia: Fortress Press, 1988.
Donald J. Bretherton, “Lazarus of Bethany: Resurrection or Resuscitations?” *ExpTim* 104 (1993), 169-173.

Doran, Robert, “The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: An Agonistic Story,” *CBQ* 69 (2007), 259-270.
Downing, F. Gerald, “The Ambiguity of The Pharisee and the Toll collector (Luke 18:9-14) in the Greco-Roman World of Late Antiquity,” *CBQ* 54 (1992), 80-99.
Drury, J. *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*. London: SPCK, 1985.
——, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*. London, Darton: Longman & Todd, 1976.
Du Plessis, I.J. “Once More: The Purpose of Luke’s Prologue (Lk 1:1-4),” *NovT* 16 (1974), 259-271.
——, “Philanthropy or Sarcasm? Another Look at the Parable of the Dishonest Manager (Luke 16:1-13).” *Neotestamentica* 24 (1990), 1-20.
——, “The Lukan Audience-Rediscovered? Some Reactions to Bauckham’s Theory,” *Neotestamentica* 34 (2000), 243-261.
Duff, Jeremy and McGrath, Joanna Collicutt, *Meeting Jesus: Human responses to a yearning god*. London: SPCK, 2006.
Dunkerley, R. “Lazarus,” *NTS* 5 (1959), 321-327.
Dunn, J.D.G. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Pres International, 1996.
Dupont, J. “’ΑΝΕΛΗΜΦΘΗ (Act. 1:2),” *NTS* 8 (1961-61), 154-57.
——, “The Poor and Poverty in the Gospels and Acts,” in *Gospel Poverty: Essays in Biblical Theology*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1977, 25-52.
——, “The Salvation of the Gentiles and the Theological Significance of Acts,” *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Paulist, 1979, 11-33.
——, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
Durber, Susan, “The Female Reader of the Parables of the Lost,” *JSNT* 45 (1992), 59-79.
Eastman, Susan, “The Foolish Father and the Economics of Grace,” *ExpTim* 117 (2006), 402-405.
Easton, B.S. “The Purpose of Acts,” in *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers*, F.C. Grant (ed.). London, Seabury, 1955, 33-57.
——, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, New York: Scribners, 1926.
Eck, Ernest Van, “When Patrons are not Patrons: A Social-Scientific Reading of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-26),” *HTS Teologiese Studies* 65 (2009), 346-56.
Eco, Umberto, *The Role of the Reader*. London: Hutchinson, 1981.
Egelkraut, H.L. *Jesus' Mission to Jerusalem: A Redaction Critical Study of the Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke, Lk 9:51-19:48*. Frankfurt/M: P. Lang; Bern: H. Lang. 1976.
Einarson, B. and Link, G.K. *Theophrastus De Causis Plantarum 3 vols*. Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1976, 1 264-69.
Ellis, E.E. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
Enslin, M.S. “The Samaritan Ministry and Mission,” *HUCA* 51 (1980), 29-38.
Erickson, Millard, *Christian Theology*, vol 2. Grand Rapid: Baker Book House, 1984.
Esler, P.F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivation of Lucan Theology*, SNTSMS 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
——, “Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham’s Gospels for All Christians,” *SJT* 51 (1998), 235-248.
Evans, C.A. “Luke 16:1-18 and the Deuteronomy Hypothesis,” in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders (eds.). Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993, 121-139.
——, “Mishna and Messiah ‘In Contest’: Some Comments on Jacob Neusner’s Proposals,” *JBL* 112 (1993), 267-89.
——, “Prophecy and Polemic: Jews in Luke’s Scriptural Apologetic,” in *Luke and Sripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*, C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders (eds.). Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993, 171-211.

——, "The Pharisee and the Publican: Luke 18:9-14 and Deuteronomy 26," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner (eds.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994, 342-355.

Evans, C.F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*, D.E. Nineham (ed.). Oxford, 1955, 37-53.

——, "Uncomfortable Words — V," *ExpTim* 81 (1969-70), 228-31.

——, *Saint Luke*. TPINTC; London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990.

Events, J.M. "Conversion and Call of Paul," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, Gerald. F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin and Daniel G. Reid (eds.). Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993, 156-63.

Farmer, W.R. "Notes on a Literary and Form-critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material Peculiar to Luke," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 301-316.

Farrell, H.K. "The Structure and Theology of Luke's Central Section," *TJ* 7 (1986), 33-54.

Farris, Michael, "A Tale of Two Taxations (Luke 18:10-14b): The Parable of the Pharisee and the Toll Collector," in *Jesus and His Parables: Interpreting the Parables of Jesus Today*, V. George Shillington (ed.). Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997, 23-33.

Farris, Stephen C. "The Canticles of Luke's Infancy Narrative: The Appropriation of a Biblical Tradition," in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, Longenecker, Richard N. (ed.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Edermans Publishing, 2001, 91-112.

——, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.

Feldman, E. *Biblical and Post-Biblical Defilement and Mourning: Law as Theology*. New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1977.

Felix, Paul W. "Literary Dependence and Luke's Prologue," *MSJ* 8/1 (1997), 61-82.

Fernando, Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*. JSNTSup 252; London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Filson, F.V. "The Journey Motif in Luke-Acts," in *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (eds.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: The Paternoster Press, 1970, 68-77.

——, *Three Crucial Decades*. Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1963.

Finegen, Jack, *Light from the Ancient Past: The Archaeological Background of Judaism and Christianity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Finn, T.M. "The God-Fearers Reconsidered," *CBQ* 47 (1985), 75-84.

Fitzmyer, J.A. "The Story of the Dishonest Manager (Lk 16:1-13)," *TS* 25 (1964), 23-42.

——, "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts," in *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers*, E.H. Lovering (ed.). Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, 524-38.

——, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

——, *The Gospel According to Luke, X-XX IV*. AB 28; 2 vols.; Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1985.

——, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Fletcher, D.R. "The riddle of the unjust steward: Is irony the key?" *JBL* 82 (1963), 15-30.

Florentino García Martínez and Eiberg J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition.* Leiden: Brill, 1997-98.

Flummer, A. *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1964.

Flusser, D. "The Parable of the Unjust Steward: Jesus' Criticism of the Essenes," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, James H. Charlesworth (ed.). New York: Doubleday, 1992, 176-97.

Foakes-Jackson, F.J. and Lake, K. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part 1, vol. II. London: Macmillan, 1922.

Foerster, Werner, "ἀσώτως, ἀσωτία," *TDNT*, I, 506-507.
Forbes, G.W. *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*. JSNTSup, 198; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
Ford, J.M. "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Luke's Gospel," in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, R.J. Cassidy and P.J. Scharper (eds.). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983, 80-98.
——, "Towards the Restoration of Allegory: Christology, Epistemology and Narrative Structure," *SVTQ* 34 (1990), 161-195.
——, *My Enemy is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke*. New York: Orbis Books, 1984.
Ford, R.Q. *The Parables of Jesus: Recovering the Art of Listening*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
Franklin, E. *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1965.
Freed, Edwin D. "The Parable of the Judge and the Widow (Luke 18.1–8)," *NTS* 33 (1987), 38-60.
Friedel, L.M. "The Parable of the Unjust Steward," *CBQ* 3 (1941), 337-348.
Friedrichsen, Timothy A. "The Temple, A Pharisee, A Tax Collector, and The Kingdom of God: Rereading a Jesus Parable (Luke 18:10-14a)," *JBL* 124 (2005), 89-119.
Frye, Northrop, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Eassays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
Funk, R.W. *Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*, R. Funk, Roy W. Hoover and Jesus Seminar (eds.). New York: Macmillan, 1993.
Funk, R.W. "Structure in the Narrative Parables of Jesus," *Semeia* 2 (1994), 51-73.
——, "The Good Samaritan as Metaphor," *Semeia* 2 (1974), 74-81.
——, "The Old Testament in Parable: The Good Samaritan," *Encounter* 26 (1965), 251-267.
——, *Language, Hermeneutic and the Word of God*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
——, *Parables and Presence*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
Gächter, Paul, "The Parable of the Dishonest Steward after Oriental Conception," *CBQ* 12 (1950), 121-31.
Gadd, C.J. "Epic of Gilgamesh, Tablet XII," *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale* XXX (1933), 127-43.
Gager, J.J. "Jews, Gentiles, and Synagogues in the Book of Acts," *HTR* 79 (1986), 91-99.
Gagnon, R. "Luke's Motives for Redaction in the Account of the Double Delegation in Luke 7:1-10," *NovT* 36 (1994), 122-45.
Gallagher, R.L. and Hertig, P. *Mission in Acts: Ancient Narratives in Contemporary Context*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2004.
Garrett, S.R. "Beloved Physician of the Soul? Luke as Advocate for Ascetic Practice," *Asceticism and the New Testament*, L.E. Vaage and V.L. Wimbush (eds.). London: Routledge, 1999, 71-96.
——, "Exodus from Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24," *CBQ* 52 (1990), 652-680.
——, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
Garwood, P. Anderson, "Seeking and Saving What Might Have Been Lost: Luke's Restoration of an Enigmatic Parable Tradition," *CBQ* 70 (2008), 729-49.
Gaston, Lloyd, *Horae Synopticas Electronicae*. Missoula: SBL, 1973.
Gaventa, Beverly Roberts, *Acts*. ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003.
——, *From Darkness to Light*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
Geldenhuys, Norval, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
Gempf, Conrad "Public Speaking and Published Accounts," *The Book of Acts in Its First-Century Setting*, vol. 1: *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke (eds.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993, 259-303.
Genette, Gerard, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. trans. J. E. Lewin; Ithaca, NY: Cornell

