

Luke Theology Kober Dissertation.
The Theology of the Gospel of Luke
Manfred E. Kober, Th.D.

A THEOLOGY OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

A Dissertation Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Systematic Theology
Dallas Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Theology

by
Manfred E. Kober
May 1970

A THEOLOGY OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

Manfred E. Kober, Th.D.

Modern studies of Luke have either concentrated on source criticism or the *Formgeschichte* of the Third Gospel. The scope of this dissertation has been rather different. Its aim is to give a coherent view of Luke's doctrinal teaching in his Gospel as a whole, arranged theologically, in the order of his own emphases in which he gives prominence to them, with a special emphasis on matters peculiar to himself.

A discussion of the background of the Gospel has shown that contrary to the views of most Lucan scholars, Luke the physician and companion of Paul is the author of the Gospel. This study of the author and his background was thought important because without understanding the man, it is impossible to fully comprehend his method and message.

The contemporary approaches to Lucan Theology were traced with reference to several outstanding representatives. Their systems, measured by the testimony of the Lucan sources and their own inner consistency, were found to be woefully inadequate to do justice to Luke's purpose of writing, and to present a well-balanced Lucan Theology.

The author's own stated purpose for writing was compared with his special emphases to arrive at his overall historical-theological purpose for penning the longest letter of the New

Testament. It was seen that Luke wished to present such a complete and historical account of the Son of Man as a universal Savior, that Theophilus and the other Gentile readers could know with certainty and would believe in truth the universal gospel of salvation.

At the heart of Biblical Theology is always an investigation of the author's particular approach and interest, the special themes which appear and reappear, and the conscious or unconscious preoccupations which make him stress one incident and pass over another. This study of the Third Gospel, therefore, by comparing Luke with the other Synoptics, has brought into focus an abundance of special emphases and concepts peculiar to Luke.

As a Gentile he shows intense interest in the universal aspects of the Gospel.

As a physician he betrays his vocation by his meticulous attention to medical details and his distinctive medical vocabulary.

And as the Evangelist who presents Jesus as the seeking and saving Son of Man, Luke underscores the Savior's interest in various despised groups and individuals.

It has been shown that Luke's central theological theme is the person and work of the Son of Man, and that all other doctrinal concepts are directly related to Him who is the perfect man. Luke's remarkably frequent references to the Holy Spirit showed the Savior's dependence in his incarnation. Repeated Lucan references to angels serve to authenticate the divine mission of the Son of Man, while it has been demonstrated that the references to the demonic world serve to underscore the authority of the Son of Man.

A detailed study of the Lucan perspective on ethical concepts, such as the necessity of prayer, the reprehensibility of pride, and the stewardship of possessions suggested that Christ was not merely the perfect teacher but the perfect example of men as well.

The study of the Lucan eschatological discourses revealed that Luke sees the Son of Man as the future Davidic King and Messianic Judge. Luke expects the soon return of the Savior. While the believers are exhorted to look for the return of their King, the unbelievers are warned of the revelation of their Judge. In Luke's Gospel the warnings are invitations to come to Him who came to save the lost. This burden of the Savior becomes part of the eschatology of Luke.

Accepted by the Faculty of the Dallas Theological Seminary and Graduate School of Theology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Theology.

Examining Committee
Charles C. Ryrie
F. Duane Lindsey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

- I. INTRODUCTION
 - The Intention or the Study
 - The design of the study
 - The definition of Biblical Theology
 - The demand of the study
 - The Importance of the Study
 - The importance or Lucan Theology
 - The importance of the Gospel of Luke

- II. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS OF LUKE'S GOSPEL
 - The Attestation and Authorship
 - Conclusions concerning the author
 - The country of the author
 - The career of the author
 - The contacts of the author
 - The Date and Destination
 - The date
 - The destination
 - The Prologue and Purpose
 - The prologue
 - The purpose
 - The Design and Development
 - The design
 - The development
 - Comparisons and Contrasts
 - Luke and other New Testament writers
 - Luke and special material

- III. CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO LUCAN THEOLOGY
 - The Period before 1950
 - Representatives of the period
 - Resume of the period
 - The Period after 1950
 - Reasons for the new emphasis
 - Representatives of the period
 - Rejection of the new emphasis

- Interest in Universalism
 - The destination
 - The genealogy
 - The offer of salvation
 - Old Testament quotes
 - Omissions
 - Explanations and changes
 - The parables
- Interest in Medical Matters
 - Expressions
 - The miracles
 - The parables
 - Technical terms
- Special Interest in People
 - Women
 - Children
 - Outcasts
- Interest in Prayer
- Interest in Praise and Rejoicing
- Sympathetic Interest
- Interest in Forgiveness
- Interest in History
- Interest in Social Life
- Interest in Poverty and Wealth

- The Incarnation of the Son of Man
 - The forerunner of the Son of Man
 - The birth of the Son of Man
 - The boyhood of the Son of Man
- The Preparation of the Son of Man
 - The ministry of the forerunner of the Son of Man
 - The baptism of the Son of Man
 - The genealogy of the Son of Man
 - The temptation of the Son of Man
- The Appellations of the Son of Man
 - Jesus
 - Son of Man
 - The Son of God
 - Lord
 - Messiah

Other Messianic Titles

VI. THE LUCAN PICTURE OF THE WORK OF THE SON OF MAN

- The Activities in His Ministry
 - The divine imperative of His activities
 - The Messianic import of His activities
- His Association with the Multitude
 - Designations for the multitude
 - Description of the multitude
 - Dealings of Christ with the multitude
- The Authority of His Person
 - The authority resident in His words
 - The authority revealed by His works
- The Accomplishments in Salvation
 - The promise of salvation
 - The prediction of suffering
 - The prescription for salvation
 - The provision of salvation
- The Assumption or Former Glory
 - The resurrection
 - The ascension

VII. THE LUCAN PRIMACY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT 182

- The Personal Reality of the Holy Spirit in Luke's Gospel
 - The Holy Spirit as a person
 - The Holy Spirit as deity
 - The Holy Spirit in types
- The Vital Relationships of the Holy Spirit to the Ministry of the Son of Man
 - The relationship to the preparation of the Son of Man
 - The relationship to the preaching of the Son of Man
 - The relationship to His performing of miracles
 - The relationship to the prayers of the Son of Man
- The Promised Reception of the Holy Spirit as a Gift
 - The realization of the promise
 - The results of the reception of the Spirit

VIII. THE LUCAN PREEMINENCE OF SPIRIT BEINGS 212

- The Emphasis on Angels
 - The ministry of angels
 - The manifestation of angels
- The Encounter with Demons

- The identity of demons
- The activity of demons
- The judgment of demons
- The Enigma of Satan
 - Satan the Tempter and Christ's triumph
 - Satan the Prince and Christ's power
 - Satan the Deceiver and Christ's deliverance

IX. THE LUCAN PERSPECTIVE ON ETHICS

- The Lucan Perspective on Prayer
 - Its importance as seen in the Savior's examples of prayer
 - Its characteristics as seen in the Savior's exhortations concerning prayer
 - Its efficacy as seen in Luke's emphasis on prayer
- The Lucan Perspective on Pride
 - The reprehensibility of pride
 - The result of pride
 - The remedy for pride
- The Lucan Perspective on Possessions
 - The emphasis of the Gospel
 - The evil of greed
 - The ethic of giving

X. THE LUCAN PANORAMA OF THE FUTURE 280

- The Promised Kingdom
 - The proclamation of the kingdom
 - The postponement of the kingdom
 - The presence of the Davidic Kingdom in the future
- The Predicted Judgment
 - The declarations concerning judgment
 - The dispensing of judgment
 - Deliverance from judgment
 - The description of the judgment

XI. CONCLUSION

- A Review of the Importance of Lucan Theology
- The Relating of the Study to Contemporary Lucan Theology
- A Resume of Lucan Themes

BIBLIOGRAPHY 312

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Intention of the Study

The design of the study

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate systematically the Gospel of Luke from the viewpoint of Biblical Theology. Its aim is to answer certain questions concerning the Gospel.

What was Luke's purpose in writing?

What did Luke understand about Christianity and Christ?

What is Luke's special emphasis?

How does he differ from the other Gospels?

What is the distinctive contribution that the Gospel of Luke makes to the New Testament and to God's revelation as a whole?

The definition of Biblical Theology

Biblical Theology has been defined as "that branch of theological science which deals systematically with the historically conditioned progress of the self-revelation of God as deposited in the Bible."¹ Biblical Theology is thus seen to be related to Systematic Theology in that both branches of theological science are based on the Bible and are systematic in methodology. Biblical Theology differs, however, from Systematic Theology in other respects. While Systematic Theology looks at the Bible as a complete revelation and while its perspective is that of today, Biblical Theology is limited to the distinctive perspective of a specific period or author, seeing that part of God's revelation in its historical circumstance. It forms the basis of Systematic Theology and can do without it, whereas Systematic Theology is dependent on the results of Biblical Theology. If Systematic Theology deals with the complete light of God's revelation, Biblical Theology examines and analyzes the individual light rays in the spectrum of God's Word.

The demand of the study

Biblical Theology, then, of which Lucan Theology is a part, demands that this study is limited to the historical circumstances, distinctive emphases, and particular contributions of Luke. And a theology of the Gospel of Luke is confined to just that Gospel. Luke's second volume, the book of Acts, and the other Gospels are referred to merely for the purpose of comparison and contrast.

¹ Charles C. Ryrie, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1959), p. 12.

The subject matter of this dissertation is limited to an inductive study of the Gospel, and, according to the proper procedure of Biblical Theology, the chapters of this study will be arranged in the order of emphasis that Luke placed on the various doctrines.

Although Biblical Theology presupposes the results of Biblical Introduction in such matters as date and authorship, it is necessary to refer to these questions briefly in this study, insofar as they have a bearing on the content of the Gospel. And with the recent emphasis on Lucan Theology, it will not be out of order to add a chapter on the contemporary approaches to Lucan Theology. It will be seen whether the recent discovery of Luke as a theologian is to be received warmly or rejected forthrightly.

In summary, it is the intention of this Theology of the Gospel of Luke to answer the question: What contribution did Luke make to Christianity by means of the Gospel? Or, to put it very pointedly another way: As Theophilus received this Gospel, how much could he understand about Christianity's founder and the Christian faith? This is the problem to be investigated. This is the question to be answered.

The Importance of the Study

The importance of Lucan Theology

The intent. – Luke's intent was to write the story of Christ and a record of the extension of Christianity. His basic theme is therefore the very core of Christianity, namely, the person and work of Christ. As his Gospel treats the content of the Gospel, the book of Acts sets forth the communication of the Gospel. It has been rightly observed that Luke

is the only New Testament writer who makes any conscious attempt to show how, "Then the earthly life of Jesus was over, the Church came into being, and to relate the one to the other. This fact not only makes Luke a fascinating figure to modern students; it supplied him with his motive for writing, and provides the clue to His work."²

The extent. – The importance of Lucan Theology is further seen in the extent of the Lucan writings. The principal contributor to the New Testament is, as few people probably realize, not the Apostle Paul but Luke. His two volumes together comprise more than one quarter of the New Testament. Even if Paul wrote Hebrews, his writings are exceeded by those of Luke. By line count, according to the Textus Receptus, the longest books of the New Testament are Luke, Acts, and Matthew, and in that order. Therefore, even if judged by bulk alone, the Lucan writings are of the greatest importance.

The content. – The unique content of Luke and Acts further adds to the importance of

² C. K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (London: The Epworth Press, 1961), p. 55.

Lucan Theology. Much of the material found in the Gospel and Acts is not found in any other book of the New Testament. No other Gospel writer has surpassed Luke in content. As a historian, Luke is not interested to give the biography of a hero, but to present the Savior of the world. And Luke reaches farther back than the other Gospels and gives the background and birth of the forerunner of the Savior. It is well to note that through Luke, the historian,

the limits of the original proclamation of the Gospel are stretched in the other direction as well, inasmuch as there is added to the first volume a second one which continues the history of the Savior of the world into the immediate time of the writer.³

While the distinctive importance of the Gospel of Luke will be discussed below, it may be in order to quote in length a discussion of the uniqueness of Acts:

The Book of Acts is even more indispensable. No narratives parallel to it have survived. It is our sole record of the apostolic age. The other New Testament books only indirectly throw light on events in that most significant era. The Book of Acts, written independently of them, forms the background to their understanding, and it alone tells the story behind them. Even the extensive and self-revealing correspondence of Paul would leave his life and setting afloat for us in a sea of ignorance were it not for the succinct outline of his career sketched for us in Acts. The Book of Acts is the keystone linking the two major portions of the New Testament, the "Gospel" and the "Apostle," as the early Christians called them. To change the figure, the Book of Acts is the only bridge we have across the seemingly impassable gulf that separates Jesus from Paul, Christ from Christianity, the gospel of Jesus from the gospel about Jesus. Though the writings of Luke do not answer all the demands that our curiosity makes of them, it is only fair to recognize how much of interest they do supply us.⁴

The neglect. – A fourth reason why Lucan theology is important is related to the neglect which the writings of Luke have suffered. A glance at books of Biblical Theology soon makes it apparent that the theology of Luke's two-volume work nowhere receives separate treatment. Several New Testament Theologies contain sections on Acts, and those are primarily studies of the theology of the speeches in Acts. The theology of the Gospel of Luke, however, is only treated as a part of Synoptic Theology, never as a subject by itself. This makes a study of Lucan Theology, especially that of the Gospel of Luke, of greatest importance.