University Press, 1980.
Gerhardsson, B. “If We Do Not Cut the Parables out of Their Frames,” *NTS* 37 (1991), 321-335.
——, *The Good Samaritan, The Good Shepherd?* ConBNT 16; Lund: Gleerup, 1958.
Gibson, Margaret D. “On the Parable of the Unjust Steward,” *ExpTim* 14 (1902-03), 334.
Gilbert, Gary, “The disappearance of the Gentiles: God-fearers and the image of the Jews in Luke-Acts,” *Putting body & soul together* (1997), 172-84.
Gill, David, “Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages,” *HTR* 63 (1970), 199-221.
Gillman, John, *Possessions and the Life of Faith: A Reading of Luke-Acts*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
Gilmour, Michael J. “Hints of Homer in Luke 16:19-31,” *Didaskalia* 10 (1999), 23-33.
Girard, L. *L’Évangile des voyages ou la section Lc. 9:51-18:14 de saint Luc*. Paris, 1951.
Glancy, Jennifer A. “Slaves and Slavery in the Matthean Parables,” *JBL* 119 (2000), 67-90.
Godet, F. *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1976.
González, J. L. *Faith and Wealth: A History of Early Christian Ideas on the Origin, Significance, and Use of Money*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990.
Goodenough, Erwin R. “The Perspective of Acts,” ed., Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1968, 51-59.
Gooding, David, *According to Luke*. Leichester: InterVarsity Press, 1987.
Goppelt, L. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols.; ed. J. Roloff; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
Gorringe, T. “A Zealot Option Rejected? Luke 12:13-14,” *ExpTim* 98 (1987), 267-70.
Goulder, M.D. “Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels,” *JTS* 19 (1968), 51-69.
——, “The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey,” in *Studia Evangelica II* (TU, 87), F.L. Cross (ed.). Berlin, 1964, 195-202.
——, *Luke: A New Paradigm*. 2 vols. JSNTSup 20. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
Gowler, David B. ‘Socio-narratological Character Analysis of the Pharisees in Luke-Acts,’ PhD dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.
——, “At His Gate Lay a Poor Man: A Dialogic Reading of Luke 16:19-31,” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 32(2005), 249-65.
——, *Host, Guest, Enemy, and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts*. New York, Bern, Frankfurt, Paris: Peter Lang Press, 1991.
——, *What Are They Saying About the Parable*? New York: Mahwah, N.J. Paulist Press, 2000.
Grant, Robert M. and Freedman, David N. *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1960.
Graves, Mike “Luke 10:25-37: The Moral of the ‘Good Samaritan’ Story?” *RevExp* 94 (1997), 269-75.
Green, J.B. and McKeever, Michael C. (eds.), *Luke-Acts and New Testament Historiography*. IBR Bibliographies; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994.
Green, Joel B. “Doing Repentance: The Formation of Disciples in the Acts of the Apostles,” *Ex auditu* 18 (2002), 1-23.
——, “Eschatology and the Nature of Humans,” *Science & Christian Belief* 14 (2002), 33-50.
——, “Good News to Whom? Jesus and the “Poor” in the Gospel of Luke,” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*, J. B. Green and M. Turner (eds.). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994, 59-74.
——, “Persevering Together in Prayer: The Significance of Prayer in the Acts of the Apostles,” in *Into God’s Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, Longenecker, Richard N. (ed.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Edermans Publishing, 2001, 183-202.
——, “The Problem of a Beginning: Israel’s Scriptures in Luke 1-2,” *BBR* 4 (1994), 61-86.

——, “Wealthy… Who? Me?: Surprising Perspectives on Faith and Wealth from Luke-Acts,” *The Living Pulpit* April-June (2003), 18-19.
——, *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
——, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
——, “Conversion in Luke-Acts: The Potential of a Cognitive Approach,” in Consultation on the Use of Cognitive Linguistics in Biblical Interpretation, *Conversion in Luke-Acts* (*SBL*). *wpd* (2006), 1-28.
Greene, M. Dwaine, “The Parable of the Unjust Steward As Question and Challenge,” *ExpTim* 112 (2000), 82-87.
Gregory, A.F. “The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts,” *JSNT* 29 (2007), 459-72.
——, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*. WUNT, 2.169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
Gressmann, Hugo, *Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus. Eine literargeschichtliche Studie*. Abhandlungen der Königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1918.
Grieb, A. Katherine, *The Story of Romans: A Narrative Defense of God’s Righteousness*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
Griffith, F. LI. *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis: The Sethom of Herodotus and the Demotic Tales of Khamuas*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1900.
Griffiths, J. Gwyn, “Cross-cultural Eschatology with Dives and Lazarus,” *ExpTim* 105 (1993), 7-12.
Grobel, K. ‘“… Whose Name Was Neves,’” *NTS* 10 (1963-64), 373-382.
Grundmann, W. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. THKNT, 3; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.
Günter, Stemberger, *Jewish Contemporaries of Jesus: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
Haenchen, E. “The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (eds.). London: SPCK, 1966, 258-278.
——, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
Hägerland, Tobias, “Jesus and the Rites of Repentance,” *NTS* 52 (2006), 166-187.
Hagner, D. *Matthew*. 2 vols. WBC. Dallas: Word, 1993.
Hamm, Dennis “The Tamid Service in Luke-Acts: The Cultic Background behind Luke’s Theology of Worship (Luke 1:5-25; 18:9-14; 24:50-53; Acts 3:1; 10:3, 30),” *CBQ* 65 (2003), 215-31.
Hamm, M.D. “The Freeing of the Bent Woman and the Restoration of Israel: Luke 13:10-17 as Narrative Theology,” *JSNT* 31 (1987), 23-44.
Hanhart, Karel, *The Intermediate State in the New Testament*. Groningen: V.R.B., 1966.
Hanks, Thomas D. “Poor, Poverty.” *ABD*, 5, 403-424.
Harris, L.O. “Prayer in the Gospel of Luke,” *SJT* 10 (1967), 59-69.
Harris, O.G. ‘Prayer in Luke-Acts: A Study in the Theology of Luke,’ PhD dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966.
——, “Luke’s Theology of Prayer,” in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1990 Seminar Papers*, David J. Lull (ed.). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990, 529-551.
Harrison, Stephanie, “The Case of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector: Justification and Social Location in Luke’s Gospel,” *CurTM* 32 (2005), 99-111.
Hartin, Patrick J. “Poor,” in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, David Noel Freedman, Allen C. Myers and Astrid B. Beck (eds.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000, 1070-1071.
Heard, W. “Luke’s Attitude toward the Rich and the Poor,” *TJ* 9 (1988), 47-80.
Hedrick, C. W. *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.

——, “An Unfinished Story about a Fig Tree in a Vineyard (Luke 13:6-9),” *PRSt* 26 (1999), 169-192.
——, “Paul’s Conversion/Call: A Comparative Analysis of The Three Reports in Acts,” *JBL* 100 (1981), 415-32.
——, *Many Things in Parables: Jesus and His Modern Critics*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
Heidel, Alexander. *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1949.
Heininger, B. *Metaphorik, Erzählstruktur und szenisch-dramatische Gestaltung in den Sondergutgleichnisse bei Lukas*. NTAbh, 24; Münster: Aschendorff, 1991.
Hendrickx, Herman, *The Parables of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.
——, “A Man Had Two Sons: Lk 15:11-32 in the Light of the Ancient Mediterranean Values of Farming and Household,” *East Asian Pastoral Institute* 31 (1994), 46-66.
Hendriksen, W. *Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke*, in New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.
Hengel, Martin, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000.
Hensell, Eugene, “The Great Journey in Luke’s Gospel,” *Review for Religious* 66 (2007), 316-319.
Hepper, F.N. *Illustrated Encyclopedia of Bible Plants*. Grand Rapids Baker, 1992.
Hertig, P. “The Jubilee Mission of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke: Reversals of Fortunes,” *Missiology: An International Review* 26 (1998), 167-79.
Herzog, Frederick, *Liberation Theology: Liberation in the Light of the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Seabury, 1972.
Herzog, W.R. *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as the Pedagogue of the Oppressed*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
Hickling, C.J.A. “A Tract on Jesus and the Pharisees? A Conjecture on the Redaction of Luke 15 and 16,” *HeyJ* 16 (1975), 253-265.
Hicks, J.M. “The Parable of the Persistent Widow (Luke 18:1-8),” *ResQ* 33 (1991), 209-23.
Hiebert, P. “Widows,” *Oxford Companion to the Bible*, B. M. Metzger and M. D. Coogan (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993, 795-798.
Hiers, Richard H. “Friends by Unrighteous Mammon: The Eschatological Proletariat (Luke 16:9),” *JAAR* 38 (1970), 30-36.
Higgins, A.J.B. “The Preface to Luke and the Kerygma in Acts,” in *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, W.W. Gasque and P.P. Martin (eds.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1970, 78-91.
Hill, D. *The Gospel of Matthew*. London: Oliphants, 1972.
Himmelfarb, M. *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1983.
Hinson, E. Glenn, “Persistence in Prayer in Luke-Acts,” *RevExp* 104 (2007), 721-36.
Hirsch, E.D. *The Aims of Interpretation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
——, *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.
Hock, Ronald F. “Lazarus and Micyllus: Greco-Roman Background to Luke 16:19-31,” *JBL* 106 (1987), 447-463.
Hoerber, Robert G. “Paul’s Conversion/Call,” *Concordia Journal* (1996), 186-188.
Holgate, David A. *Prodigality, Liberality and Meanness in the Parable of the Prodigal Son: A Greco-Roman Perspective on Luke 15:11-32*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
Holleran, J.W. “The Saint and the Scoundrel,” *BibTod* 25 (1987), 375-379.
Holmas, Geir Otto “‘My house shall be a house of prayer’: Regarding the Temple as a Place of Prayer in Acts within the Context of Luke’s Apologetical Objective,” *JSNT* 27 (2005), 393-416.

Holmgren, Fred C. “The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: Luke 18:9-14 and Deuteronomy 26:1-15,” *Int* 48 (1994), 252-261.
Houlden, J.L. “The Purpose of Luke,” *JSNT* 21 (1984), 53-65.
Hoyt, T. ‘The Poor in Luke-Acts,’ PhD dissertation, Duke University, 1975.
Huffard, E.W. “The Parable of the Friend at Midnight: God’s Honour or Man’s Persistence?” *ResQ* 21 (1978), 154-160.
Hughes, Frank W. “The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric,” in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (eds.). JSNTSup 90; England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993, 29-41.
Hultgren, Arland J. “Interpreting the Gospel of Luke,” *Int* 30 (1976), 353-65.
——, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
Hultgren, Stephen, “The Apostolic Church’s Influence on the Order of Sayings in the Double Tradition. Part II: Luke’s Travel Narrative,” *ZNW* 100 (2009), 199-222.
Hunter, A.M. *Interpreting the Parables*. London: SCM Press, 1960.
——, *The Parables Then and Now*. London, 1971.
Ireland, D.J. *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God: An Historical, Exegetical and Contextual Study of the Parable of the Unjust Steward in Luke 16:1-13*. NovTSup, 70; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
Jackson, Paul Norman, “Allegiance to Jesus from the Transfiguration to his Death in Luke’s Gospel,” *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 40 (1997), 48-62.
James, W. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: Collier MacMillan, 1961.
Janoff, Bulman R, *Shattered Assumptions: Towards a new Psychology of trauma*. New York: The Free Press, 1992.
Jeremias, J. *Rediscovering the Parables*, London: SCM Press, 1966.
——, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus*, Vol. 1. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1971.
——, “Tradition und Redaktion in Lukas 15,” *ZNW* 62 (1971), 172-189.
——, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1969.
——, *The Parables of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1972.
Jervell, J, “God’s Faithfulness to the Faithless People: Trends in Interpretation of Luke-Acts,” *WW* 12 (1992), 29-36.
——, “Paul: The Teacher of Israel: The Apologetic Speeches of Paul in Acts,” in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972, 153-83.
——, “Retrospect and Prospect in Luke-Acts Interpretation,” in *SBL Seminar Paper 1991*, E.H. Lovering (ed.). Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991, 383-404.
——, “The Church of Jews and Godfearers,” in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*, J.B. Tyson (ed.). Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988, 11-20.
——, “The Divided People of God: The Restoration of Israel and Salvation for the Gentiles,” in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Pub. House, 1979, 41-74.
——, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972.
——, *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 2000.
Johnson, A.F. “Assurance for Man: The Fallacy of Translating *Anaideia* by ‘Persistence’ in Luke 11:5-8,” *JETS* 22 (1979), 123-131.

Johnson, L.T. “On Finding the Lukan Community: A Cautious Cautionary Essay,” *SBL 1979 Seminar Papers*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979, 87-100.
——, *Sharing Possessions: Mandate and Symbol of Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
——, The Gospel of Luke. Sacra Pagina, 3, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991.
——, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS 39, Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
——, “Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception-History Pertinent?,” *JSNT* 28 (2005), 159-62.
Jones, G.V. *The Art and Truth of the Parables*. London: SPCK, 1964.
Jones, Ivor H. *The Matthean Parables: A Literary and Historical Commentary*. NovTSup 80, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
Jones, Peter R. *Studying the Parables of Jesus*. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 1999.
——, *The Teaching of the Parables*. Nashville: Broadman, 1982.
Joubert, S.J. “The Jerusalem community as role-model for a cosmopolitan group: A socio-literary analysis of Luke’s symbolic universe,” *Neotestamentica* 29 (1995), 49-59.
Juel, D. *Luke-Acts: The Promise of History*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1983.
Jülicher, A. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976.
Kanagaraj, J. Jeyaseelan, “Good News to the Poor in the New Testament,” *Good News to the Poor: The Challenge to the Church*, Sebastian C.H. Kim and Krickwin C. Marak (eds.). ISPCK, 1998, 40.
Kariamadam, P. “The Composition and Meaning of the Lucan Travel Narrative (Lk 9:51-19:46),” *Bible Bhashyam* 13 (1987), 179-198.
Karris, R.J. “Missionary communities: a new paradigm for the study of Luke-Acts,” *CBQ* 41 (1979), 80-97.
——, “Poor and Rich: The Lukan *Sitz-im-Leben*,” *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, C.H. Talbert (ed.). Danville, VA/Edinburgh: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion/ T & T Clark, 1978, 112-25.
——, *Jesus and the Marginalized in John’s Gospel*. Collegeville: Michael Glazier, 1990.
——, *Prayer and the New Testament*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2000.
——, *What Are They Saying About Luke and Acts*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
Käsemann, E. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1964.
——, *Perspectives on Paul*. London: SCM Press, 1971.
Kazen, Thomas, “Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts,” *NTS* 51 (2005), 561-78.
Keesmaat, Sylvia C. “Strange Neighbors and Risky Care,” in *The Challenge of Jesus’ Parables*, R.N. Longenecker (ed.). Grand Rapids: Michigan, 2000, 263-285.
Kern, Philip H. “Paul’s Conversion and Luke’s Portrayal of Character in Acts 8-10,” *TynBul* 54 (2003), 63-80.
Kilbourne, Brock and Richardson, James T. “Paradigm Conflict, Types of Conversion, and Conversion Theories,” *Sociological Analysis* 50 (1989), 1-21.
Kilgallen, J.J. “Forgiveness of sins (Luke 7:36-50),” *NovTest* 49 (2007), 105-116.
——, “Luke 15 and 16: A Connection,” *Bib* 78 (1997), 369-376.
——, “The Importance of the Redactor in Luke 18:9-14,” *Bib* 79 (1998), 69-75.
——, “The Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18:9-14): The Point?” *ExpTim* 114 (2003), 157-159.
——, “The Plan of the ‘NOMIKOΣ’ (Luke 10:25-37),” *NTS* 42 (1996), 615-19.
——, “The Purpose of Luke’s Divorce Text (16:18),” *Bib* 76 (1995), 229-38.
——, *The Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*. SubBib 32, Roma, Editrice Pontificio

Istituto Biblico, 2008.
Kim, K.-J. *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology* . JSNTSup, 155; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
Kim, S. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
Kimball, C.A. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. JSNTSup, 94; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
Kingsbury, J.D. "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Restschrift Frans Neirynck*, F. Van Segbroeck (ed.). vol. 2. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992, 1497-1512.
——, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
——, *Jesus Christ in Matthew, Mark and Luke*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
——, *Matthew as Story*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
Kinman, Brent, *Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem: In the Context of Lukan Theology and the Politics of His Day*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
Kissinger, W.S. *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*. New Jersey: Scarecrow, 1979.
Kistemaker, S.J. "The Structure of Luke's Gospel," *JETS* 25 (1982), 33-39.
——, *The Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980.
Klauck, H-J. *Allegorie und Allegorese in Synoptischen Gleichnistexten*. NTAbh, 13; Münster: Aschendorff, 1978.
Kloppenborg, J.S. "The Dishonoured Master," *Bib* 70 (1989), 474-495.
——, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son and Deeds of Gift," *NovT* 130 (2008), 169-194.
Klutz, Todd, *The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Knight, George W. "Luke 16:19-31: The Rich Man and Lazarus," *RevExp* 94 (1997), 277-283.
Koch, D.A. "The God-Fearers between Facts and Fiction: Two Theosebeis-Inscriptions from Aphrodisias and Their Bearing for the New Testament," *Studia Theologica*, 60 (2006), 62-90.
Kodell, Jerome "Luke and the Children: The Beginning and End of the Great Interpolation (Luke 9:46-56; 18:9-23)," *CBQ* 49 (1987), 415-430.
Koenig, J. *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission*. OBT, 17; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
Kosmala, Hans, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward in the Light of Qumran," *ASTI* 3 (1964), 114-121.
Köster, H. "σπλαγχνίζομαι," *TDNT*, VII, 553-555.
Kraabel, A.T. "The Disappearance of the 'God-Fearers,'" *Numen* 28 (1981), 113-26.
——, "The God-Fearers Meet the Beloved Disciple," *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, B.A. Pearson (ed.). Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 276-284.
Krämer, M. *Das Rätsel der Parabel vom ungerechten Verwalter, Lk 16:1-13*. Zürich: PAS, 1972.
Kraybill, D.B. and Sweetland, D.M. "Possessions in Luke-Acts: A Sociological Perspective," *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 10 (1983), 215-39.
Kuhn, K.G. "προσήλυτος," *TDNT*, VI, 727-744.
Kümmel, W.G. *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1957.
Kurz, W.S. 'The Function of Christological Proof from Prophecy for Luke and Justin,' PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1976.
——, "Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible," *SBLSP* 19 (1980) 283-300.
LaHurd, C.S. "Re-viewing Luke 15 with Arab Christian women" in *A feminist companion to Luke*, Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff (ed.). London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 246-68.

Lake, K. “Proselytes and God-Fearers,” *The Beginnings of Christianity.* V. in *The Acts of the Apostles*, F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake (eds.). 5 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1933, 74-96.
Lambrecht, J. “Reading and Rereading Lk 18:31-22:6,” *À cause de ι'Évangile*, (1985), 585-612.
——, “The Message of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-27),” *LouvStud* 5 (1974), 121-135.
——, *Once More Astonished: The Parables of Jesus*. New York: Crossroad, 1981.
Landry, David & May, Ben, “Honor Restored: New Light on The Parable of The Prudent Steward (Luke 16:1-8a),” *JBL* 119 (2000), 287-309.
Laverdiere, Eugene A. and Thompson,William G. “New Testament Communities in Transition: A Study of Matthew and Luke,” *TS* 37 (1976), 567-97.
Leaney, A.C.R. *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*. BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1958.
Lehtipuu, Outi, “Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and The Poor Man in Luke 16:19-31,” in *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni (eds.). Sheffield; Sheffield Academic Press, 1990, 73-105.
——, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*. NovTSup 123. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
Lenski, R.C.H. *The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1946.
Levine, Amy-Jill, “Luke's Pharisees,” in *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton (eds.). Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2007, 113-130.
Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., and Jones, H.S. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford, 1977.
Liebenberg, Jacobus, *The Language o f the Kingdom and Jesus: Parable, Aphorism, and Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the Synoptic Tradition and the Gospel of Thomas*. BZNW 102; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.
Lieber, Andrea, “I set a Table before You: The Jewish Eschatological Character of Aseneth's Conversion Meal,” *JSP* 14.1 (2004), 63-77.
Lieberman, S. “On Sins and Their Punishment,” in *Tests and Studies*. New York: Ktav, 1974, 33-48.
Liefeld, W.L. “Parables on Prayer (Luke 11:5-10; 18:1-8; 18:9-14),” in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, R. N. Longenecker (ed.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000, 240-262.
——, *Luke*, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
Lieu, J.M. “Circumcision, Women and Salvation,” *NTS* 40 (1994), 358-70.
——, “The Race of the God-Fearers,” *JTS* 46 (1995), 483-501.
——, *The Gospel of Luke*. Peterborough: Epworth, 1997.
Linnemann, E. *The Parables of Jesus: Introduction and Interpretation*. London: SPCK, 1966.
Litwak, K.D. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. JSNTSup, London: T & T Clark International, 2005.
Liu, P. “Did the Lucan Jesus Desire Voluntary Poverty of His Followers?” *EvQ* 64 (1992), 291-317.
Loader, W. “Jesus and the Rogue in Luke 16:1-8a: The Parable of the Unjust Steward,” *RB* 96 (1989), 518-32.
Lockwood, G.J. “The Reference to Order in Luke's Preface,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 59 (1995), 101-104.
Longenecker, B.W. “A Humorous Jesus? Orality, Structure and Characterisation in Luke 14:15-24, and Beyond,” *BibInt* 16 (2008), 179-204.
Longenecker, Richard N. (ed.), “Taking up the Cross Daily: Discipleship in Luke-Acts,” in *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 1996, 50-76.
——, “The Acts of the Apostles,” in *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, Frank E. Gaebelein (ed.). Grand