The rediscovery. – Since 1950 new attention has been focused on the Lucan writings, so

³ Martin Albertz, *Die Botschaft des Neuen Testamentes* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1955), p. 144. This and all future quotes from German works are translated by the writer.

⁴ Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 2.

that today they have become "a real storm center of New Testament studies" ⁵ on the Continent. It is only reasonable to assume that this trend, like all theological innovations originating in Europe, will become popular in American theology during the next decade. Biblical theologians in America have already followed suit and, as seen from recent theological literature, they are concentrating on Luke. ⁶ Thus, the increasing importance of Lucan Theology becomes apparent.

The importance of the Gospel of Luke

Even if taken by itself, the Gospel of Luke is of sufficient importance to deserve a separate study. The Gospel of Luke is the crown of the Synoptic Gospels. Several factors make it such.

Comprehensiveness. – The length of the Gospel of Luke is due to the great range of subject matter. Plummer writes concerning the scope of Luke:

His Gospel is the nearest approach to a biography; and his object seems to have been to give his readers as full a picture as he could of the life of Jesus Christ, in all the portions of it – infancy, boyhood, manhood – respecting which he had information. ⁷

Luke begins earlier than any other Evangelist, starting with the promise of the birth of John, Christ's forerunner. Luke follows the course of Christ beyond His death and resurrection to the ascension, and thus ties in his Gospel with his second volume, where he resumes the account of the ascension.

Uniqueness. – Luke contains much material which is unique to the other Gospels. If the material in all three Gospels is put together and divided into 172 sections,

Luke has 127 sections or three-fourths,
Matthew has 114 or two-thirds, and
Mark has 84 or one-half.

Of these sections 48 are peculiar to Luke,
 27 to Matthew, and

⁵ Leander Keck and J. Louis Martyn, eds., *Studies in Luke-Acts* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 21.

⁶ For example, the above book and the following three journals are entirely devoted to the Lucan writings: *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (Fall, 1967); *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, X (Fall, 1967); *Scripture*, XX (1968).

⁷ Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), p. xli.

Accordingly, between one-third and one-quarter of the material in the Synoptic Gospels is unique to Luke. Among the portions of the Gospel material which Luke alone preserves, there are five miracle stories and thirteen parables, considered to be literary gems and among the most beautiful incidents of the Gospels.

Universality. – Another reason which adds to the importance of the Gospel of Luke is its universalism; that is, Luke's message is not confined to the nation of Israel but includes the whole world. The most outstanding characteristic of Luke's Gospel is that of its universal Gospel which offers a universal salvation. It is significant that only Luke, as the lone Gentile among all the authors of the Bible, records the claim of the Savior: "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10). Luke presents God with arms out-stretched to the whole world. He presents Christ as the Son of Man who can identify with every age group – childhood, youth, and adulthood – and with every racial and national group, as one of them. This is why the Gospel of the humanity of the Savior has found such wide appeal.

Beauty. – It is not without good reason that Luke's Gospel has been described as lithe most beautiful book there is."⁹ Luke is not only the first Christian historian but he is also the first literary artist whose elegant style and rich vocabulary make him the most versatile of all New Testament writers. Tasker contrasts Luke's outstanding literary ability with the other Gospels:

The writer is clearly a man of far greater literary culture than either Mark or Matthew. Mark is almost entirely lacking in conscious literary artistry, though his work has an intensity quite peculiarly his own; and Matthew produces his effects by presenting his material in the light of certain clear theological principles. Luke, however, is a literary artist and a historian; and this makes his Gospel the most readable for the modern man.¹⁰

It is obvious that just on the basis of literary merit alone, Luke is an outstanding book. The various reasons for the importance of Luke will be discussed in greater detail below, but it should be evident that the historian, theologian, and writer Luke cannot be ignored by New Testament Theology.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. xxxv.

⁹ "C'est le plus beau livre qu'il y ait." Ernest Renan, *Les Evangiles*, Vol. I: *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme* (Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1877), p. 283.

¹⁰ R. V. G. Tasker, *The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1962), pp. 50-51.

CHAPTER II

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

The Attestation and Authorship

Conclusions concerning the author

Internal evidence. – To establish the authorship of the anonymous Third Gospel and Acts, one must start with the book of Acts. But even the Gospel of Luke shows much about the author. He is no apostle or eyewitness, but rather belongs to the second generation of Christians (1:1-4). He is probably not a Jewish Christian since he shows no special interest in the law or in appeals to the Old Testament Scriptures, as do the other Synoptic writers. He must therefore be a Gentile Christian and of Greek origin. This is evident from the polished Greek which can be seen in those passages where he himself speaks. And, finally, he is an educated man, which is demonstrated on the basis of the prologue. Its form and content are patterned after the literary custom of his time. His education is further seen by his attempt to relate the story of Jesus to the dates of world history, as was the custom of ancient historians.¹

It is all but universally recognized that the author of the Gospel of Luke is also the writer of the book of Acts. The following considerations will bear out the fact that both volumes were written by the same author. First, both books are **dedicated to the same person**, a certain Theophilus (Luke 1:3; Acts 1:1). Secondly, the author of Acts (1:1) **refers to a former treatise** written by him, an obvious reference to the Gospel. And thirdly, there is such a **similarity of language and style** that, as Bebb points out, "The argument from style is quite conclusive," and he adds that

there are many points of connexion between the Gospel and Acts other than those of style, as, for instance, the reference to the Holy Spirit as "the promise of the Father" (Ac 1:4; cf. Lk. 24:49), the idea of apostolic "witness" (Lk. 24:48, Ac passim), the common explanation of Simon as ο ἡλιωτής in Lk 6:15 and Ac 1:13, but not in the other lists.²

¹ Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, (1962), p. 11.

² L. J. M. Bebb, "The Gospel of Luke," *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), III, 162.

Other scholars, like Harnack,³ Zahn,⁴ and Ramsey⁵ have marshalled impressive arguments that both books come from the pen of the same author.

To establish the identity of this author, the book of Acts needs to be consulted, specifically the "we" sections. In three sections (16:10-17; 20:5-21:18; 27:1-28:16) the author uses the first person plural, which appears to be a way for the modest writer to indicate when he was with Paul. At Troas, Paul saw the Macedonian calling him and the author writes that "straightway we sought to go forth into Macedonia" (16: 10), which must mean that he accompanied Paul on his first missionary journey. The author is with Paul in Philippi, then the narrative continues in the third person singular until Philippi is revisited (20: 5-6). The "we" continues until Jerusalem is reached, and reappears later for the voyage to Rome (27:1-28:16). Who is this travel companion of Paul? The answer can be determined by the process of elimination:

Now Timothy, Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Tychicus, and Trophimus are all excluded by Acts 20:4. Silas cannot be easily fitted into the "we" sections; Titus can be, but there, is neither internal nor external evidence for him, while there is both for Luke.⁶

A comparison of the "we" sections with the rest of the book shows that the book is a unit and was written by one and the same author. Harnack⁷ has clearly shown that the same literary characteristics and peculiarities occur in the rest of Acts as occur in the so-called "we" sections.

One other internal proof points to Luke as the author of the Third Gospel and Acts. In 1882 William K. Hobart wrote an outstanding work⁸ which brought to light the fact that Luke and Acts are saturated with the medical language of the first century. The medical terminology and the unusual interest in sickness and the sick seemed to prove conclusively that the author was

³ Adolf Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (London: Williams and Norgate, 1907), pp. 121-45.

⁴ Theodor Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. Trout, et al. (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1953), III, 142-65.

⁵ William H. Ramsey, *Luke the Physician* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956), pp. 3-68.

⁶ Henry C. Thiessen, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), p. 152.

⁷ Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, pp. 175-98.

⁸ William K. Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954), p. xxxv.

a physician. Even Harnack, the leader of liberal criticism, concurred with Zahn in accepting Hobart's overwhelming evidence:

I subscribe to the words of Zahn (*Einleit.* ii. s. 472): "Hobart has proved for every one who can at all appreciate proof that the author of the Lukan work was a man practised in the scientific language of Greek medicine – in short, a *Greek physician*." ⁹

However, a negative critic of Lukan authorship, Henry J. Cadbury ¹⁰ thinks that he has shown that the medical terminology of Luke and Acts is of a non-technical nature and is found in non-medical writers of the first century. Cadbury is correct in asserting that the medical language does not prove that the author was a physician. However, the medical language does corroborate in a striking manner the biblical assertion (cor. 4:14) and traditional view that the author of Luke and Acts was a physician. This line of internal evidence has been appropriately summed up by Geldenhuys:

Taking all the data into consideration, one cannot but come to the conclusion that, although the language and style do not *per se* prove that the author of the books was a physician, the statement of Paul in Colossians iv.14, and the unanimous assertions of the ancient church fathers that Luke was a physician, are clearly corroborated by the nature of the contents of the books. ¹¹

External evidence. – Never in the tradition of the church has the Lukan authorship of the Third Gospel ever been questioned. Indeed, the authorship of no book of the New Testament is as strongly supported by tradition as that of the Third Gospel.

Although the present title "According to Luke" is not original, it was probably placed upon the Gospel in the first century. Ellis affirms that

the title, "According to Luke," appears in the best manuscripts. It originated when a church had two Gospels and desired to distinguish them or, at the latest, when the Gospels were a collected unit. ¹²

⁹ Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 14.

¹⁰ Henry J. Cadbury, "The Style and Literary Method of Luke," *Harvard Theological Studies*, ed. by George F. Moor, James H. Ropes, and Kirsopp Lake (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919), VI, 39.

¹¹ Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1956), pp , 20-21.

¹² E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1966), p. 63.

A unanimous tradition of the early church relative to the Lucan authorship of the Third Gospel and Acts dates back to the third century. The writings of Irenaeus of about A.D. 180 contain the first clear and certain external reference to Luke as the author of the Gospel. The Canon of Muratory (about A.D. 170-200) also names Luke as the author of the Third Gospel. The testimony of these sources of the second century is of special importance because it identifies the author with a relatively insignificant person who had not been an eyewitness to the events that he recorded.

Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, as well as the church fathers of the later centuries identify Luke, the physician, as the author of the Gospel bearing his name.¹³

Plummer succinctly summarizes the impressive array of external evidence:

It is manifest that in all parts of the Christian world the Third Gospel had been recognized as authoritative before the middle of the second century, and that it was universally believed to be the work of S. Luke. No one speaks doubtfully on the point. The possibility of questioning its value is mentioned, but not the questioning of its authorship. In the literature of that period it would not be easy to find a stronger case.¹⁴

The country of the author

His national origin. – There is little that can be said with absolute certainty about the background of Luke. His name is mentioned only three times in the New Testament, and then only in Paul's Epistles (Col. 4:14; II Tim. 4:11; Philemon 24). Certain facts point to the conclusion that he was a Gentile. In Colossians 4:14 he is distinguished from "those of the circumcision" by Paul, excluding the possibility that he was born a Jew. It is uncertain whether he was a Jewish proselyte. His name Λουκᾶς is of Greek origin and an abbreviation of Λουκανός, the Graecized form of the Latin *Lucanus*.¹⁵ The Gentile descent of the author can further be seen from indications throughout his writings. The Old Testament quotations are from the Septuagint (Greek) translation rather than the Hebrew. In the Third Gospel the Lord is addressed with the Greek titles *Didaskalos* ("Teacher") and *Epistates* ("Master"), not the Hebrew "Rabbi." Likewise, Hebrew names are generally avoided or paraphrased and where they do appear, they are explained (e.g. Acts 4:36).

¹³ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 18.

¹⁴ Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), p. xvi.

¹⁵ John M'Clintock and James Strong, eds., "Luke," *Biblical Theological and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1894), V, 550. The Luke (Lucius) of Acts 13:1 and Romans 16:21 must not be confused with Luke the Physician.