Rapids: Zondervan, 1981, 9: 207-573.
Lorenzen, Thorwald, "A Biblical Meditation on Luke 16:19-31," *ExpTim* 87 (1975), 39-43.
Lucian, *De Hist. Conscrib*. §53.
Lund, N.W. *Chiasmus in the New Testament*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.
Luz, Ulrich, *Matthew 21-28: Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
Lygre, John G. "Of What Charges? (Luke 16:1-2)," *BTB* 32 (2002), 21-28.
Maccogy, Hyam, "How Unclean Were Tax-Collectors?" *BTB* 31 (2001), 60-63.
——, *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and Its Place in Judaism*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
Mackinley, G. "St. Luke's Threefold Narrative of Christ's Last Journey to Jerusalem," *The Interpreter*, 7 (1911), 260-278.
Maddox, R. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
Malherbe, A.J. "The Christianization of a *Topos* (Luke 12:13-34)," *NovT* 38 (1996), 123-135.
Malina, B.J. and Rohrbaugh, R.L. *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
Malina, B.J. "Interpreting the Bible with Anthropology: The Case of the Poor and the Rich," *Listening: Journal of Religion and Culture* 21 (1986), 148-159.
——, "Wealth and Poverty in the New Testament and Its World," *Int* 41 (1987), 354-367.
——, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.
Malina, Bruce J. and Neyrey, Jerome H. "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values in the Mediterranean World," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, Jerome H. Neyrey (ed.). Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991, 25-65.
Mánek, J. "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke," *NovT* 2 (1958), 8-23.
Mann, J. "Jesus and the Sadducean Priests: Luke 10:25-27," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 6 (1914), 415-422.
Manson, T.W. *The Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke Arranged with Introduction and Commentary*. London: SCM Press, 1949.
——, *The Gospel of Luke*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.
Marcus, Dods, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, W. Robertson Nicoll (ed.). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956, 221-381.
Marcus, Joel, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Bible: V. 27A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
Marshall, A.J. "Ladies at Law: The Role of Women in the Roman Civil Courts," *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History V*, Carl Deroux (ed.). Brussels: Latomus. Revue D'Études Latines, 1989, 35-54.
Marshall, I.H. "Luke and his Gospel," ed., P. Stuhlmacher, *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien*. WUNT 28, Tübingen: Mohr, 1983, 289-308.
——, "Jesus–Example and Teacher of Prayer in the Synoptic Gospel," in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, Richard N. Longenecker (ed.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Edermans Publishing, 2001, 113-131.
——, *Luke: Historian & Theologian*. Devon: The Paternoster Press, 1970.
——, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978.
Martens, A.W. "The Parable of the Unproductive Fig Tree (Luke 13:6-9), in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, R. N. Longenecker (ed.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000, 157-176.
Mason, Steve, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees*. SPB 39; Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Matera, Frank J. “Jesus’ Journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:46): A Conflict with Israel,” *JSNT* 51 (1993), 57-77.

Matthews, Mary W., Shelley, Carter and Scheele, Barbara, “Proclaiming the Parable of the Persistent Widow (Lk. 18:2-5),” in *Lost Coin: Parables of Women, Work and Wisdom*, Mary Ann Beavis (ed.). London: Sheffield Academic, 2002, 46-70.

Mattill, A.J. *Luke and the Last Things*. Dillsboro: Western North Carolina, 1979.

——, “The Date and Purpose of Luke-Acts: Rackham Reconsidered,” *CBQ* 40 (1978), 335-350.

——, “The Good Samaritan and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: Halevy Reconsidered,” *Encounter* 33 (1972), 359-376.

——, “The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H.H. Evans Reconsidered,” *NovTes* 17 (1974), 15-46.

——, “The Purpose of Acts: Schenckenburger Reconsidered,” in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F.F. Bruce on his 60the Birthday*, W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin (eds.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: The Paternoster Press, 1970, 108-122.

Mazamisa, L.W. *Beatific Comradeship: An Exegetical-Hermeneutical Study on Lk 10:25-37*. Kampen: Kok, 1987.

McCaughey, J.D. “Two Synoptic Parables in the Gospel of Thomas,” *AusBR* 8 (1960), 24-28.

Meadors, Gary T. “The “Poor” In The Beatitudes of Matthew and Luke,” *Grace Theological Journal* 6.2 (1985), 305-314.

Mealand, D.L. *Poverty and Expectation in the Gospels*. London: SPCK, 1980.

Meeks, W.A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale, 1983.

Meier, John P. “The Quest for the Historical Pharisee: A Review Essay on Roland Deines, Die Pharisäer,” *CBQ* 61 (1999), 713-722.

——, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*: vol. 2, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*. New York: Doubleday, 1994, 822-831.

——, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*: vol. 3, *Companions and Competitors*. ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2001, 289-388.

Menken, M.J.J. “The Position of ΣΠΛΑΓΧΝΙΖΕΣΘ-ΑΙ and ΣΠΛΑΓΧΝΑ in the Gospel of Luke,” *NovT* 30 (1988), 107-114.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament*. 3d ed., London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Metzger, James A. *Consumption and Wealth in Luke’s Travel Narrative*. BIS 88, Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Meyer, H.A.W. *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament on the New Testament: Luke*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880.

Mhagama, Christian L. “God does the Unexpected: Luke 1:38-55,” *International Review of Mission* 77 (1988), 208-212.

Michel, O. “τελώνης,” *TDNT*, VIII, 88-105.

Miesner, D.R. ‘Chiasm and the Composition and Message of Paul’s Missionary Sermons,’ ThD dissertation, Concordia Seminary in Exile, 306 North Grand, St. Louis, 1974.

Millar, F. “Gentiles and Judaism: God-Fearers and Proselytes,” by E. Schürer; revised and edited by G. Vermes, Millar, F. and Goodman, M. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, III. 1. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986, 150-176.

Minear, P.S. “Dear Theo: The Kerygmatic Intention and Claim of the Book of Acts,” *Int* 27 (1973), 133-150.

Miranda, José, *Being and the Messiah: The Message of St. John*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1977.

Mitchell, Margaret M. “Patristic Counter-Evidence to the Claim that ‘The Gospels Were Written for All Christians’,” *NTS* 51 (2005), 36-79.

Moessner, D.P. “Dionysius’ Narrative ‘Arrangement’ (οἰκονομία) as the Hermeneutical Key to Luke’s Re-vision of the ‘Many’,” in *Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J.M. Wedderburn*, A. Christophersen, C. Claussen, J. Frey and B. Longenecker, Paul (eds.). SNTSup 217, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 149-164.

——, “The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1:1-4),” in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel*. Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999, 84-123.

——, “The Triadic Synergy of Hellenistic Poetics in the Narrative Epistemology of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Authorial Intent of the Evangelist Luke (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1-8),” *Neotestamenica* 42.2 (2008), 289-303.

——, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Montefiore, C.G. *The Synoptic Gospels*. New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1968.

Montefiore, H. and Tierner, H. *Thomas and the Evangelists, Studies in Biblical Theology, 35*. Naperville: Alec R. Allensen, 1962.

Moore, Francis John, “The Parable of the Unjust Steward,” *ATR* 47 (1965), 103-105.

Moore, G.F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. 3 vols.; New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Moore, Stephen, “Narrative Commentaries on the Bible: Context, Roots, and Prospects,” *Foundations & Facets Forum*, 3 (1987), 29-62.

Moorman, J.R.H. *The Path to Glory: Studies in the Gospel according to Saint Luke*. London, SPCK, 1963.

Moreau, A.S. “Poor, Poverty.” ed., Walter A. Elwell, *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001, 932-933.

Morris, Leon, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC; London: IVP, 1974.

——, *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries*. London: Tyndale, 1964.

Moscato, Mary A. “Current Theories Reading the Audience of Luke-Acts,” *CurTM* 3 (1976), 355-361.

Moule, C.F.D. “H. W. Moule on Acts iv. 25,” *ExpTim* 65 (1954), 220-21.

Moulton, H. and Milligan, G. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Moxnes, H. “Meals and the New Community in Luke,” *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok* 51 (1986), 158-167.

——, “Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts,” 241-68, in *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, Jerome H. Neyrey (ed.). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1991.

——, “The Social Context of Luke’s Community,” *Int* 48 (1994), 379-389.

——, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke’s Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Mullen, J. Patrick, *Dining with Pharisees*. Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2004.

Munck, J. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* . Atlanta: John Knox, 1959.

Myers, Ched, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark’s Story of Jesus*. MaryKnoll, N. Y: Orbis, 1991.

Nave, Guy D. *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts*. AcadBib 4; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.

Navone, J. *Themes of St. Luke*. Rome: Gregorian University, 1970.