His native city. – That Luke was a Greek and a possible native of Antioch in Syria can be seen from a number of facts. The Codex Bezae in Acts 11:28 mentions the joy that "we" (the believers of Antioch) experienced from a visit by Jerusalem Christians. Even if this reading is not original, it nevertheless points to an early tradition which points to Antioch as Luke's native city.¹⁶

This view is further strengthened by the many particulars which Luke records regarding the early history of the Antiochian church (cf. Acts 11:19-22; 13:1; 14:19, 21, 26; 15:22-25; 18:22). It is possible that Luke, as an inhabitant of this town, experienced his conversion here.

Another clue to Luke's native city is given by tradition. Although some question the reliability of the Anti-Marcionite Prologue to the Gospel, composed at a time (ca. 175) when the church denounced this heretic who mutilated Luke's Gospel and added it to his own canon, its wealth of independent information is substantiated by the Church Fathers and is probably accurate. The prologue reads as follows:

Luke is a man from Antioch, Syria, a physician by profession. He was a disciple of the apostles, and later he accompanied Paul until his martyrdom. Having neither wife nor child, he served the Lord without distraction. He fell asleep in Boeotia at the age of eighty four, full of the Holy Spirit.

Moved by the Holy Spirit, Luke composed all of this Gospel in the districts around Achaia although there were already Gospels in existence – one according to Matthew, written in Judea, and one according to Mark written in Italy. He reveals this fact in the prologue: that the other Gospels were written before his and that it was imperative that an accurate account of the divine plan be set forth for the Gentile believers. This was necessary in order that they might neither be distracted by Jewish myths nor, deceived by heretical and vain phantasies, depart from the truth.

Therefore, right at the beginning Luke took up the birth of John because this was a most necessary matter. John is the beginning of the Gospel. He was the forerunner of the Lord and his partner in the preparation of the gospel, in the administration of the baptism, and in the fellowship of the Spirit. The prophet with this ministry is mentioned in the Twelve (Minor Prophets).

Afterwards the same Luke also wrote "the Acts of the Apostles." Still later the Apostle John, one of the Twelve, wrote the Revelation on the isle of Patmos, and after these things the Gospel.¹⁷

Among the many Church Fathers who supported this testimony were Eusebius and Jerome. Eusebius wrote that "Luke was by race an Antiochian," and Jerome (about A.D. 400)

¹⁶ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 21.

¹⁷ Ellis, *Gospel*, p. 41.

referred to Luke as "a medical man from Antioch."¹⁸

Some reputable modern scholars, on the other hand, have proposed other cities as the birthplace of Luke. Ramsey¹⁹ offers the less than cogent explanation that Luke was the Macedonian of Philippi whom Paul saw in a dream. Ramsey explains that Luke shows a lively interest in Philippi and his narrative changes for the first time to the first person plural.

Antioch of Pisidia is urged to Rackham²⁰ as the place of Luke's birth. According to Galatians 4:13 it was here that Paul preached "because of an infirmity of the flesh" when Luke's medical assistance was obtained.

Even though it may not be possible to definitely identify the birthplace of Luke, the preponderance of evidence seems to point to Antioch in Syria.

The career of the author

Luke the physician. – There is no doubt that Luke was a man of great education and genuine culture. The Bible affirms that he was a physician (Col. 4:14) and his use of medical language confirms it. For his medical studies he could have gone to Alexandria, Athens, or Tarsus. As a native of Asia Minor, he probably attended the university at Tarsus and received a good classical education. The great masters of his profession, Aretaeus, Dioscorides, and Athnaeus were trained here. Luke would have obtained his practical training at the nearby Temple of Aesculapius, at Aegae, which furnished the nearest approach to a modern hospital that antiquity could boast. Here he would have gained the necessary experience for his profession.²¹

It is only possible to speculate concerning the circumstances of Luke's conversion. The prologue of his Gospel makes it clear that he did not know Jesus in the flesh. If the Western reading of Acts 11:28 (the "we" section at Antioch) is correct, this would require that Luke was saved before he met Paul. Tertullian, however, speaks of Paul as Luke's *magister* and *illuminator*, and Plummer thinks that "these words indicate that Tertullian perhaps means us to understand that Luke was converted to the Gospel by Paul, and this is in itself probably

¹⁸ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 21.

¹⁹ William H. Ramsey, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1951), pp. 202-203.

²⁰ Richard B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1901), pp. xxx-xxxii.

²¹ A. T. Robertson, *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1936), p. 24.

enough."²² If the Bezan text for Acts 11:28 is correct, then Barnabas, Paul, and Luke are together at Antioch as early as A.D. 42. Robertson explains that the close tie between them may point to the fact that they were college mates at Tarsus.²³

Luke practiced his medical profession throughout his life. His close association with Paul makes it almost certain that "Luke the beloved physician" served Paul in that capacity. The Apostle Paul had been suffering from an affliction in which he despaired even of life (II Cor. 1:9), and undoubtedly needed continuous medical attention, especially in the later years. The belief that Luke may have treated others as well is based by some on Acts 28:8, where Paul "cured" the father of Publius miraculously, and in the next verse it is said that others "who had infirmities . . . came and were healed." The word ἰάομαι seems to refer to the gift of healing which Paul had from God, while θεραπεύω is used for the medical treatment of those who came to be healed. The use of this latter word, together with the "us" in verse ten, strongly suggests that Luke added his medical skill to Paul's gift of healing.²⁴

Luke the freedman. – Some have conjectured that Luke was a freedman. This view is based on the custom of both Greeks and Romans to educate one of their domestic slaves and then to grant him his freedom in return for services rendered. Also, such contracted names as Luke (from Lucanus) were supposedly common for slaves. And further, the sympathies which Luke showed for all the poor and down-trodden may point to his own past as a slave.²⁵

Luke the artist. – Church tradition attributes to Luke an artistic ability. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, a poet of the Victorian period, has given expression to this ancient tradition in these lines:

Give honor unto Luke Evangelist,
For he it was (the ancient legends say)
Who first taught Art to fold her hands and pray.²⁶

²² Plummer, *Commentary*, p. xx.

²³ Robertson, *Luke*, p. 24.

²⁴ F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), p. 524.

²⁵ Doremus A. Hayes, *The Most Beautiful Book Ever Written* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1913), p. 197.

²⁶ Dante Gabriel Rossetti, "In the House of Life," Sonnet lxxiv, quoted in Curtis Hidden Page, *British Poets of the Nineteenth Century* (Boston: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Company, 1904), p. 804.

Luke is said to have painted a portrait of the Virgin Mary. Hayes²⁷ traces this tradition back to the sixth century, at which time Theodorus Lector, a reader in the church of Constantinople, tells that the Empress Eudoxia found at Jerusalem a painting of Mary by Luke, and she presented it to her daughter, Pulcheria, the wife of Theodosius II. In the Church of Santa Matia Maggiore at Rome is another portrait of Maria ascribed to Luke, dating back to A.D. 847 and farther, and an inscription in the catacombs refers to a painting of Mary as "one of seven painted by Luca." In the thirteenth century Luke appeared as the patron saint of painters.

This tradition may be nothing more than "an idle legend of Greek origin,"²⁸ but even if Luke never painted with a brush, he certainly has done so with his pen and may rightly be called the founder of Christian art. The earliest Christian painting portrays "The Shepherd with the Lost Sheep" of Luke 15 and the Gospel of Luke has been a favorite source for medieval and modern painters, far above any other Gospel. Luke's special scenes have inspired the greatest artists. Only a literary artist could draw the verbal pictures of scenes like the annunciation, the shepherds, the manger, the young Christ in the temple, the good Samaritan, the prodigal son, the walk to Emmaus.

Luke the musician. – It is obvious that Luke is fond of music. He is the first Christian hymnologist. He alone preserved five great hymns and his Gospel begins and ends with praise. Hayes pays this noble tribute to Luke the musician:

He had the Greek love for melody. He was full of music himself. He collected and recorded the first Christian hymns. He gave Paul medicine when he needed it, and when all medicines had failed, like another David before another Saul, he ministered to him in melody until his physical ills and his spiritual wounds were all healed. He must have been a versatile genius, this man Luke, ready to serve and able to serve according to any man's need. No wonder that he was beloved by all, and his praise was in all the churches.²⁹

Luke the author. – Luke distinguished himself through his medical career but he is best known to us as a writer. That the two vocations are not contradictory, indeed, that there exists a close relationship between the two, is an established fact. This interrelationship has been ably pointed out by Hutton:

It would appear, indeed, as though the very qualities that go to the making of a good physician go also to the making of a good writer – good spirits that enable a man to impart brightness to a patient, thereby bringing him on the way to recovery; sympathy,

²⁷ Hayes, *Book*, pp. 37-38.

²⁸ M'Clintock and Strong, *Encyclopedia*, p. 551.

²⁹ Haynes, *Book*, pp. 36-37.

pity, a final kindness of the heart which will always see something more than the grim temporary facts of the case; faith which sees the health that may be coming when the unformed eye might see only the heartless ravages of a disease; the fighting instinct which he has daily to summon wherewith to arrest the approach of some malady. And with all these things that may be credited to himself – the deep compassion for his fellowmen which must become the very habit of mind of one whose calling acquaints him so persistently with the ills that flesh is heir to. These, which are the qualities of a good physician, are surely the very qualities of good writing. For a good book, I take it, and the human race in the long run agrees, is a book which is bathed in a final kindness towards the human race.³⁰

Luke is the only Evangelist who had scientific training. One would expect to see the result of that training in his writings. At least four particulars of his Gospel show Luke's scientific background.

First, one can note **the accuracy of his narrative**. He set out to trace things accurately from the first, so that Theophilus might be assured of the certainty of these things (1:3-4), and such eminent scholars as Harnack and Ramsey rank Luke in the first class of historians. Luke's university training is further evident in his versatility. Plummer's comment is much to the point.

The author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is the most versatile of all the New Testament writers. He can be as Hebraistic as the seventy, and as free from Hebraisms as Plutarch. And, in the main, whether intentionally or not, he is Hebraistic in describing Hebrew society and Greek in describing Greek society.³¹

Another evidence of Luke's high education and broad culture is that of his fluency. As a trained man he would have practice in writing. This practice would result in facility of expression. In comparison to the other Gospels, Luke has a much greater vocabulary, adds many interesting details, and gives a fuller and more symmetrical account.

Finally, to accuracy, versatility and fluency, Luke adds beauty of literary style. The language which he employs is the most beautiful Greek in the New Testament, with the possible exception of that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. His expert use of classical Greek, his effective use of contrasts, and his stylistic duplications prompt Plummer to acknowledge that "he possesses the art of composition. He knows not only how to tell a tale truthfully, but how to tell it with effect. . . . As the fine literary taste of Renan affirms, it is the most beautiful book in the

³⁰ John A. Hutton, "The Differentia of the Gospel According to St. Luke," *The Expository Times*, XXXIV (October, 1922-September, 1923), 306-7.

³¹ Plummer, *Commentary*, p. xlix.

world."³²

Luke's psychological insights. – As a trained physician, Luke would also have the makings of a psychologist. Smith has shown why this is so:

The good physician has to be something more than a physiologist. It is not enough that he understand "nerves," he must understand moods and temperament. By the very nature of the case the physician seeks to understand not merely the human body but also human nature. He may have to guard his better judgment by thinking of his patient as a "case," but they who still have memories of the old time family doctor know that underneath a scientific pose there often is a nature that is quick with human sympathy and feeling. And Luke was called "the beloved physician." This characterizing phrase predisposes us to belief that here is one whose profession made possible the psychologist.³³

Even a cursory reading of his Third Gospel is sufficient to indicate that this predisposition is correct. It was not enough for Luke to narrate facts but he also analyzed them. Christians are indebted to Luke for the exquisite stories of the infancy and boyhood of Jesus. It is he who **emphasizes the loneliness of the Savior** and who adds many illuminating details which illustrate Luke's interest in psychological aspects. Men wondered at the words of grace proceeding from the Savior (4:22). The eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened on the Savior (4:20). As a physician, Luke marveled at the cure of the woman with an issue of blood; as a psychologist he was conscious of the power which went out from Jesus (8:43-46).³⁴

Luke the missionary. – Though a physician, artist, author, and psychologist, Luke was above all a missionary. In Acts 16:10, Luke includes himself among those (Paul, Silas, and Timothy) who answered the call to come to Macedonia "to preach the gospel unto them." Relating his arrival at the riverside in Philippi, he writes, "We sat down and spake to the women that were come together" (Acts 16:1). Luke was pointed out as one of the men who preached the way of salvation (Acts 16:17), and he was left in Philippi for over six years until Paul came back from Corinth on his way to Jerusalem (Acts 20:5). From then on he is with Paul to the close of Acts. He is probably one of "the messengers of the churches, the glory of Christ" (II Cor. 8:23), in which case he would be one of the agents taking up the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem (II Cor. 8:25). So then, as a fellow-worker (Philemon 24) with Paul, he is Luke the Evangelist because he preached, as well as because he wrote the Third Gospel. As the first

³² *Ibid.*, xlvi

³³ Fred Smith, "The Gospel of Luke Considered as a Psychological Document," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXX (1923), 491.

³⁴ S. C. Carpenter, *Christianity According to S. Luke* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1919), ch. XIII: "S. Luke the Psychologist," pp. 177-88.

medical missionary, he apparently used his skill to care for Paul, who had frail health for many years. He assisted Paul as a preacher and he attended him as a physician.

The contacts of the author

It has been seen that according to the passages in which Luke's name occurs, he was a beloved companion of and fellow-worker with the Apostle Paul. It is not known how long Luke lived. Only a Greek legend tells us that Luke remained unmarried, and that he died in Bithynia at the age of seventy-four or eighty-four.³⁵

Of necessity, during his long career, Luke's association with Paul brought him into contact with others of the early ministers of the Gospel. Mark, Aristarchus, and Demas are linked with him specifically in Philemon 24 as fellow-workers. According to Colossians 4:10-14, Jesus Justus and Epaphras also seem to have been associated with Luke in the ministry, at least for a time. Luke lived with Philip the evangelist for several days (Acts 21:8-10), lodged with Mnason, an original disciple (Acts 21:16), and also met with James the brother of Christ in Jerusalem (Acts 21:18). As Luke sought firsthand contemporary information about the themes of his Gospel, these contacts no doubt comprised his prime sources.

There is likewise good evidence that Luke met Mary, the mother of Jesus. How else could he have obtained the information concerning the events of the birth of the Savior, which still betrays its Hebrew source, and which is unique to him? How else could he have knowledge of the innermost feelings of Mary which come to light in Luke 1:24, 36, 41; 2:19, 21, 51? William M. Ramsey, who has confirmed the historicity of Luke, demonstrates that either this information was obtained from Mary herself or Luke has deliberately tried to create a false impression.³⁶

As a conscientious historian, Luke undoubtedly made good use of his contacts, especially in Caesarea and Jerusalem. They were the oral sources for his Gospel. And it was because of these contacts with eyewitnesses and with the Apostle Paul that his Gospel was received as authentic and authoritative at an early time. Already in I Timothy 5:17-18, a quote from Deuteronomy and from the Third Gospel (Luke 10:7) are both referred to as $\eta \ \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}$. And Eusebius specifies the Gospel and Acts as $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha \ \beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha$.³⁷

The Date and Destination

³⁵ C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel* (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1946), p. 15.

³⁶ William M. Ramsey, *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898), p. 78.

³⁷ M'Clintock and Strong, *Encyclopedia*, p. 551.

The date

In the early part of the second century, the Gospel of Luke was fully recognized. There is, however, great disagreement as to the date of composition. There are primarily two main views. One position is that Luke wrote after A.D. 70, another view sees the Gospel completed before A.D. 70.

Those who give the Gospel a later date offer two arguments for their view. **They assume that Luke had made use of the *Antiquities of Josephus***, which was written in A.D. 94. The reference in Luke 3:1-2 to Lysanius as tetrarch of Abilene is to prove this dependence. Guthrie³⁸ has shown the fallacy of the arguments, which would date the Gospel at A.D. 100.

A second, and far more common argument for the late date of Luke is that Luke purposely altered the more obscure words of Mark 13:14, because by the time he wrote he knew precisely what had happened. The prophecy of judgment upon Jerusalem was shaped *ex eventu*.³⁹ The weakness of this view becomes apparent when it is recognized that its proponents are of the radical source criticism school who consider predictive prophecy impossible. Luke used the more precise description of Jerusalem surrounded by armies (Luke 21:20) rather than "abomination of desolation" because the strictly Jewish expression of Mark would have little meaning for Luke's Gentile readers.

The early date for Luke is closely linked with an early date for Acts. Acts was written after the Third Gospel (Acts 1:1). It was also written before the death of Paul, since it ends so abruptly and mentions nothing concerning the martyrdom of the Apostle, which occurred about A.D. 68. Scroggie thinks that Luke finished Acts in A.D. 63.⁴⁰ The Gospel would have been written shortly before that date.

That Luke wrote no later than A.D. 60 can be seen from the above-mentioned reference to Luke 10:7 found in I Timothy 5:17-18. Assuming that Paul wrote I Timothy around A. D. 61, or 65, this reference to Luke argues for an early date, as noted by Birks:

The plain and simple inference is, that St. Paul here quotes St. Luke's gospel, as Scripture, on the same footing of authority with the Law of Moses. Such a quotation

³⁸ Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*. (London: The Tyndale Press, 1965), I, 106.

³⁹ P. Feine, J. Behm, and Werner Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. by A. J. Mattill (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 105.

⁴⁰ W. Graham Scroggie, *A Guide to the Gospels* (London: Pickering and Inglis Ltd., 1965), p. 340.

implies further, that the gospel was already known to Timothy and accepted by Christians as part of the written code of the New Testament.⁴¹

This limitation of the date throws light on the place of composition. Luke was with Paul in Caesarea in A.D. 58-60, and while Paul was imprisoned there, Luke would have had ample time to write his Gospel, or at least to carry on investigations, to start the Gospel, and then to complete it in Rome.⁴² Should the anti-Marcionite Prologue be correct, then Luke wrote his Gospel in Greece (Achaia). Other places which have been suggested are Alexandria, Ephesus, and Corinth.

The destination

There is clear evidence to whom the Gospel was addressed. Luke himself indicates that the object he had in view in compiling his Gospel was that a certain Theophilus ("lover or God") might know the certainty or those things in which he had been orally instructed. Acts is addressed to the same person Theophilus, concerning whom, unfortunately, next to nothing is known. He is described as "most excellent" (κράτιστε), an expression which was used of senators and knights, such as the Roman procurators Felix (Acts 23:26; 24:3) and Festus (Acts 26:5).⁴³

Some have denied the personal existence of Theophilus altogether. Karl Barth, for example, thinks that Theophilus is a name "behind which there is possibly hidden the simple Christian of the second or third generation in general."⁴⁴ Cadbury, on the other hand, advocates the view that Theophilus was not a Christian but an influential non-Christian and that, accordingly, Luke-Acts was conceived of as an *apologia* for Christianity.⁴⁵ Zahn⁴⁶ and Lenski⁴⁷ think that the absence of the epithet in Acts 1:1 is evidence that Theophilus became converted in the interval before Luke penned his second volume. Whether he was saved when the Gospel was written cannot be

⁴¹ R. R. Birks, *Horae Evangelicae* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1892), p. 253.

⁴² Scroggie, *Guide*, p. 340.

⁴³ Fritz Rienecker, *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhausverlag, 1966), p. 2.

⁴⁴ Wilhelm Michaelis, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Ergänzungsheft* (Bern: Berchtold Haller Verlag, 1961), p. 11.

⁴⁵ Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), pp. 203-4.

⁴⁶ Zahn, *Introduction*, III, 365.

⁴⁷ Lenski, *Interpretation*, p. 11.

said with certainty. But it is obvious that Theophilus is already an informed person, whom Luke wishes to give certainty as to the origins of Christianity. This personal purpose makes Theophilus more than just another person of nobility, whose financial backing and interest would assure a wide circulation of the Gospel. The prologue is more than a dedication to a *patronus libri* who would see the book to the book-market.

The place of residence of Theophilus can only be surmised. From the details of Acts 28:14-15 it appears that Theophilus lived in Rome. Seisenberger's arguments for Rome are rather appealing:

Theophilus was certainly not a native of Palestine, for in mentioning Nazareth (i. 26) and Capharnaym (iv. 31) Saint Luke thinks it necessary to add that they are in Galilee, and he calls Arimathea (xxiii. 51) a town in Judea. He describes the position of the Mount of Olives and gives its distance from Jerusalem (Acts i. 12) and also states the distance to Emmaus (Luke xxiv, 13). Theophilus seems not to have been a Greek, as in that case the Athenians would hardly be mentioned as they are in Acts xvii. 12. The nearer the actors in the story come to Rome, the fewer are these descriptive touches.⁴⁸

While the immediate destination of the Gospel was to the nobleman Theophilus, it is unreasonable to suppose that it was meant for the eyes of Theophilus alone. Luke's work was written for readers throughout the Roman Empire, for the instruction and encouragement of all Gentile converts. The book is written by a Gentile for Gentiles. That this is so can be seen by the noticeable absence of Hebrew words, by the explanation of technical terms (e.g. 7:30; 10:25), by the translation of some words (23:33; 6:15), by the infrequent quotes from the Old Testament, and by the repeated appeal to the Gentiles, in distinction to the Jewish emphasis of the other Gospels. Luke had ministered many years among the Gentiles. Now he wished to confirm their faith.

The Prologue and Purpose

The prologue

The importance of the prologue. – The prologue is important in several respects. It indicates what sources Luke used. It explains what method of investigation he followed. It points out the arrangement of the Gospel. And it establishes the fact of the historicity of the Gospel. It reads as follows:

Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word; it seemed good

⁴⁸ Michael Seisenberger, *Practical Handbook for the Study of the Bible* (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1925), p. 389.

to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed [1:1-4].

As to Luke's sources, they clearly were two-fold: written and oral. What these oral sources probably were has already been discussed above. But what were the written sources? One can immediately exclude the apocryphal gospels which were written after that time. Neither would Luke be referring to the First and Fourth Gospels, for Matthew and John belong to the eyewitnesses in verse two. Cairns suggests that Mark's Gospel might be excluded as well because Eusebius quoted Papias stating that Mark was the interpreter for Peter, who was one of the eyewitnesses to the life and work of Christ.⁴⁹

Whatever these sources may have been, Luke shows that there were many narratives of the life of Christ in existence when he wrote. They were probably short descriptions of the words and deeds of Christ which have been lost. Luke decided to write his own account, but by this he does not reject the other accounts as untrustworthy or that he hoped to improve on them, for in verse three he puts himself on the same footing as these predecessors. He apparently desired a more detailed and comprehensive account.

It is necessary to raise briefly at this point the synoptic question. How much did the three Synoptics depend on each other? In relation to Luke, his sources have commonly been classified as:

(1) Oral tradition. Primarily the birth and infancy narratives and the hymns in the first two chapters are believed to have been derived from oral tradition.

(2) St. Mark's Gospel. Luke is said to use about 60 per cent of Mark's 661 verses; these contribute the basis for about a third of Luke's total of 1148 verses. The material from Mark relates mainly to what Jesus did ("kerygma").

(3) The Q document. When the common Marcan material is eliminated from Matthew and Luke, there remain yet some 250 verses which consist mainly of sayings and discourses of Christ ("didache"). Their close parallelism seems to point to a common source, conveniently called Q, from the German word *Quelle*, or source.⁵⁰

(4) The L source. When the Marcan material is eliminated from Matthew and Luke, and the 250 verses which are common to Matthew and Luke, there still remain about 580

⁴⁹ Earle E. Cairns, "Luke as a Historian," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXII (July-September, 1965), 221. Thiessen, p. 139, maintains that Mark was written subsequent to Luke, and on that account could not be a source.

⁵⁰ Scroggie, *Guide*, p. 86.

verses in Luke to be accounted for, and whose source has been designated as "L". It is believed to be of Palestinian provenance and to have provided Luke with the material in the travel insertion (9:51-18:14), and in his non-Markan portions of the Passion and post-Resurrection narrative. Nearly 40 per cent of Luke would appear to be from this special source.⁵¹

The study of the actual sources of the Gospels does not affect Biblical Theology, nor does the view that the Gospels depended on each other necessarily destroy the doctrine of inerrancy, however, as Thiessen⁵² points out, these documentary hypotheses were set up, strangely enough, just when the Bible lost its position as the infallible Word of God and the destructive form-critical approach to the Bible came into vogue. It should also be noted that there is anything but agreement on these views. Even after almost a century of debate on the priority of Mark and the extent of the Q document, scholars have been unsuccessful to come to any agreement on the documentary hypotheses. Meyer⁵³ shows the wide variety of views according to which one Evangelist made use of another. Others⁵⁴ show the hopeless contradictions among scholars concerning Q, and recent works bring into serious question that there ever existed such a document as Q.⁵⁵

On the other hand, there have always existed eminent scholars who have insisted that the Gospels were written independently of each other, and that the Evangelists relied primarily on oral testimony.⁵⁶ The learned Dean Alford makes a plausible case for the independent origin of

⁵¹ Buckner B. Trawick, *The New Testament as Literature. (Gospels and Acts)* (New York: Barnes and Nobel Inc., 1966), p. 52. Streeter proposed the alternate theory, the Proto-Luke hypothesis, that Luke put together a draft of his Gospel before he became acquainted with Mark, and later inserted some Marcan material before publishing his Gospel. Cf. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930), pp. 199ff.