Neagoe, A. *The Trial of the Gospel: An Apologetic Reading of Luke’s Trial Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Neale, D.A. *None But The Sinners: Religious Categories in the Gospel of Luke*. JSNTSup 58,

Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
Neirynck, F. “Luke 4:16-30 and the Unity of Luke-Acts,” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. BETL, 142; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 357-395.
Neusner, Jacob, (ed.), “The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before A.D. 70: The Problem of Oral Transmission,” in *Origins of Judaism: The Pharisees and Other Sects*. vol. 2. New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1990, 155-172.
——, “Mr. Sanders’ Pharisees and Mine,” *SJT* 44 (1991), 73-95.
——, “The Mishna in Philosophical Context and Out of Canonical Bounds,” *JBL* 112 (1993), 291-304.
——, “Two Pictures of the Pharisees: Philosophical Circle or Eating Club,” Anglican Theological Review 64 (1982), 525-538.
——, *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
Neyrey, Jerome H. *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Peabody, Massachusetts; Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
Nicholas, Wilkin Robert, ‘Repentance as a condition for Salvation in the New Testament,’ ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1985.
Nickelsburg, G.W.E. “Riches, the Rich, and God’s Judgment in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel according to Luke,” *NTS* 25 (1978), 324-344.
Nock, A.D. “Religious Developments from the Close of the Republic to the Death of Nero,” in *The Cambridge Ancient History. X. The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C.-A.D. 70*, S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock and M.P. Charlesworth (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 465-511.
Noël, F. *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9:51-19:28*. Brussel: Voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2004.
Noel, T.L. ‘Parables in Context: Developing a Narrative-Critical Approach to Parables in Luke,’ PhD dissertation; Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Kentucky, 1986.
Nolland, J. “Feuillet,” *RevThom* 77 (1977), 191.
——, “The Role of Money and Possessions in the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32),” in *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*, Bartholomew, Craig G., Green, Joel B., and Thiselton, Anthony C. (eds.). Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan, 2005, 178-209.
——, *Luke*, 3 vols. WBC, 35; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1993.
Ó Fearghail, Fearghus, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts. A Study of the Role of Lk 1:1-4:44 in the Composition of Luke’s Two-Volume Work*. AnBib, 126, Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.
O’Brien, P.T. “Prayer in Luke-Acts,” *TynBul* 24 (1973), 111-127.
O’Day, Gail, R. “The Citation of Scripture as a Key to Characterization in Acts,” *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, P. Gray and Gail R. O'Day (ed.). Leiden: Brill, 2008, 207-221.
O’Neill, J.C. *The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting*. London: SPCK, 1970.
O’Toole, R.F. “Reflections on Luke’s Treatment of Jews in Luke-Acts,” *Biblica* 74 (1993), 529-555.
——, *Luke’s Presentation of Jesus: A Christology*. SB, 25, Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004.
——, *The Unity of Luke’s Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts*, GNS 9. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1984.
Oakman, D.E, “Jesus and Agrarian Palestine: The Factor of Debt,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers*, Kent Harold Richards (ed.). Atlanta: Scholars, 1985, 57-73.
——, “The Buying Power of Two Denarii: A Comment on Luke 10:35,” *Forum* 3.4 (1987), 33-38.
——, “The Countryside in Luke-Act,” in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*,

Jerome Neyrey (ed.). Peabody, M.A.: Hendrickson, 1991, 151-179.
——, *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day*. Studies in the Bible and early Christianity 8; Lewiston, N. Y. 1986.
——, *Jesus and the Peasants*. Cascade Books, Eugene, 2008.
Oesterley, W.O.E. *The Gospel Parables in the Light of their Jewish Background*. New York: Macmillan, 1936.
Ogg, George "The Central Section of the Gospel according to St Luke," *NTS* 18 (1971), 39-53.
Okorie, A.M. "The Characterization of the Tax Collectors in the Gospel of Luke," *CurTM* 22 (1995), 27-32.
Osborne, G. "Luke: Theologian of Social Concern," *TJ* 7 (1978), 135-148.
Osei-Bonsu, J. "The Intermediate State in Luke-Acts," *IBS* 9 (1987), 115-130.
Overman, J.A. "The God-Fearers: Some Neglected Features," *JSNT* 32 (1988), 17-26.
Paffenroth, K. *The Story of Jesus according to L*. JSNT Sup, 147, Sheffied, 1997.
Pagán, Samuel, "Poor and Poverty: Social Distance and Bible Translation," *Semeia* 76 (1996), 69-79.
Palmer, H. "Just Married Cannot Come," *NovT* 18 (1976), 241-257.
Pao, D.W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 2:130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
Pargament, K. *The Psychology and Religion of Coping: Theory, practice and research*. New York, Guilford, 1997.
Parris, David P. "Imitating the Parable: Allegory, Narrative and the Role of Mimesis," *JSNT* 25 (2002), 33-53.
Parrott, Douglas M. "The Dishonest Steward (Luke 16:1-8a) and Luke's Special Parable Collection," *NTS* 37 (1991), 499-515.
Parsons, M.C. "Allegorising Allegory: Narrative Analysis and Parable Interpretation," *PRSt* 15 (1988), 147-164.
——, "Landmarks Along the Way: The Function of The "L" Parables in the Lukan Travel Narrative," *SJT* 40 (1997), 33-47.
——, "The Unity of the Lukan Writings: Rethinking the OPINIO COMMUNIS," in *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays on Acts in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders*, Naymond H. Keathley (ed.). Texas, Waco: Baylor University, 1990.
Parsons, M.C. and Pervo, R.I. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
Patterson, Stephen J. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1993.
Paul, Geoffirey "The Unjust Steward and the Interpretation of Luke 16:9," *Theology* 61 (1958), 189-193.
Peace, Richard V. *Conversion in the New Testament: Paul and the Twelve*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing, 1999.
Pearce, Keith, "The Lucan Origins of the Raising of Lazarus," *ExpTim* 96 (1985), 359-361.
Perkins, P. "Taxes in the New Testament," *JRE* 12 (1984), 182-200.
——, *Hearing the Parables of Jesus*. New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1981.
Perpich, S.W. *A Critique of Structuralist Exegesis, With Specific Reference to Lk 10:29-37*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1984.
Perrin, N. *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1967.
Peterson, David, "The Motif of Fulfilment and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, B.W. Winter and A.D. Clarke (ed.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: The Paternoster Press, 1993, 83-104.
Peterson, W.L. "The Parable of the Lost Sheep in the Gospel of Thomas and the Synoptics," *NovT* 23 (1981), 128-147.

Phillips, T.E. “Reading Recent Readings of Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke and Acts,” *CBR* 1.2 (2003), 231-269.

——, *Reading Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.

Pietersma, Albert, *The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres the Magicians*. New York: Brill, 1994.

Pilgrim, W.E. *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1981.

Piper, Ronald A. “Social Background and Thematic Structure in Luke 16,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, F. Van Segbroeck (ed.). 3 vols. Leuven, Leuven University Press, 1992, 2:1637-1662.

Pleins, J. David and Hanks, Thomas D. “Poor, Poverty.” in *The Anchor Dictionary of the Bible*, David Noel Freedman (ed.). vol 5. New York: Doubleday, 1992, 402-424.

Plummer, A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Luke*. ICC; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1922.

Plymale, Steven F. “Luke’s Theology of Prayer,” in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1990 Seminar Papers*, David J. Lull (ed.). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990, 529-551.

——, *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*. AUS, 7.118; New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

Pobee, J.S. *Who Are the Poor? The Beatitudes as a Call to Community*, RBS 32. Geneva: WCC, 1987.

Pöhlmann, Wolfgang, *Der Verlorene Sohn and das Haus: Studien zu Lukas 15:11-32 im Horizont der antiken Lehre von Haus, Erziehung und Ackerbau*. WUNT 68; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1993.

Porter, Stanley E. “The Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-13): Irony is the Key,” in *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield*, David J. A. Clines, S. E. Fowl, and S. E. Porter (eds.). JSOTSup 87, Sheffield: JSOT, 1990, 127-153.

Powell, Mark Allan, “The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary-Critical Study,” *JBL* 109 (1990), 93-110.

Praeder, Susan Marie, *The Word in Women’s Worlds: Four Parables*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988.

Preisker, H. “Lukas 16:1-7,” *TLZ* 74 (1949), 85-92.

Price, R.M. *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts: A Feminist-Critical Scrutiny*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Prior, Michael, *Jesus: The Liberator: Nazareth Liberation Theology (Luke 4:16-30)*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Rabinowitz, L. *Midrash Rabbah*, H. Freedman and M. Simon (eds.). London: Soncino, 1938.

Räisänen, Heikki, “The Prodigal Gentile and His Jewish Christian Brother, Lk 15:11-32,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, F. Van Sebbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden (eds.). Leuven: University Press, 1992, 2:1617-1636.

Rambo, Lewis R. “Current Research on Religious Conversion,” *Religious Studies Review* 8 (1982), 146-159.

——, *Understanding Religious Conversion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

Ramelli, Ilaria L. E. “Luke 16:16.: the Good News of God’s Kingdom Is Proclaimed and Everyone Is Forced into It,” *JBL* 127 (2008), 737-758.

Ramsey, G.W. “Plots, Gaps, Repetitions, and Ambiguity in Luke 15,” *PRS* 17 (1990), 38-41.

Rapske, Brian, “Opposition to the Plan of God and Persecution,” in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, I.H. Marshall and D. Peterson (eds.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998, 235-256.

Ravens, David, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Ray, Summers, *The Secret Saying of the Living Jesus*. Waio: Word, 1968.
Rayan, Samuel, "Jesus and the Poor in the Fourth Gospel," *Biblebhashyam* 4 (1978), 213-228.
Regalado, Ferdinand O. "The Jewish Background of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus," *Asia Journal of Theology* 6 (2002), 341-448.
Reicke, B. "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," *Studia Evangelica I* (TU, 73, Berlin, 1959), 206-216.
Reid, Barbara E. "A Godly Widow Persistently Pursuing Justice: Luke 18:1-8," *Biblical Research* 45 (2000), 25-33.
——, "Beyond Petty Pursuits and Wearisome Widows: Three Lukan Parables," *Int* 56 (2002), 284-294.
——, "Luke's Mixed Message for Women," *Chicago Studies* 38 (1999), 283-297.
Reid, Robert Stephen, "On Preaching 'Fictive Argument'; A Reader-Response Look At A Lukan Parable And Three Sayings On Discipleship," *Restoration Quarterly* 43 (2001), 13-31.
Reinhartz, Adele, "Gospel Audiences: Variations on a Theme," in *Audience of the Gospel: the origin and function of the Gospels in early Christianity*, Edward W. Klink III (ed.). New York: T & T Clark, 2010, 134-152.
Reinstorf, D.H. "Luke's parables and the purpose of Luke's Gospel," *HTS* 58/3 (2002), 1281-1295.
——, "The Rich, The Poor, and The Law," *HTS* 60 (2004), 329-348.
Rengstorf, K.H. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. NTD 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1937.
——, *Die Re-investitur des verlorenen Sohnes in der Gleichniserzählung Jesu Luk. 15:11-32*. AFLNW 137; Köln: Westdeutscher, 1967.
Rensberger, David, *Overcoming the World: Politics and Community in the Gospel of John*. London: SPCK, 1989.
Resseguie, J.L. "Interpretation of Luke's Central Section (Luke 9:51-19:44) Since 1856," *SBT* 5 (1975), 3-36.
——, "Point of View in the Central Section of Luke," *JETS* 25 (1982), 41-47.
——, *Spiritual Landscape: Images of the Spiritual Life in the Gospel of Luke*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.
Rhoads, David and Michie, Donald, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
Richardson, Peter, *Building Jewish in the Roman East*. Waco, Tex: Baylor University Press, 2004.
Riches, J. "The Synoptic Evangelists and their Communities," in *Christian Beginnings: Word and Community from Jesus to Post-Apostolic Times*, J. Becker (ed.). Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993, 213-241.
Rickards, R.R. "The Translation of Luke 11:5-13," *BT* 28 (1977), 239-243.
Ricoeur, Paul, "Biblical Hermeneutics," *Semeia* 4 (1975), 27-148.
——, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.
——, *The Rule of Metapher*. Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
Riley, H. *Preface to Luke*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1993.
Ringe, Sharon H. "Luke 9:28-36: The Beginning of an Exodus," *Semeia* 28 (1983), 83-99.
Rius-Camps, J. and Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny, *The message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*. London; New York: T & T Clark International, 2006.
Robbins, V.K. "Prefaces in Greco-Roman Biography and Luke-Acts," *SBLSP* 14 (1978), 193-207.
——, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," in *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, Jerome H. Neyrey (ed.). Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991, 305-332.