⁵² Thiessen, *Introduction*, pp. 117-18.

⁵³ H. A. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. William P. Dickson and Frederick Crombie (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884), pp. 23-31.

⁵⁴ Robert Morgenthaler, *Die lukanische Geschichts-schreibung als Zeugnis* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949), II, 76.

⁵⁵ Lewis A. Foster, "The 'Q' Myth in Synoptic Studies," *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society*, VII (Fall, 1964), pp. 111-16.

⁵⁶ Theodor Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas* (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920), pp. 20-21. Cf. B. F. Westcott, *Introduction to the Studies of the Gospels* (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1887), pp. 212-13. Also J. F. Springer, "The Synoptic Problem," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXXII (October, 1925), 484-86. Springer shows on hand of detailed and meticulous research the difficulties of the view that the Evangelists depended on

the Gospels. He supposed that beside the mere oral Gospel, which had in a measure become stereotyped, there were also written statements embracing both the incidents of the life of Christ and His teaching, and these were prudently used by the Evangelists, and, it may be, incorporated in their Gospels. He summarizes his objection to the interdependence of the Evangelists thus:

I do not see how any theory of mutual interdependence will leave to our three Evangelists their credit as able or trustworthy writers, or even as *honest men*: nor can I find any such theory borne out by the nature of the variations apparent in the respective texts.⁵⁷
[emphasis in the original]

He offers cogent reasons why he considers it impossible that the Evangelists borrowed from each other:

It is inconceivable that one writer borrowing from another matter confessedly of the very first importance, *in good faith and with approval*, should alter his diction so singularly and capriciously as, *on this hypothesis*, we find the text of the parallel sections of our Gospels altered. Let the question be answered by ordinary considerations of probability, and let any passage common to the three Evangelists be put to the test. The phenomena presented will be much as follows: – first, perhaps, we shall have three, five, or more words *identical*; – then as many *wholly distinct*: then two clauses or more, expressed in the *same words* but *differing order*: – then a clause *contained in one or two*, and *not in the third*: – then *several words identical*: – then a clause not only *wholly distinct* but *apparently inconsistent*; – and so forth: – with recurrences of the same arbitrary and anomalous alterations, coincidences, and transpositions. Nor does this description apply to verbal and sentential arrangement only; – but also, with slight modification, to that of the larger portions of the narratives.⁵⁸

Godet, who agrees with Alford, correctly seizes up the basic problem which besets all the proposed solutions of the synoptic problem which fail to take Luke's prologue into consideration:

Apart from these first lines of Luke, we know absolutely nothing definite about the more ancient narratives of the life of Jesus which preceded the composition of our Gospels. Therefore every theory as to the origin of the synoptics, which is not constructed out of the materials furnished by this preface, runs the risk of being thrown

each other.

⁵⁷ Henry Alford, *The New Testament for English Readers* (Boston: Lee and Shepard, Publishers, 1872). I, "Prolegomena," 11.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

aside as a tissue of vain hypotheses the day after it has seen the light.⁵⁹

The importance of the prologue of Luke in relation to the synoptic problem and the material of Luke is evident. The same prologue shows what methods of investigation he followed. Luke said that he had perfect understanding from the first or, more precisely, he followed everything step by step, point by point.⁶⁰ The perfect tense of this participle (παρηκολουθηκότι) shows that the work had already been done before the time of writing. The words "from the very beginning" (ἀνωθεν) mean that Luke went back to the very beginning of the Gospel narrative and traced all things (πασιν) from that original point. In the fashion of a true historian, he studied all things to determine their accuracy, sifted them to remove those matters which he found unreliable or could not confirm, and then selected those facts which he felt would best serve his purpose.⁶¹ Luke's careful investigation brought this praise from Sir William Ramsey:

Luke is a historian of the first rank; not merely are his statements of fact trustworthy; he is possessed of the true historic sense; he seizes the important and critical events and shows their true nature at greater length, while he touches lightly or omits entirely much that was valueless for his purpose. In short, this author should be placed along with the very greatest of historians.⁶²

The prologue shows Luke's material which he used, it reveals his careful method of inquiry, and it indicates the order with which he presented his narrative. He claimed to be writing "in order" (1:3). The word *καθεξῆς* is peculiar to Luke (Luke 18:1; Acts 3:24; 11:4; 18:23) and means *orderly*, or *in an orderly way*. His use of the word implies that he had a definite plan of procedure. While Ramsey takes it to be "a rational order, making things comprehensible, omitting nothing that is essential for full and proper understanding,"⁶³ Godet thinks "the term must stand for chronological order."⁶⁴ Zahn combines the two ideas and shows that both apply to the Third Gospel:

A further means is suggested by *καθεξῆς*. For inasmuch as the facts in question

⁵⁹ F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans. by E. W. Shalders (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1870), I, 54.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 60.

⁶¹ Cairns, "Luke," 222.

⁶² William H. Ramsey, *The Bearing of Recent Discoveries on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915), p. 222.

⁶³ Ramsey, *Was Christ Born*, p. 14.

⁶⁴ Godet, *Commentary*, I, 62.

were historical, it is self-evident that the order in which they were to be set forth must in a general way correspond to the order in which they took place. But we do not know definitely how far Luke, notwithstanding the carefulness of his investigations, was in a position to give the exact chronology. Moreover, by the use of this expression he does not mean to say that chronological accuracy is the main point in his narrative, but that He intends to give a logically connected historical account in which what precedes prepares for and explains what follows, in contrast to the disconnected narratives to which Theophilus had been heretofore accustomed.⁶⁵

That Luke fulfilled his aim of a continuous and comprehensive account is borne out fully by his achievement in the composition of Luke- Acts which excels in orderliness and comprehensiveness.

The implications in relation to Acts. – Does the prologue include in its perspective the book of Acts as well as the Gospel? The answer to this question has been a matter of hot debate for many years. Dr. Wilibald Grimm, who in the typical and verbose fashion of a German scholar gives an exhaustive and exhausting exposition of the prologue, lists the various views and their representatives on this matter. He himself believes that only the Gospel is in view, and that Luke decided to write Acts sometime after the completion of the Gospel. One looks in vain in the Gospel, he says, for any hint that he planned to give a history of the early church, and the variations in the two ascension accounts in Luke 24:50ff and Acts 1:2ff prove that the two volumes were not composed in immediate succession.⁶⁶ The opposite and more probable position is taken by Potwin.⁶⁷ He presents **five** arguments for his view:

- (1) There is no express limitation confining the coming narrative to the life of Christ.
- (2) Certain expressions in the preface foreshadow a longer period than is covered by the Gospel. For example, the "all things" of verse three apparently must refer also to the momentous event of Pentecost.
- (3) The introduction to Acts harmonizes with the idea that the book is a continuation originally intended, and not an afterthought.
- (4) It is generally agreed that Luke did actually write Acts shortly after the Gospel.

⁶⁵ Zahn, *Introduction*, III, 52-53.

⁶⁶ Wilibald Grimm, "Das Proömium des Lucas evangeliums," *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, XVI (1871), 33-78.

⁶⁷ Lemuel S. Potwin, "Does the Preface to Luke's Gosrpel Belong also to Acts?" *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXVIII (April, 1881), 328-332.

(5) Zahn likewise argues that the prologue includes the book of Acts. His observation concerning Luke's purpose is much to the point: "Just as he planned to begin at the very beginning (ἀνωθεν), so he must have purposed to carry the narrative down to its conclusion."⁶⁸

The purpose

Negatively. – A time-honored thesis holds that the Lucan writings were apologetic in nature. They were intended to be a defense brief for the trial of Paul. Streeter argues that Luke's books are designed to present a case for Christianity to the Roman aristocracy and to make them favorably disposed towards Christians. He calls Act's "*the first of the Apologies*,"⁶⁹

The error of this approach is apparent because, in relation to Luke, it generally assumes a very late date. The background of the Third Gospel is usually pictured thus:

Once the initial persecution of the Church by Nero had come to an end, Christians found themselves in a precarious, though by no means a hopeless, situation. Their legal security had gone, for their faith was now regarded as a new, and therefore illegal, religion. Their one chance of survival lay in avoiding the unfavorable notice of the civil authorities, and this in turn depended on their ability to retain the goodwill of their neighbors, most of whom considered the Christian religion to be a barbarous superstition and associated it with all manner of depravities.⁷⁰

The error of this approach is pointed out by Barrett. He refers to Acts but his argument applies equally well to the Gospel:

It was not addressed to the Emperor, with the intention of proving the political harmlessness of Christianity in general and of Paul in particular; a few passages might be construed to serve this purpose, but to suggest that the book as a whole should be taken in this way is absurd. No Roman official would ever have filtered out so much of what to him would be theological and ecclesiastical rubbish in order to reach so tiny a grain of relevant apology.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Zahn, *Introduction*, III, 53.

⁶⁹ Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1930), pp. 535, 539.

⁷⁰ G. B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* (New York: Seabury Press, 1963), p. 14.

⁷¹ C. K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Research* (London: The Epworth Press, 1961), p. 63.

Luke-Acts is therefore not an apology. However, a second false thesis sees for Luke-Acts a purely theological purpose. Conzelmann, for example, feels that Luke-Acts is a theological creation to show the three periods of the history, of salvation: the period of Israel (Luke 16 :16), the period of Jesus' ministry, and the period of the church.⁷² He thus asserts that Luke, rather than being historically accurate, uses historical and geographical details in a strictly symbolic manner to present his theological views. Luke is strictly a theologian to whom the meaning of everything is symbolic. Barclay has a fitting observation on this approach:

No one will deny that Luke had theological interests and aims, for all the gospel writers were seeking to confront men with Jesus Christ an Savior and Lord, but in our judgment Luke's writings read in such a way that they are the writings of a man who was writing history, in the sense of history with a purpose, as the ancient writers understood history.⁷³

Positively. – The purpose of Luke must be thought in connection with questions about the Gospel, its date, its theological emphases, and its recipients.

The first and most obvious purpose of Luke is a historical one. In the prologue Luke insists that his motive for writing was to provide a comprehensive, historically accurate account of the origin and progress of Christianity. The prologue itself is an historian's preface and the six-fold dating in 3:1-2 is a setting of the Christian story in the context of world history.⁷⁴

While Luke emphasizes the human aspect of his investigation and simply lays claim to the care and accuracy of an honest, painstaking, and well-informed editor, the resulting historical accuracy is further assured by the fact that Luke was acting under the immediate superintendence of the Holy Spirit in the selection of his materials as well as in their use.

There is further evidence from the prologue that the book has a personal purpose. The immediate purpose of Luke is to confirm Theophilus in the faith of which he already has some knowledge, and to give him a consecutive history on which he could rely.

Zahn has given a good summary statement of the first two purposes:

⁷² Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers), p. 16.

⁷³ William Barclay, *The First Three Gospels* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), p. 282.

⁷⁴ F. F. Bruce, *The New Testament Documents – Are They Reliable?* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963), pp. 80-92.

Luke does not, like Matthew, write an apology on behalf of Christ and his church in order to meet objections of a national character. Nor does he, like Mark, present from a single point of view, narratives which have been impressed upon his memory by frequent hearing and repetition. His design is rather, as a Greek historian, to set forth the history of Christianity from its beginnings to the completion which it had reached in his own time, and he aims to do this in such a way that his exposition, based upon thorough investigation and presenting the whole development of Christianity connectedly, shall impress, with a sense of the trustworthiness of the Christian traditions, a cultured Gentile who has heard much about the facts which are current in the Christian Church and held to be the basis of its faith, and whose relations to individual Christians, like the author, are friendly.⁷⁵

There is yet a third purpose for the writing of the Gospel, and that is a spiritual one. A key verse to the entire book is 19:10: "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." This is the theological thrust of the Gospel. Luke presents Jesus Christ as the Son of Man. The key phrase "Son of Man" is to be found twenty-six times in this book and it stresses His humanity. He is the true representative of the whole human race. He is the perfect man among sinful men.

The key word of the Gospel is *save*. Together with the forms *Savior* and *salvation* it appears twenty times in the book. The message of the book is therefore: the Son of Man offers salvation to all.

It has already been established that the Gospel contains many indications that the book is written by a Gentile for Gentiles. Luke's explanations of religious customs, localities, and Jewish expressions would have been unnecessary for Jews. Origen confirms the universal purpose of the Gospel. He writes that "Luke composed his Gospel for Gentiles."⁷⁶

This brief study has shown that Luke's purpose is not merely historical or theological, rather, he wrote with a historical-theological purpose in mind: to present the historical Jesus of Nazareth as a universal Savior. Instead of creating his facts, Luke carefully selected them, guided by his over-all theological purpose. Summarizing, then, "the three-fold purpose of Luke, it may be stated thus: He wished to present such a complete and historical account of the Son of Man as a universal Savior, that Theophilus and other Gentile readers could know with certainty and would believe in truth this universal Gospel of salvation."⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Zahn, *Introduction*, III, 61-62.