Robert H. Stein, “The Genre of the Parables” in *The Challenge of Jesus’ Parables*, Richard N. Longenecker (ed.). Grand Rapids, Eerdmans Publishing, 2000, 30-50.
Robertson, A.T. “The Implications in Luke’s Preface,” *ExpTim* 35 (1924), 319-321.
Robinson, James M. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. 3d ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
Robinson, William Childs, “The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke’s Travel Narrative (9:51ff),” *JBL* 79 (1960), 20-31.
Roglan, Max, “μακροθυμεῖν in Ben Sira 35:19 and Luke 18:7: A Lexicographical Note,” *NovT* 51 (2009), 296-301.
Rohrbaugh, R.L. “A Dysfunctional Family and Its Neighbors (Luke 15:11b-32),” in *Perspectives on the Parables: Images of Jesus in his Contemporary Setting*, V.G. Shillington (ed.). Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997, 141-164.
——, “The Pre-Industrial City in Luke-Act: Urban Social Relations,” in *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, Jerome H. Neyrey (ed.). Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 137-147.
Rollins, W. G. “Slavery in the NT,” *IDBSup*, 830-832.
Rordorf, W. “Paul’s Conversion in the Canonical Acts and in the Acts of Paul,” *Semeia* 80 (1997), 137-144.
Roth, S. John, “Jesus the Pray-er,” *CurTM* 33 (2006), 488-500.
——, *The Blind, the Lame and the Poor: Character Types in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
Rowe, C.K. “History, Hermeneutics and the Unity of Luke-Acts,” *JSNT* 28 (2005), 131-57.
——, “Literary Unity and Reception History: Reading Luke-Acts as Luke and Acts,” *JSNT* 29 (2007), 449-457.
Ruether, Rosemary Radford, “The Crisis of Liberation Theology: Does God Opt for the Poor?” in *God and the Nations*, Douglas John Hall and Rosemary Radford Ruether (eds.). Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995, 93-104.
Ryken, Leland, *How to read the Bible as Literature*. Grand Rapids: Michigan; Zondervan, 1984.
Safrai, Shemuel, “Home and Family: Religion in everyday life,” *Jewish People in the 1the Century* (1976), 728-833.
Saldarini, Anthony J. “Pharisees,” *ABD*, vol. 5, 289-303.
——, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1988.
Sanders, E.P. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM Press, 1985.
——, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishna*. London: SCM Press, 1990.
——, *Judaism: Practice & Belief 63 BCE-66 CE*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
——, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM Press, 1977.
Sanders, J.A. “The Ethic of Election in Luke’s Great Banquet Parable,” in *Essays in Old Testament Ethics*, James L. Crenshaw and John T. Willis (eds.). New York: Ktav, 1974, 247-271.
Sanders, J.T. “The Pharisees in Luke-Acts,” in *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*, D. E. Groh and R. Jewett (eds.). Lanham, Md: University Press of America, 1985, 141-188.
——, “The Prophetic Use of the Scriptures in Luke-Act,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, C.A. Evans and W.F. Stinespring (eds.). Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987, 191-98.
——, “Tradition and Redaction in Luke 15:11-32,” *NTS* 15 (1969), 433-438.
——, “Who is a Jew and who is a Gentile in the Book of Acts?” *NTS* 37 (1991), 434-455.
——, *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM Press, 1987.

Saussure, F. *Course in General Linguistics*. London 1960.
Schaberg, Jane, "Luke," in *The Women's Bible Commentary*, Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe (eds.). Westminster: John Knox Press, 1992, 257-292.
Scheffler, Eben, "Compassionate action: living according to Luke's gospel," in *Identity, Ethics, and Ethos in the New Testament*, Jan G. van der Watt (ed.). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2006, 77-106.
Schellenberg, Ryan S. "Which Master? Whose Steward? Metalepsis and Lordship in the Parable of the Prudent Steward (Lk. 16:1-13)," *JSNT* 30 (2008), 263-288.
Schleiermacher, F. *Luke: A Critical Study*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellin Press, 1993.
Schmid, J. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. vol 3. Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1960.
Schmidt, K.L. "ἀσφάλεια, ἀσφαλής, ἀσφαλῶς, ἀσφαλίζω," *TDNT*, I, 506.
Schmidt, T.E. *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels*. JSNTSup, 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
Schmithals, W. "Lukas-Evangelist der Armen," *ThViat* 12 (1975), 153-167.
Schneider, G. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Ökumenischer Taschenbuch Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3; 2 vols; Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1977.
Schottroff, L. and Stegemann, W. *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor*. New York: Orbis Books, 1986.
Schottroff, L. *Lydia's Impatient Sisters: A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
——, "Das Gleichnis vom verlorenen Sohn," *ZTK* 68 (1971), 27-52.
——, *The Parables of Jesus*. trans. Linda M. Maloney: Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC-AD 135)*, II. ed., and rev. G. Vermes *et al*.; T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1987.
Schürmann, H. *Traditionsgeschichte Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1968.
Schwartz, H. *Elijah's Violin and Other Jewish Folktales*. New York: Penguin, 1987.
Schwarz, G. "Lukas 13:1-5: Eine Emendation," *NovT* 11 (1969), 121-126.
Schweizer, E. *The Good News according to Luke*. Atlanta: John Knox; Lundon: SPCK, 1984.
Scott, B.B. "A Master's Praise: Luke 16:1-8," *Bib* 64 (1983), 173-188.
——, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
——, *Jesus, Symbol-Maker for the Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
——, *Re-Imagine the World: An Introduction to the Parables of Jesus*. Santa Rosa, California; Polebridge Press, 2001.
Scott, M.D. 'Conversion in Luke and Paul: Some Exegetical and Theological Explorations,' PhD dissertation, Durham University, 2010.
Seccombe, D.P. *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*. SNTU, 6; Linz: A. Fuchs, 1982.
Segal, A.F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven: Yale University, 1990.
Seim, T.K. *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
Sellew, Philip "Interior Monologue as A Narrative Device in the Parables of Luke," *JBL* 111/2 (1992), 239-253.
Sellin, Gerhard, 'Studien zu den grossen Gleichniserzählungen des Lukas-Sonderguts: Die ἄνθρωπός-τις-Erzählungen-besonders am Beispiel von Lk 10,25-37 sund 16,14-31 untersucht,' PhD dissertation: Münster, 1974.
——, "Gleichnisstrukturen," *LingBib* 31 (1974), 89-115.
Shaun, Casey, Crossin, John, Eric H. Crump, Grieb, A. Katherine, Mitchell,,Beverly and Riggs, Ann K. *Love for the Poor and the Church's Witness to It*. For the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA. Friendship Press, 2005.

Sherwin-White, A. N. *Rome Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
Shoemaker, Mel, "Good News to the Poor in Luke's Gospel," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 27 (1992), 181-205.
Sider, John, "Proportional Analogy in the Gospel Parables," *NTS* 31 (1985), 1-23.
——, *Interpreting the Parables: A Hermeneutical Guide to their Meaning*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
Sievers, Joseph "Who Were the Pharisees?" in *Hillel and Jesus*, James H. Charlesworth and Loren L. Johns (eds.). Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997, 137-155.
Silva, M. *Biblical words and their meaning: A introduction to lexical semantics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.
Sim, David C. "The Gospels for all Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham," *JSNT* 84 (2001), 3-27.
Smalley, Stephen S. "Spirit, Kingdom and Prayer in Luke-Acts," *Novum Testament* 15 (1973), 59-71.
Smith, B.T.D. *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Study*. Cambridge: University Press, 1937.
Smith, C.W.F. *The Jesus of the Parables*. Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1975.
Smith, Justin Marc, "About Friends, by Friends, for Others: Author-Subject Relationships in Contemporary Greco-Roman Biographies," in *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*, Edward W. Klink III (ed.). New York: T & T Clark, 2010, 49-67.
Sneen, D.J. "An Exegesis of Luke 1:1-4 with Special Regard to Luke's Purpose as a Historian," *ExpTim* 83 (1971) 40-43.
Snodgrass, K.R. 'From Allegorizing to Allegorizing: A History of the Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus,' in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, Richard N. Longenecker (ed.). Grand Rapids: Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000, 3-29.
——, "*Anaideia* and the Friend at Midnight (Luke 11:8)," *JBL* 116 (1997), 505-513.
——, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids, Michigan; Eerdmans Publishing, 2008.
Spencer, F.S. "Neglected Widow in Acts 6:1-7," *CBQ* 56 (1994), 715-733.
——, "Preparing the Way of the Lord: Introducing and Interpreting Luke's Narrative, A Response to David Wenham," in *Reading Luke: Inter pretation, Reflection, Formation*, C.G. Bartholomew, J.B. Green and A.C. Thiselton (eds.). Grand Rapids; Michigan: Zondervan, 2005, 104-24.
Springs, Steele, E. "Luke 11:37-54-A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?" *JBL* 103 (1984), 379-394.
Squire, J.T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
——, "The Gospel according to Luke," in *The Gospels*, Stephen C. Barton (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, 158-181.
Stagg, F. "Luke's Theological Use of Parables," *RevExp* 94 (1997), 215-229.
——, "The Unhindered Gospel," *RevExp* 71 (1974), 451-462.
Stählin, G. "χήρα," *TDNT*, IX, 440-465.
Stanton, G.N. "Luke and People of God," in *Paper presented to the Divinity Faculty*. University of Aberdeen, February, 1991.
——, *The Gospels and Jesus*. Oxford Bible Series, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
Steck, O.H. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. WMANT, 23, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1967.
Stegman, T.D. "Reading Luke 12:13-34 as an Elaboration of a Chreia: How Hermogenes of Tarsus