⁷⁶ Cited by Gloag, *Introduction*, p. 229.

⁷⁷ For the purpose of Luke-Acts see Edward A. McDowell, "The Gospel of Luke," *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, X (Fall, 1967), 15: "To show how the gospel was projected into the Roman Empire as the universal gospel in keeping with the life and work of Jesus of

The Design and Development

The design

The scope. – The scope of Luke's writings, a two-volume work, marks him off from all other New Testament writers and Luke-Acts from all other New Testament books. Barrett ⁷⁸ remarks that these all stand on one side or the other of a great watershed. They are aware of Luke-Acts; they presuppose its existence; but they do not describe it nor cover the same ground. Luke alone makes it his task to give an exposition of the beginnings of the Christian movement. He does not limit himself to the rise and progress of the church, but draws up his narrative of the ministry of Christ. As has already been pointed out, in the first volume he gives the content of the Gospel or the facts of the Savior. In the second volume he presents the communication of the Gospel or the acts of the Apostles.

At some point in the early history of the church, however, an unfortunate divorce took place and the two books were separated because of the desire of the church to include the Gospel with the other three. To recapture the scope of Luke's writing, modern writers are speaking of Luke-Acts. ⁷⁹

The style. – Luke's Gospel is primarily Hellenistic in style, except in certain sections peculiar to him, such as the birth narratives. Reicke has these comments on Luke's Hellenistic style:

Generally, his language reveals the Hellenistic culture which is indicated in the prologue. He does not, it is true, write in pure Attic Greek, for his language rather shows a strong dependence on the Septuagint, and Jewish-Hellenistic traditions. But he does clearly attempt to write in the Greek of the world of culture, and to make use of correct terminology, as we can see, for example, in Luke 3:1. ⁸⁰

Peculiar to Luke is a very large number of words not found elsewhere in the New Testament. S. Davidson lists more than 420 words which are used by Luke and not by the other

Nazareth as the universal Savior."

⁷⁸ Barrett, *Luke*, p. 53.

⁷⁹ For the Hellenistic custom of writing two-volume works, see Everett P. Harrison, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), p. 184.

⁸⁰ Bo Reicke, *The Gospel of Luke*, trans. by Ross Mackenzie (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), p. 31.

Evangelists.⁸¹ Almost three-fourths of Luke's special words occur in the Septuagint, indicating that Luke was more familiar with the Septuagint than were Matthew or Mark. The total number of words used only by Luke exceeds the aggregate of the other three Gospels.

The nature of Luke's vocabulary is also peculiar. His Gospel is filled with Hebraisms while at the same time he shows a great command of Greek. The Hebraisms in Luke, according to Plummer,⁸² come partly from his sources, partly from his contacts with Paul, whose language is saturated with Old Testament terms. The following are some of the main Hebraisms of Luke:

- (1.) the very frequent use of $\epsilon \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau \omicron$ in a new subject, especially $\epsilon \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau \omicron \acute{\epsilon} \nu \tau \omega$, with the accusative and infinitive, corresponding to בְּיָהֳרָיִךְ , twenty-three times, not once in Matt., only twice in Mark;
- (2.) the same idiom, with $\acute{\epsilon} \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau \omicron$, e. g. ix, 34, 36; x, 35; xi, 37;
- (3.) $\acute{\epsilon} \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau \omicron \omega \varsigma$, or $\omega \varsigma$ alone of time, the Hebrew בְּיָמֶיךָ , e.g. ii, 15; v, 4, only once each in Matthew and Mark;
- (4.) $\Upsilon \psi \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \varsigma$, used for God = עֲלֵי יְיָ , five times, once in Mark;
- (5.) $\omicron \iota \kappa \omicron \varsigma$, for family = בֵּית ;
- (6.) $\acute{\alpha} \pi \omicron \tau \omicron \upsilon \nu \upsilon \nu$ = הַרְפָּסָה , four times, not once in the other gospels;
- (7.) $\acute{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \acute{\iota} \alpha$ in the genitive as an epithet, e.g. $\omicron \iota \kappa \omicron \nu \omicron \mu \omicron \nu \tau \eta \varsigma \acute{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \acute{\iota} \alpha \varsigma$ "κριτῆς τῆς ἀδικίας";
- (8.) $\pi \rho \omicron \sigma \acute{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \tau \omicron \pi \acute{\epsilon} \mu \psi \alpha \iota$, xx, 11, 12;
- (9.) $\kappa \alpha \rho \delta \acute{\iota} \alpha$ = בֶּלֶן .⁸³

On the other hand, there are certain classical words and phrases peculiar to Luke which he uses in place of Hebrew terms which are less familiar to his Gentile readers.⁸⁴

⁸¹ Samuel Davidson, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1882), I, 486-93. Differing from Davidson is G. Mackinlay, "Special Lucan words," *Bibliotheca Sacra* LXXVII (October, 1920), 419. He compares Luke with the rest of the New Testament and sees 261 words in the Gospel or a total of 735 words in Luke -Acts not used elsewhere in the New Testament.

⁸² Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 1.

⁸³ M'Clintock and Strong, *Encyclopedia*, V, 555. For an extended discussion of $\acute{\epsilon} \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau \omicron$ in Luke, see Paul Winter, "On Luke and Lucan Sources," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1956), pp. 217-42.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* E.g. $\acute{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \acute{\alpha} \tau \eta \varsigma$ for $\rho \alpha \beta \beta \acute{\iota}$, six times; $\nu \omicron \mu \iota \kappa \omicron \iota$ for $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon \iota \varsigma$, six times; $\nu \alpha \acute{\iota}$, $\acute{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \omega \varsigma$, or $\acute{\epsilon} \pi' \acute{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \acute{\iota} \alpha \varsigma$ for $\acute{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, which only occurs seven times, to thirty in Matthew, and fourteen times in Mark; $\acute{\alpha} \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \lambda \acute{\upsilon} \chi \nu \omicron \nu$ for $\kappa \alpha \acute{\iota} \epsilon \iota \nu \lambda$, four times; $\lambda \acute{\iota} \mu \eta \nu$ of the Lake of Gennesareth for $\theta \acute{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha$, five times; $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \eta \lambda \upsilon \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \omicron \varsigma$ for $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \upsilon \tau \iota \kappa \acute{\omicron \varsigma}$; $\kappa \lambda \acute{\iota} \nu \iota \delta \iota \omicron \nu$ for $\kappa \rho \acute{\alpha} \beta \beta \alpha \tau \omicron \varsigma$;

To these two apparently opposite features of Hebraisms and classical Greek terms comes a third peculiarity, Luke's medical language. This medical language has been investigated by Hobart, as has been shown above, and even if his list of 400 words has been sifted, there still remains a large number of medical words, peculiar to Luke, which confirm that he was a physician. His knowledge of medical matters is seen, for example, in his use of βελόνη, the technical word for a surgical needle (Luke 18:25).⁸⁵

Of the words which are peculiar to, or occur much more frequently in Luke, some of the most important in relation to his theology are the following:

The use of Κύριος in the narrative as a synonym for Ἰησοῦς, which occurs fourteen times (e.g. vii, 13; x, 1; xiii, 15, etc.), and nowhere else in the synoptic gospels save in the addition to Mark; xvi., 19, 20; σωτήρ, σωτηρία, σωτήριον, not found in the other gospels, except the first two once each in John; χάρις eight times in the Gospel, sixteen in Acts, and only thrice in John, χαρίζομαι, χαριτόω; εὐαγγελίζομαι very frequent, while εὐαγγέλιον does not appear at all.⁸⁶

In comparing the Gospel with Acts, it is apparent that the style of the latter is more pure and free from Hebraisms, and too style of the latter part of Acts is more pure than the style of the first part. Hebrew idioms seem to disappear in those scenes of which he was an eyewitness and which he describes entirely in his own words.⁸⁷

The syntax. – A number of syntactical usages occur so frequently in Luke-Acts, that they may be considered characteristic:

Πρός with the accusative is preferred to too simple dative after verbs of saying. This construction occurs 151 times in the Gospel and Acts, and 25 times in the rest of the NT. Another noteworthy usage is that of γίνομαι followed by καί, a finite verb, or an infinitive; these are almost confined to St. Luke, in whose writings they are found more than 50 times. His use of the optative, a mood comparatively rare in the NT, is also remarkable. In regard to conjunctions, his fondness for τε, especially in Ac, has been already noticed; he shares with St. Paul a fondness for the expression δὲ καί.⁸⁸

φόρος for κήρυκτος .

⁸⁵ See ch. IV for a more detailed discussion of Luke's medical matters.

⁸⁶ M'Clintock and Strong, *Encyclopedia*, V, 555.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, V, 556.

⁸⁸ Bebb, "Gospel of Luke," III, 169-70. Complete lists of syntactical peculiarities will be found in Plummer, pp. lxxv-lxxvi.

The doublets. – A distinctive stylistic feature of Luke is the presence of doublets.⁸⁹ Doublets are repetitions of words, phrases, or identical or closely similar incidents. As an example of word doublets, the following passages may be cited: "Lord , Lord" (6:46); "Master, Master" (8:24); "Martha, Martha" (10:4); "Jerusalem, Jerusalem" (12:34); "Simon, Simon" (22:31); "crucify, crucify" (23:24).⁹⁰

The contrasts. – It has rightly been remarked that Luke is a Gospel of contrasts. Starting with the contrast between the doubt of Zacharias and the trustful obedience of Mary, almost every chapter contains striking contrasts of persons. Luke alone mentions Simon and the sinful woman, Martha and Mary, the ungrateful Jewish lepers and the grateful Samaritan leper, the unneighborly Levite and priest and the neighborly Samaritan, the rich man and Lazarus, the Pharisee and the publican, the prodigal and his elder brother, the tears and the hosannas on the brow of Olivet. He alone contrasts the woes with the blessings in the sermon on the plain and records the penitent and the blaspheming malefactor.

The development

The order. – Luke's general order and outline is basically that of the Gospel of Mark. However, the content of the Third Gospel differs significantly from Mark. The differences between the two are exhibited in Luke's omissions and additions. Luke's major omission or the so-called *great lacuna* comes after Luke 9:17, where chronologically Mark 6:45-8:26 would seem to fit in. This omission is compensated for by the three extensive additions not found in Mark.

Luke records too early history of John and Jesus, 1:5-2:52, which is of distinctly Jewish-Christian character. Next, there is the little insertion in 6:20-8:3, including Luke's sermon on the plain. Finally, Luke adds the large central section, 9:51-18:14, which is the center and core of the Third Gospel. The section makes up almost one- third of the whole Gospel and contains practically all of Luke's distinctive contributions to the Gospel story, including many of the beautiful parables of Christ. However, despite the great importance of the section, the great

⁸⁹ Morgenthaler, *Lukanische*, I, 16-194, contains the most exhaustive treatment of doublets in Luke-Acts. He lists etymological, tautological, anithetical, titular, geographical, and memomatic doublets, and feels they are used to confirm the truth of Luke.

⁹⁰ Doublets of identical sentences are found in such passages as 8:16 and 11:33; 8:17 and 12:2; 8:18 and 19:26; 9:3 and 10:4. Doublets of incidents are very prominent. Luke records two songs in ch. 1; two welcomes in the temple (2:28, 38); two conversions of publicans , Levi and Zacchaeus (5; 19); two commissions , the twelve and the seventy (9; 10); two disputes as to who is the greatest (9:46; 12:24); two persons who are raised from the dead (7:17; 8:54); two instances of cleansing lepers (5:13; 17:14); two forgiving of sins (5:20; 7:48); two discourses concerning the future (17; 21); and two announcements of Jerusalem's doom (19; 21). These illustrations could be multiplied. Luke's literary talent is obvious.

variety of names given to it – the Travel Narrative, the Perean Section, the Samaritan Document, the Great Interpolation – shows that the commentators have been unable to cope with it. Bultmann speaks of it as a fiction of Luke.⁹¹ Others see it as either a wholesale copying from the Logia of Matthew,⁹² a strange combination of reliable and unreliable written and oral tradition,⁹³ a Christian Deuteronomy,⁹⁴ or a concocted symbolic entity, meant to set out a certain conception of Christology.⁹⁵ On the other hand, conservative scholars have maintained the trustworthiness and purposefulness of this section,⁹⁶ and have demonstrated its chronological sequence and its harmonious relationship to Mark⁹⁷ and to John.⁹⁸

This central section details Christ's final journey⁹⁹ to Jerusalem. Its theological significance lies in the fact that Christ is determined to go to Jerusalem to be rejected and crucified (13:22; 18:31; 19:11, 28). As the great Teacher He instructs His disciples in the light of His rejection.

The arrangement. – In general, Luke's Gospel is arranged chronologically, except where, because of the indefiniteness of his sources, Luke was uncertain himself of the time

⁹¹ Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), p, 24.

⁹² A. Resch, "Pragmatische Analyse der grossen Einschaltung des Lukas," *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, XXI and XXII (1876, 1877), 654-696, 65-92.

⁹³ Bo Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," *Studia Evangelica*, ed. Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Harald Riesenfeld, and W. C. van Unnik (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), pp. 206-216.

⁹⁴ C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 42.

⁹⁵ Conzelmann, *Theology*, pp. 60-65.

⁹⁶ Ned B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Luke to Christ* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), pp. 125-27.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ H. E. Guilleband, "The Travel Narrative in St. Luke," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXX (April, 1923), 237-245.

⁹⁹ Guilleband feels that Luke covers Christ's three journeys to Jerusalem, agreeing with John 7:10-12:19.

element.¹⁰⁰ The chronological order itself seems modified only where Luke's special theological interests determine his arrangement. There are two very important concepts in Luke-Acts which explain certain peculiarities of arrangement. They are the city of Jerusalem and the temple.¹⁰¹ The whole structure of the book seems to revolve around these places. Morgenthaler¹⁰² sees this arrangement in Acts as well. Thus he sets forth the structure of Luke- Acts in the following manner:

Scenes in Jerusalem I	Luke 1:5-4:13
Travel Narrative I	4:14-19:44
Scenes in Jerusalem II	19:45-24:53
Scenes in Jerusalem III	Acts 1:4-7:60
Travel Narrative II	8:1-21:17
Scenes in Jerusalem IV	21:18-26:31
Travel Narrative III	27:1-28:31

In Luke, Morgenthaler¹⁰³ sees the Jerusalem scenes always framed by temple scenes. This structural design explains why Luke opens and closes the Gospel with a temple scene and why he differs from Matthew in the order of the last two temptations of Christ. Luke records that the last temptation took place at the temple. The arrangement of Luke's Gospel would therefore be thus:

Temple Scene: Zacharias 1:5-22
Temple Scene: Simeon and Anna 2:21-37
Jerusalem Scene: 1:5-4:13 Preparation
Temple Scene: Twelve-year old Jesus 2:46
Temple Scene: Third Temptation 4:9
Travel Narrative: Galilee 4:14 -9: 50
Travel Narrative: Samaria 9:51-19:44

¹⁰⁰ For a list of the many indefinite time indications see Davidson, II, 50. For convincing evidence that the Third Gospel follows chronological sequence, see Birks, pp. 31-38.

¹⁰¹ There are six occurrences of Jerusalem in chapters 1-2, twenty- four in the rest of Luke, and sixty-four in Acts. The temple is mentioned six times in chapters 1-2, eighteen times in the rest of Luke, and twenty- seven times in Acts. For the importance of Jerusalem and the temple in Luke see Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966), p. 370, and P. Simpson, "The Drama of the City of God. Jerusalem in St. Luke's Gospel," *Scripture*, XV (1963), 65-80.

¹⁰² Morgenthaler, *Lukanische*, I, 163.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, I, 164-174. He shows the amazing parallelism between the first and second Jerusalem scenes, and the first and second parts of the travel narratives.

Temple Scene: Cleansing of the Temple 19 :45
Jerusalem Scene: 19:45-24:53 Passion
Temple Scene: Disciples Rejoicing 24:53

Without a doubt, Luke had some such artistic arrangement in mind when he wrote. Jerusalem is the city of salvation. Here the universal Gospel had its beginning. From here it sent forth to the whole world. ¹⁰⁴

The outline. –

- I. The prologue to the Gospel of the Son of Man (1:1-4)
- II. The incarnation of the Son of Man (1:5-2:52)
 - A. The announcement of the forerunner (1:5-25)
 - B. The announcement of the Son of Man (1:26-56)
 - C. The advent of the forerunner (1:57-80)
 - D. The advent of the Son of Man (2:1-52)
- III. The preparation of the Son of Man (3:1 - 4:13)
 - A. The forerunner of the Son of Man (3 :1-20)
 - B. The baptism of the Son of Man (3 :23-38)
 - C. The genealogy of the Son of Man (3:23-38)
 - D. The temptation of the Son of Man (4:1-13)
- IV. The ministration of the Son of Man (4:14-9:50)
 - A. The authority of the Son of Man (4:14-6:11)
 - B. The associates of the Son of Man (6:12-49)
 - C. The activities of the Son of Man (7:1-9:50)
- V. The repudiation of the Son of Man (9:51-19:27)
 - A. Incidents of His repudiation (9:51-11:13)
 - B. Instructions in light of His repudiation (12:1-19:27)
- VI. The condemnation of the Son of Man (19: 28-23: 56)

¹⁰⁴ Rienecker (p, 5) thinks that the Third Gospel revolves three cities, Nazareth, Capernaum, and Jerusalem, and that Acts can be summarized with the names Jerusalem, Antioch, and Rome. Lee's comment is much to the point: "Luke arranged his material with a dramatist's art; and a good dramatist likes to avoid unnecessary changes of scene. The climax of the Gospel is set in Jerusalem, as that of the Acts is set in Rome. In both books we notice that, once the capital has been reached, there is no further change of scene to weaken the grandeur of the climax." G. M. Lee, "The Resurrection Appearances in Luke," *The Expository Times*, LXV (October, 1953 - September, 1964), 158.

- A. The presentation of the Son of Man (19:28-47)
 - B. The pronouncements of the Son of Man (20:1-22:6)
 - C. The passover of the Son of Man (22:7-22:35)
 - D. The passion of the Son of Man (22:39-23:56)
- VII. The exaltation of the Son of Man (24:1-53)
- A. The announcement to the woman (24:1-12)
 - B. The appearances to the disciples (24:13-49)
 - C. The ascension of the Son of Man (24:50-53)

Comparisons and Contrasts

Luke and other New Testament writers

Comparison with the Evangelists. – Each Evangelist emphasizes a slightly different aspect of Christ. Most perceptive writers recognize the unique portraits of Christ given by the Gospel writers. Matthew presents Christ as the King (Zech. 9 :9). Mark presents Christ as the Servant (Isa. 42:1). John pictures Christ as the Son of God (Isa. 40:4), but our Evangelist presents Him as the Son of Man.¹⁰⁵ It must not be forgotten, however, that the Gospels, especially the Synoptic Gospels, resemble one another in purpose, scope, and content much more than they differ from one another.

Comparison of Luke and Paul. – Since Luke was an intimate friend, travel-companion, and co-worker of Paul, it would be strange if a Pauline influence on Luke could not be seen. It may well be said that the Third Gospel breathes the spirit of Paul. Luke has many words in common with Paul,¹⁰⁶ and many prominent Pauline ideas are found in Luke. Both men stress the universality of the Gospel, the need of faith (πίστις), the grace (χάρις) of God shown to man, His forgiveness and salvation (σωτηρία), and justification by faith (e.g. 17:10; 18:14). The account of the Lord's Supper by Luke (22:19-20b) is almost identical with that of Paul (I Cor. 11:23-25), and there are points of resemblance in the resurrection accounts (Luke 24; I Cor. 15:1-7). Both emphasize the ministry of the Holy Spirit.

Luke and special material

Luke's Gospel is more comprehensive in subject matter than any of the others. Many

¹⁰⁵ For a more detailed comparison of Luke with the other Synoptics, see M. F. Unger, *Bible Handbook* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1966), p , 512. Harnack (pp. 224-231) compares Luke with John and extensive comparisons of the Gospels can be found in Andrew Jukes, *The Characteristic Differences of the Four Gospels* (London: James Nisbet and Company, 1878).

¹⁰⁶ Points of language common to Luke and Paul have been fully tabulated by Plummer, pp. xliv-xlv, liv-liv.

events, miracles, parables, discourses, holy songs, and other matters recorded by Luke are found nowhere else. He preserved some of the most beautiful treasures of God's truth.

Events. – (1) The events surrounding the birth of John, the birth of the Lord Himself, His circumcision, presentation in the temple, and His visit to the temple at age twelve.
(2) Most of the incidents included in 9:51-19:28, such as the sending of the seventy, Christ's visit by Mary and Martha, the slain Galileans, Zacchaeus, and Christ's tears over Jerusalem.
(3) Circumstances surrounding the trial and death of Jesus: His look on Peter, the trial before Herod, three sayings of the cross, the prayer for His executioners, the promise to the penitent thief, and the dismissal of His spirit.
(4) Circumstances surrounding the resurrection, the appearance to Peter, the Emmaus disciples, and His ascension.

Miracles. – Six of the twenty miracles which Luke records are distinctive to him:
(1) A miracle of nature, the miraculous catch of fishes (5:1-11);
(2) a miracle of resurrection, raising the widow's son at Nain (7:11-17); and
(3) miracles of healing, the impotent woman (13:10-17),
(4) the man with the dropsy (14:1-6),
(5) the ten lepers (17:11-19), and
(6) Malchus' ear (22:50-51).

Parables. – Nothing emphasizes Luke's contrast with the two other Synoptics quite as much as does his distinctive selection of the Savior's parables. Nineteen of Luke's thirty-five parables are peculiar to him.¹⁰⁷ Three have reference to **prayer**: the friend at midnight (11:5-8), the unjust judge (18:1-8), and the Pharisee and publican (18:10-14). Illustrating **the seeking and forgiving love of God** are the following: the twin parables of the lost coin and the lost son (15:8-31), the two debtors (7:41-43), the barren fig tree (13:6-9), the great supper (14:12-24). **Man's relation to his fellow-man** is set forth in the parable of the good Samaritan (10:30-37) and that concerning the chief seats (14:7-11). **Discipleship** is taught in the parables of the unfinished tower and the unwaged war (14:28-31), and **expectancy** taught by the watching servants and the faithful steward (12:35-48).

Discourses. – Some of Christ's major discourses are unique to Luke:
(1) The message at Nazareth (4:16-20);
(2) instructions to the seventy (10:1-16);
(3) utterances in the great insertion (9:51-19:28); and
(4) the conversation with the Emmaus disciples (24:13-35).

Holy songs. – These are the *Magnificat*, or the Song of Mary (1:46-55); the *Benedictus*, or the Psalm of Zacharias (1:68-79); the *Gloria in Excelsis*, or the Song of the Angels (2:14); and the *Nunc Dimittis*, or the Song of Simeon (2:29-32).

¹⁰⁷ Scroggie, *Guide*, pp. 351-352.

Angelic appearances. – The Third Gospel begins and closes with the record of ministering angels. Gabriel appears to Zacharias (1:11) and to Mary (1:26-27). A multitude of angels appears to the shepherds (2:9). An angel strengthened Christ in Gethsemane (22:43), and two angels proclaim His resurrection (24:4).

CHAPTER III

CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO LUCAN THEOLOGY

The modern interest in the Gospel of Luke seems to have started with Joseph Ernest Renan (1823-1892). Renan, "whose artistic judgment was as sound as his misunderstanding of Christ's message was abysmal,"¹ looked upon the Third Gospel as the most beautiful book in the world. His interest in Luke, expressed in his *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme* (1886), was purely that of an artist.

The Period before 1950

A century ago F. C. Baur and his "Tübingen School" made a sharp distinction between Paul the Apostle as presented in Acts and Paul's own witness in his epistles. The un-Pauline character of the death of Christ and the philosophy in Acts brought him to the opinion that Acts was a second-century synthesis, mediating a quarrel between Jewish Christianity and the followers of Paul.²

Representatives of the period

The criticism of the last century had come to the conclusion that Luke-Acts is the work of one hand, but it rejected that this was Luke's hand. In the words of Saintsbury: "It has been the mission of the nineteenth century to prove that everybody's work was written by somebody else."³

Not until the publication of *Luke the Physician* (1906) by the rationalistic German theologian Adolf Harnack, in which he completely reversed his former views and admitted that Luke the Physician wrote Luke-Acts, did the majority of critics at length concur, that Luke penned the Third Gospel and Acts.

Likewise, the formidable proofs for the Lucan authorship marshalled by Hobart and Ramsey had restored the credit of Luke with many critics.

¹ William F. Arndt, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), p. 27.

² E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1966), pp. 42-43).

³ Cited by J. A. M'Clymont, *New Testament Criticism* (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913), p. 2.