Sheds Light on Luke's Gospel," *NovT* 49 (2007), 328-352.
Stein, R.H. "Interpreting the Parables of Luke," *SJT* 40 (1997), 6-16.
——, "Luke 1:1-4 and *Tradionsgeschichte*," *JETS* 26 (1983), 421-430.
——, *An Introduction to the parable of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981.
——, *Luke, The New American Commentary*, NAC vol. 24. Nashville, TN:Broadman Press, 1992.
Stendahl, K. *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays*. London; SCM Press, 1977.
Sterling, G.E. "Turning to God: Conversion in Greek-Speaking Judaism and Early Christianity," in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day (eds.). Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008, 69-95.
——, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.
Steyn, Gert J. "Driven by conviction and attitude! Ethics in the Acts of the Apostles," in *Identity, Ethics, and Ethos in the New Testament*, Jan G. van der Watt (ed.). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2006, 135-163.
Strauss, M.L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
Strelan, Rich, "A Note on ἀσφάλεια (Luke 1:4)," *JSNT* 30 (2007), 163-171.
Summers, R. *Commentry on Luke*. Waco, TZ: Word, 1972.
Swartley, W.M. *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels. Story Shaping Story*. Peabody: Hendrickson Pubishers, 1994.
Sweetland, D.M. "The Good Samaritan and Martha and Mary," *BibTod* 21 (1983), 325-330.
Székely, J. *Structure and Theology of the Lucan 'Itinerarium'*. Budapest: Szent Jeromos Katolikus Bibiátarsulat, 2008.
Talbert, C.H. "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lucan Christology," *NTS* 14 (1968), 259-271.
——, "Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing, 1984, 91-103.
——, "The Church and Inclusive Language for God?" *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 19 (1992), 421-439.
——, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. SBLMS 20, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
——, *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of the Lukan Purpose*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.
——, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982.
——, *What Is A Gospel?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
Tanghe, V. "Abraham, son fils et son envoyé (Luc 16:19-31)," *RB* 91 (1984), 557-577.
Tannehill, R.C. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story", *JBL* 104 (1985), 69-85.
——, *Luke*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
——, "Should We Love Simon the Pharisee? Hermeneutical Reflections on the Pharisees in Luke," *CurTM* 21 (1994), 424-433.
——, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1. *The Gospel according to Luke*, vol. 2. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
Taubenschlag, Raphael, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri: 332 B.C-640 A.D.* Warszawa: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1955.
Taylor, Vincent, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*. London: Macmillan, 1933.
TeSelle, Sallie M. *Speaking in Parables: A Study in Metaphor and Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress; London: SCM Press, 1975.
Telford, W.R. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing*

of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition. JSNTSup, 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
Thackeray, Henry St. John, *Josephus*, et al., LCL, 10 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961-81.
Theissen, G. *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
Thielcke, Helmut, *The Waiting Father*. London: J. Clarke; New York: Harper and Bros, 1959.
Thielman, Frank, *Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
Thiselton, A.C. 'Semantics and New Testament Interpretation,' in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, I. H. Marshall (ed.). Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1977, 75-104.
——, "The Parables as Language-Events: Some Comments on Fuch's Hermeneutics in the Light of Linguistic Philosophy," *SJT* 23 (1971), 437-468.
——, "The Supposed Power of Words in the Biblical Writings", *JST* 25 (1974), 282-299.
Thompson, J.A.K. *The Ethics of Aristoltle*. Harmondsworth, 1959.
Thompson, M.B. "The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience*, Richard Bauckham (ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998, 49-70.
Tiede, D. Lenz, *Luke*. ACNT, Minneapolis, Minn: Augsburg Pub House, 1988.
——, "Acts 1:6-8 and the Theo-Political Claims of Christian Witness," *WW* 1 (1981), 41-51.
——, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
Tobert, M.A. *Perspective on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations.* Philadelphia, Fortress, 1979.
Todd, Klutz, *The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Townsend, J.T. *Midrash Tanhuma: Translated into English with Introduction, Indices, and Brief Notes (S. Buber Recension). I. Genesis.* Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1989.
Trau, J.M. "The Lost Sheep: A Living Metaphor," *BibTod* 28 (1990), 277-83.
Trebilco, P.R. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*. SNTSMS, 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
Trench, R.C. *Notes on the Parables of Our Lord*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881.
Troost, A. "Reading for the Author's Signature: Genesis 21:1-21 and Luke 15:11-32 as Intertexts," in *A Feminist Companion to Genesis*, Athalya Brenner (ed.). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993, 251-272.
Trudinger, L.P. "Exposing the Depths of Oppression (Luke 16:1b-8a): The Parable of the Unjust Steward," in *Jesus and his Parables: Interpreting the Parables of Jesus Today*, V. G. Shillington (ed.). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 121-137.
——, "Once Again, Now, Who is my Neighbour?" *EvQ* 48 (1976), 162-163.
Tuckett, C.M. "Synoptic Tradition in the Gospel of Truth and the Testimony of Truth," *JTS* 35 (1984), 133-145.
——, *Luke*. NTG; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
Turner, M.M.B. "Prayer in the Gospels and Acts," *Teach us to Pray: Prayer in the Bible and the World*, D. A. Carson (ed.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: The Paternoster Press and Baker Book House, 1990, 58-83.
Tyson, J.B. "Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts: Reading as a Godfearer," *NTS* 41 (1995), 19-38.
——, "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts," *NTS* 30 (1984), 574-583.
——, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia, S.C: University of South Carolina Press, 1991.
——, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM Press, 1987.

Udoh, Fabian E. “The Tale of an Unrighteous Slave (Luke 16:1-8[13]),” *JBL* 128 (2009), 311-335.
Van Beeck, Frans Jozef, “Lost and Found in Luke 15: Biblical Interpretation and Self-Involvement,” *ExpTime* 114 (12, 2003), 399-404.
Van Elderen, Bastiaan, “Another Look at the Parable of the Good Samaritan,” in *Saved by Hope*, James I. Cook (ed.). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, 109-119.
Van Stempvoort, P.A. “The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts,” *NTS* 5 (1958-59), 30-42.
Van Unnik, W.C. “The Gospel of Truth and the New Testament,” in *The Jung Codex*, F. L. Cross (ed.). London: Mowbray, 1955, 79-129.
——, “Luke’s Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography,” *Les Actes des Apôtres: traditions, redaction, theólogie*, J. Kremer (ed.). Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979, 37-60.
——, “Once More St. Luke’s Prologue,” *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973), 7-26.
——, “Remarks on the Purpose of Luke’s Historical Writing (Luke 1:1-4),” in *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik*. 3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1973, 6-15.
——, “The ‘Book of Acts’ the Confirmation of the Gospel,” *NovT* 4 (1960-61), 26-59.
Verheyden, J. “The Unity of Luke-Acts,” *HTS* 55 (1999), 964-979.
——, “The Unity of Luke-Acts. What are up to?” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. BETL, 142; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999, 3-56.
Verhoef, Eduard, “[Eternal] Life and Following the Commandments: Lev 18,5 and Luke 10,28,” in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. C. M. Tuckett (ed.). Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997, 571-77.
Via, Dan O. “Parables and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach,” *Semeia* 1(1974), 105-133.
——, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*. Philadelphia: Fortress: SPCK, 1967.
Vine, Victor E. “Luke 14:15-24 and Anti-Semitism,” *ExpTim* 102 (1991), 262-263.
Vogels, Walter, “Having or Longing: A Semiotic Analysis of Luke 16:19-31,” *ÉgIThéol* 20 (1989), 27-46.
Volckaert, J. “The Parable of the Clever Steward,” *Clergy Monthly* 17 (1953), 332-341.
Völkel, M. “Exegetische Erwägungen zum Verständnis des Begriffs καθεξῆς im lukanischen Prolog,” *NTS* 20 (1973-74), 289-299.
Vos, Craig S. de, “The Meaning of ‘Good News to the Poor’ in Luke’s Gospel: The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich-Man as a Test Case,” *In Other Words*, A.C. Hagedorn, Z.A. Crook and Eric Stewart (ed.). Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007, 67-86.
Waetjen, C. “The Subversion of ‘World’ by the Parable of the Friend at Midnight,” *JBL* 120 (2001), 703-721.
Wailes, S.L. *Medieval Allegories of Jesus’ Parables*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
Walasky, P.W. *“And so we came to Rome”: The Political Perspective of St. Luke*. SNTSMS 49, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
Walker, W.O. “Jesus and the Tax Collectors,” *JBL* 97 (1978), 221-238.
Wall, R.W. “‘The Finger of God’: Deuteronomy 9:10 and Luke 11:20,” *NTS* 33 (1987), 144-150.
——, “Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38-42) in the Context of a Christian Deuteronomy,” *JSNT* 35 (1989), 19-35.
Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
Walls, A.F. “‘In the Presence of the Angels’ Luke 15:10,” *NovT* 3 (1959), 314-16.
——, “Converts or Proselytes? The Crisis over Conversion in the Early Church,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 29 (2004), 2-6.
Wansey, J. C. “Parable of the Unjust Steward,” *ExpTim* 47 (1935-36), 39-40.

Warden, Duane, “The Rich Man and Lazarus: Poverty, Wealth, and Human Worth,” *SCJ* 6 (2003), 81-93.
Weatherly, J.A. *Jewish Responsibility for the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. JSNTSup 106, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
Weder, Hans, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern. Traditions-und redaktionsgeschichtliche Analysen und Interpretationen* . Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
Wehrli, Eugene S. “Expository Articles: Luke 16:19-31,” *Int* 31 (1977), 276-282.
Weiss, K. “ὑπωπιάζω,” *TDNT*, VIII, 590-91.
Wendland, E.R. “Finding Some Lost Aspects of Meaning in Christ’s Parables of the Lost- and Found (Luke 15),” *TJ* 17 (1996), 19-65.
Wenham, D. “The Purpose of Luke-Acts: Israel’s Story in the Context of the Roman Empir,” in *Reading Luke: Inter pretation, Reflection, Formation*, C.G. Bartholomew, J.B. Green and A.C. Thiselton (ed.). Grand Rapids; Michigan: Zondervan, 2005, 79-102.
——, *The Parables of Jesus: Pictures of Revolution*. London:Hodder & Stoughton, 1989.
Whitaker, G.H. “The Philology of St. Luke’s Preface,” *Exp* 7 (1920), 262-72, 380-84.
Wilcox, M. “The God-Fearers in Acts: A Reconsideration,” *JSNT* 13 (1981), 102-122.
Wilken, R.L. “In Defence of Allegory,” *ModTh* 14 (1998), 197-212.
Williams, F.J. “The Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-9): Note on the Interpretation Suggested by Reverend R.G. Lunt,” *ExpTim* 66 (1955), 371-372.
Wilson, P.S. “The Lost Parable of the Generous Landowner and Other texts for Imaginative Preaching,” *Quarterly Review* 9 (1989), 87-99.
Wilson, S.G. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. SNTSMS 23; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
——, *Luke and the Law*. SNTMS 50, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
Wink, W. “The Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan: A Communal Exegesis Approach,” *RevExp* 76 (1979), 199-217.
Winn, A.C. “Elusive Mystery: The Purpose of Acts,” *Int* 13 (1959), 144-156.
Witherington, Ben, “Jesus, the Savior of the Least, the Last, and the Lost,” *Quarterly Review* (1995), 197-211.
——, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Exeter: Paternoster, 1998.
Witherup, Ronald D. *Conversion in the New Testament*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1994.
Wittig, Susan, “A Theory of Multiple Meanings,” *Semeia* 9 (1977), 75-103.
Wright, J.H. “Implications of Conversion in the Old Testament and the New,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 28 (2004), 14-19.
Wright, N.T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*, vol. 2 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
Wright, Stephen I. “Parables on Poverty and Riches (Luke 12:13-21; 16:1-13; 16:19-31),” in *The Challenge of Jesus’ Parables*, R. N. Longenecker (ed.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000, 217-239.
——, “The Parable of the Shrewd Manger (Luke 16:1-13),” in *The Challenge of Jesus Parables*, R. N. Longenecker (ed.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000, 224-230.
Young, B.H. *Jesus and his Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus’ Teaching*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
Ziesler, J.A. “Luke and the Pharisees,” *NTS* 25 (1979), 146-157.
Zimmermann, H. “Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter: Lk 10:25-37,” in *Die Zeit Jesu*, G.

Bornkamm and K. Rahner (eds.). Freiburg: Herder, 1970, 58-69.
Zimmermann, R. “The etho-poietic of the parable of the good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-37). The ethics of seeing in a culture of looking the other way,” *Verbum et Ecclesia* 29 (2008), 269-92.
——, “How to Understand the Parables of Jesus. A Paradigm Shift in Parable Exegesis,” *Acta Theologica* 29 (2009), 157-82;
——, *Hermeneutik der Gleichnisse Jesu. Methodische Neuansätze zum Verstehen urchristlicher Parabeltexte*; Herausgegeben von Ruben Zimmermann unter Mitarbeit von Gabi Kern. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
——, *Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu*. Herausgegeben von Ruben Zimmermann; in Zusammenarbeit mit Detlev Dormeyer, Gabi Kern, Annette Merz, Christian Münch, Enno Edzard Popkes. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2007.

Abstract

For the most part, Lukan parables have been examined primarily as individual parables without any attempt to connect them to the purpose of Luke's Gospel. I propose, therefore, in this dissertation, to go further than that by examining the role of the Lukan parables within the purpose of Luke's Gospel, in the hope that the unique features of the Lukan parables will give us clues as to Luke's overall purpose. After a brief survey of the historical research into the Lukan parables, and a methodological consideration for a study of the parables, the focus of this study will be a detailed analysis of the Lukan parables.

Furthermore, in order to find a unifying motif for the Lukan parables, I will examine the theological themes of these parables, and the function and role of the Lukan parables in the travel narrative of the Gospel of Luke. I will propose, as a result, that a unifying motif for the Lukan parables is 'Perspectives on the Christian life'. This comprises the relationship with one's neighbours: Love and forgiveness; one's relationship to material possessions; their right use; and relationship with God: Faith and repentance. Since the Christian life is one of the two pivotal themes of the travel narrative, and the theological themes of the Lukan parables converge on the Christian life, I will propose that the Lukan parables function clearly as instruction about the Christian life: That the Lukan parables were evidently intended by Luke to teach what it means to follow Jesus, and how Christians should live in the world. Hence the unifying motif of the Lukan Parables: 'Perspectives on the Christian life.'

I will therefore research the role of the Lukan parables within the purpose of Luke's Gospel. After surveying the many proposals about the purpose of Luke-Acts, I will suggest that Luke wrote to reassure his readers of the gospel that had already been preached and taught to them, especially under the detailed discussion of God's plan. I will propose that Luke's intention is to write a story of the continuation and fulfillment of God's plan, which brings salvation to all people, that is, the redemptive purpose of God. In short, Luke seeks to reassure his readers of the gospel by presenting God's plan of salvation.

Finally, I will make two proposals for the role of the Lukan parables in the purpose of Luke's Gospel: The role of the Lukan parables as one facet in making concrete God's redemptive purpose, and the role of the Lukan parables in serving to accomplish God's redemptive purpose. Here, I will examine the role of the Lukan parables particularly within God's redemptive purpose, since Luke seeks to reassure his readers of the gospel with the pattern of God's plan of salvation.

Firstly, I will propose that when Christians live up to Jesus' teaching of the Christian life, presented in the microcosm of the Lukan parables, not only is it in congruence with God's redemptive purpose, but it also establishes God's redemptive purpose in their life. Luke fervently desires that his readers embody and realize the redemptive purpose of God among them, through the life of faith clearly presented in the Lukan parables, beyond just simply responding to the gospel by accepting Jesus as Savior. Secondly, I will propose that the Christian life presented in the Lukan parables further serve to accomplish God's saving purpose, particularly in its acceptance of the physically, economically and ethnically weak, the proper use of possessions for God and for the poor, as well as prayer that reflects a desire to know the purpose and plan of God, committing themselves to the service of God's redemptive purpose.

In conclusion, the Lukan parables, as perspectives of the Christian life, play a vital role not only in embodying God's redemptive purpose within the faith-life of the Christian, but also in serving to accomplish God's saving purpose.

Abstrak

Die Lukas-gelykenisse is altyd merendeels as individuele gelykenisse ontleed, sonder enige poging om dit aan die doel van die Evangelie volgens Lukas te verbind. Ek beoog dus in hierdie proefskrif om verder as dit te gaan deur die rol van die Lukas-gelykenisse binne die doel van die Evangelie volgens Lukas te ondersoek, in die hoop dat die unieke kenmerke van die Lukas-gelykenisse ons leidrade sal gee oor Lukas se algehele doel. Ná ‘n kort oorsig oor die historiese navorsing in die Lukas-gelykenisse, en ‘n metodologiese oorweging vir ‘n studie van die gelykenisse, sal die studie ‘n gedetailleerde analise van die Lukas-gelykenisse behels.

Voorts, ten einde ‘n saambindende tema vir die Lukas-gelykenisse te vind, sal ek die teologiese temas van hierdie gelykenisse, en die funksie en rol van die Lukas-gelykenisse in die reisverhaal van die Evangelie volgens Lukas, ondersoek. Ek sal vervolgens voorstel dat ‘n saambindende tema vir die Lukas-gelykenisse die volgende behels: “Perspektiewe op die Christelike lewe”. Dit bestaan uit die verhouding met ‘n mens se naaste: liefde en vergifnis; die mens se verhouding tot aardse besittings: hulle regte gebruik; en verhouding tot God: geloof en sondebelydenis. Aangesien die Christelike lewe een van die twee belangrike temas van die reisverhaal is, en die teologiese temas van die Lukas-gelykenisse in die Christelike lewe saamkom, sal ek voorstel dat die Lukas-gelykenisse duidelik as onderrig oor die Christelike lewe funksioneer: Die Lukas-gelykenisse was klaarblyklik deur Lukas bedoel om onderrig te wees oor wat dit beteken om Jesus te volg, en hoe Christene in die wêreld behoort te leef. Derhalwe die saambindende tema van die Lukas-gelykenisse: “Perspektiewe op die Christelike lewe”.

Ek sal dus die rol van die Lukas-gelykenisse binne die doel van die Evangelie volgens Lukas navors. Nadat die talle voorstelle oor die doel van Lukas-Handelinge nagegaan is, sal ek voorstel dat Lukas geskryf het om sy lesers gerus te stel oor die evangelie wat reeds aan hulle verkondig en onderrig is, veral onder die gedetailleerde bespreking van God se plan. Ek sal voorstel dat dit Lukas se bedoeling was om ‘n verhaal te skryf oor die voortsetting en vervulling van God se plan, wat redding aan alle mense bring – dit is, die verlossingsdoel van God. Kortliks, Lukas poog om sy lesers gerus te stel deur God se verlossingsplan aan te bied.

Laastens sal ek twee voorstelle maak oor die rol van die Lukas-gelykenisse in die doel van die Evangelie volgens Lukas: Die rol van die Lukas-gelykenisse as een faset om God se verlossingsdoel konkreet te maak, en die rol van die Lukas-gelykenisse in die volbringing van

God se verlossingsdoel. Hier sal ek die rol van die Lukas-gelykenisse spesifiek binne God se verlossingsdoel ondersoek, aangesien Lukas poog om sy lesers gerus te stel oor die evangelie met die aard van God se reddingsplan.

Ek sal voorstel dat wanneer Christene leef volgens Jesus se leer van die Christelike lewe, soos aangebied in die mikrokosmos van die Lukas-gelykenisse, dit nie net in ooreenstemming met God se verlossingsdoel is nie, maar ook God se verlossingsdoel in hul lewe daarstel. Lukas streef hartstogtelik daarna dat sy lesers die verlossingsdoel van God, soos deur die lewe van geloof duidelik in die Lukas-gelykenisse aangebied, onder hulle sal beliggaam en realiseer, meer as om net bloot as ‘n reaksie op die evangelie, vir Jesus as Redder te aanvaar. Ek sal ook voorstel dat die Christelike lewe, soos aangebied in die Lukas-gelykenisse, voorts dien om God se reddingsdoel te volbring, spesifiek in die aanvaarding van die fisiese, ekonomiese en etniese swakkes, die behoorlike gebruik van besittings vir God en die armes, sowel as deur gebed wat graag die doel en plan van God wil leer ken, terwyl hulle hulself tot diens aan God se verlossingsdoel verbind.

Ten slotte speel die Lukas-gelykenisse as perspektiewe op die Christelike lewe ‘n belangrike rol, nie net om God se reddingsdoel binne die geloofslewe van die Christen te beliggaam nie, maar ook om God se reddingsdoel tot uitvoer te bring.