The year 1923 marked the first turning point in Lucan studies. The question of literary sources was left behind, and the form-critical method was introduced in the study of the Gospels. Martin Dibelius (1884-1947) published the first of a series of essays dealing with form criticism (Formkritik) of the Gospels. When he turned to Acts, however, he spoke not of form criticism but of style criticism (Stilkritik). In Acts, Luke is no longer a compiler of tradition but an author with a new style. Dibelius asserted that "the question as to what is tradition and what is the author's own composition has to be repeated with reference to each section."⁴ To be sure, Dibelius still considered Luke to be the author of Acts, but as a historian, he was "not a kind of photographer, but more like a portrait painter,"⁵ or, in the words of Haenchen, "Dibelius has shown that Luke as a composing historian, could present reality in a changed form to make its meaning lucid."⁶

The importance of Dibelius to Lucan studies, as Lindsey precisely states, is that "Dibelius forms a link between the earlier writers who viewed Luke as a historian, and modern writers who view him as a theologian."⁷

Resume of the period

With Dibelius the quest for sources in Acts was abandoned, since most material in Luke-Acts was understood to be Luke's own composition. Luke was shown to be more than a historian in the nineteenth century sense of the word. He composed Acts as an artistic work which is "fundamentally a preaching of the Gospel by Luke in and for his own time,"⁸ enriched by legendary material.

Finally, only the traditional view of Lucan authorship remains. All other traditions concerning Luke-Acts have been abandoned.

The Period after 1950

The post-Dibelian era is interested more with Luke's own theology than with the theology

⁴ Cited by C. K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (London: The Epworth Press, 1961), p. 27.

⁵ Reginald H. Fuller, *The New Testament in Current Study* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p. 94.

⁶ Ernst Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959), p. 45.

⁷ F. Duane Lindsey, "Lucan Theology in Contemporary Perspective," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXV (October-December, 1968), 348.

⁸ Barrett, *Luke*, p. 30.

of the early church which his works allegedly mirror. The renewed interest in Luke as a theologian is well summarized by W. C. van Unnik:

In these studies, Luke appeared no longer as a somewhat shadowy figure who assembled stray pieces of more or less reliable information, but as a theologian of no mean stature who very consciously and deliberately planned and executed his work. Luke the theologian differs not only from Mark and Matthew and John, but also from Paul, whom he admired but misrepresented. The picture drawn by Luke of the life of Jesus and of the early church had an enormous influence on succeeding ages. But Luke was not primarily a historian who wanted to give a record of the past for its own sake, but a theologian who, by way of historical writing, wanted to serve the church of his own day amid the questions and perils that beset her. This "discovery" of Luke the theologian seems to me the great gain of the present phase of Luke-Acts study, whatever may be the final judgment about the character and importance of that theology.⁹

Reasons for the new emphasis

What gave rise to the new impetus to the study of the writings of Luke? Van Unnik¹⁰ offers several reasons.

The rediscovery of Luke the theologian. – Luke wrote Acts in addition to the Gospel. Why did he do so? Does it have a special meaning? These are the questions that scholars tried to answer. Then too, they found a theology in Acts which greatly differed from that found in the Gospel, or so they thought. Next, the "why" of this change had to be explored. The answer was found in the delay of the second coming (Parousieverzögerung). The church had been mistaken about Christ's imminent return, and the emergency had to be met by a new theological reinterpretation of the Gospels. The writer of Acts was the man to do it. Consequently, the efforts of New Testament scholarship were expended on this newly-discovered theologian.

The relationship of history to theology. – C. K. Barrett sees the sudden spurt of Lucan studies in a broader perspective, that of the relationship of history to theology:

It would not be far wrong to say that the focus of New Testament studies is now moving to Lucan writings. The Fourth Gospel raised, in one form, the problems which is always pressed upon the Christian thinker by the nature of his subject, namely, that of the relation between history and theology. It is the same ultimate problem that the Lucan

⁹ W. C. van Unnik, "Luke-Acts, A Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship," *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 23-24.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-30.

writings raise, though they raise it in a different way.¹¹

Much in the same manner Ellis observes: "In the present generation perhaps no question has exercised New Testament students more than the relation of history and interpretation of the Gospels."¹²

The reaction in New Testament scholarship. – There are two further reasons for the new interest in Luke-Acts which suggest themselves to the pedantic mind. One is so obvious that it really needs no formulation. It is apparent from even a cursory survey of the theological scene that New Testament scholarship operates like a pendulum: it swings from one extreme to another. It thrives on action and reaction. Was Luke a reliable historian at the turn of the century, he is now a composing theologian. Was New Testament criticism involved with one New Testament book two decades ago, it is now concentrating on another book. Since the other Gospels have suffered from over-exposure to critical investigation long enough, it was inevitable that Luke's turn would be next. Like the Egyptians in the Red Sea, the other Gospels have gone down under the proud waters of higher criticism and not one of them is left. Now Luke's time has come.

The re-interpretation of Lucan Theology. – Tasker points to one final reason for the current preoccupation with Luke. It is the modern scholars' mistaken view of Luke's theology which endears Luke to their minds. Their "desire for a religion which stresses the love of God at the expense of His severity, and which regards Jesus as an ethical Teacher rather than the Savior of the World"¹³ has led many not only to a new view of Luke's sources, as Tasker states, but also to a new emphasis on Luke the theologian in whom they see the picture of such an ethical Jesus while failing to see His substitutionary atonement.

Representatives of the period

The first New Testament scholar who wrestled with the relationship of history and theology was Ernst Käsemann. According to him a great change took place in the eschatological outlook of the church. The fact that Luke wrote Acts shows to him that the early church despaired of the *parousia* of Christ, "for one does not write the history of the church if one daily expects the end of the world."¹⁴

¹¹ Barrett, *Luke*, p. 50.

¹² Ellis, *Gospel*, p. 6.

¹³ R. V. G. Tasker, *The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1962), p. 55.

¹⁴ Cited by van Unnik, "Luke -Acts," p. 29.

Hans Conzelmann. – Conzelmann resumes this theme of the delayed *parousia* in his epochal work, *The Theology of St. Luke*. The title of this English translation (1960) is less suggestive of the content than the German title, *Die Mitte der Zeit* (1954), or, "The Midpoint of Time."¹⁵ The publication of this work marked the second turning point in Lucan studies. Conzelmann feels that Luke has substituted the expectancy of the early church for an imminent *parousia* with a theology of Heilsgeschichte of three successive periods, moving from creation to the ultimate *parousia*. Conzelmann lists these three periods as

The period of Israel, of the Law and the Prophets. The period of Jesus, which gives a foretaste of future salvation. The period between the coming of Jesus and his Parousia, in other words, the period of the Church and of the Spirit. This is the last age. We are not told that it will be short.¹⁶

These three periods are based on Conzelmann's basic thesis, as explained by Marshall:

Conzelmann's thesis starts from the assumption that the first Christians lived in hope of the imminent parousia of Jesus. A powerful eschatological fervor animated the early Church, but this was in danger of being replaced by disillusionment as the years went by and the parousia was delayed beyond all expectation. In order to retain a living faith for the Church, certain thinkers attempted to come to terms with the new situation and revise their theology. The early apocalyptic fervor had to be replaced by a faith fit for **life in a world that went on in much the same way as it always had done**. A key figure in this metamorphosis of early theology for second and third generation Christians was Luke or, as Conzelmann would hold, the unknown Christian who passes under that name.¹⁷

According to Conzelmann each of these three epochs has its own division and characteristics and although there is some continuity between the periods, they are primarily sharply distinguished. The first period included the work of John the Baptist and ceased with him. The ministry of Jesus was conceived of as a period free from Satanic influence (cf. Luke 4:13; 22:3). This middle period is divided into three phases.

¹⁵ One is inclined to agree with the reviewer who described this volume as "one of the dullest books I have ever read" and referred to "its difficult thought and progression (one's only indication that one has reached the end of the book is that there is no more of it!)." Cited by I. Howard Marshall, "Recent Study of the Gospel According to St. Luke," *The Expository Times*, LXXX (October, 1968), 4.

¹⁶ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 150.

¹⁷ Marshall, "Recent Study," 4-5.

The first is marked by the call of Jesus and the gathering of witnesses in Galilee (3:1-9:50). The second contains the disclosure of the necessity of Christ's passion (9:51-19:27). The third includes the passion at Jerusalem and the ascension (19:28-24:53).¹⁸

The vacuum resulting from the delayed *parousia* was filled up in two ways. First, the time of delay was not to be a period of inactive waiting but one of activity in which God is working out His foreordained plan through the disciples. Second, Luke emphasizes the role of the church, which works as God's institution and instrument until the *parousia*. This, according to Conzelmann, is the pragmatic outworking of God's Heilsgeschichte in the church age.

The work of Conzelmann has the merit of attempting to see the distinctive features of Luke's Gospel and to recognize that Luke-Acts must be treated as one work. He sees that Luke was the first Christian historian for whom not merely the life of Christ but also the history of the church had become important. Further, he correctly assesses Luke's task as an attempt to show the continuity between the life of the church and the earthly ministry of Jesus. And finally, he also re-emphasizes Luke's work in relating Christianity to the world around it. In the words of Marshall:

The Church, now committed to a lengthy period of life in this world, found it necessary to come to terms with such a life and had to work out its attitudes to the Jewish nation out of which it had sprung and to the Roman government under whose sway it existed.¹⁹

How well Conzelmann has understood Luke's theology remains to be seen. It is a fact, however, that every Lucan scholar who wrote since Conzelmann's theology first appeared, has taken issue with him on one or several major points of his premises.²⁰ And this is more than just the ordinary academic feuding so common among theologians. He is being criticized freely on every point of his thesis.

The first charge which is brought against him is that he is mistaken in his view of the "delay of the *parousia*." He is guilty of de-eschatologizing Luke. Marshall writes: "The idea that Lucan theology and reinterpretation of the teaching of Jesus was dependent upon the disillusionment of the Church at the delay of the *parousia* is very much of an exaggeration."²¹

¹⁸ Conzelmann, *Theology*, p. 17.

¹⁹ Marshall, "Recent Study," 5.

²⁰ The only exception seems to be Günther Bornkamm who follows Conzelmann very closely. Cf. Günther Bornkamm, "Synoptische Evangelien," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (3rd ed. ev.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957), II, 764-66.

²¹ Marshall, "Recent Study," 5-6.

Ned B. Stonehouse rightly remarks that the theory of a delayed *parousia* has never been adequately established:

True, as the Thessalonian correspondence and II Peter 3:3f. indicate, there were mockers and some of a mentality akin to gnosticism who reacted critically to the eschatological hope. But these data are far from supporting the widely held conception that after a brief period in which the church was governed by an intense concentration upon the second coming it entered upon a time when it had to adjust its total outlook to the fact that Christ had not appeared on the clouds of heaven.²²

Even Be Reicke admits that this theory of Luke's de-eschatologizing is based on misconceptions:

First, it is impossible to prove that in its original form, the gospel was absolutely eschatological in the sense given to this concept in modern theology, so that Jesus and the Apostles would have dismissed the idea of an interim period before the *parousia*, even if the duration of this intervening period were unknown. ... Second, it is not at all true that Luke represents Jesus and the kingdom of God in a lesser eschatological light than the other Synoptists.²³

A false starting point brings Conzelmann to false results. Richardson has well summarized this dilemma:

It is his perspective, not the evidence, which determines his conclusions. His unhistorical starting-point leads him to the view that St. Luke had to revise his sources because they implied that the *parousia* was at hand and did not envisage any Gentile mission stretching into the future. Conzelmann does not entertain the possibility that St. Luke was in fact being a true historian.²⁴

A second criticism leveled against Conzelmann deals with his misconception of history, or his "de-historizing." Part of this criticism relates to his hypothesis of a "Satan-free" era during the ministry of Jesus. Christ's "middle of time" is supposedly characterized by an absence of Satanic activity. Satan leaves Christ at His temptation (Luke 4:13), not to appear again until the end of Christ's life. The *terminus ad quem* for this period is Luke 22:3 where Luke records that

²² Ned B. Stonehouse, "Hans Conzelmann: The Theology of St. Luke," *Westminster Theological Journal*, XXIV (November, 1961- May, 1962), 67.

²³ Bo Reicke, *The Gospel of Luke*, trans. by Ross Mackenzie (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), pp. 75-76.

²⁴ Alan Richardson, "Second Thoughts III. Present Issues in New Testament Theology," *The Expository Times*, LXXV (October, 1963-September, 1964), 112. Cf. Georg Braumann, "Das Mittel der Zeit," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LIV (1963), 140-45.

Satan entered Judas.²⁵ Marshall calls this view "one of the most vulnerable parts of his theory about Luke,"²⁶ and Stonehouse²⁷ shows the fallacy of taking Luke 22:3 as a clear demarcation between the middle period and the period of the church. The verse has no relation to Luke 4:13. Conzelmann's reference to Luke 22:28 as a proof for the renewed temptation fails to take into account various passages throughout the Gospel which deal with the activity of Satan and the resultant temptation (8:12, 13) and the conflict with Satan in the exorcism of demons (cf. 10:17f.; 11:20ff.; 13:16).

Another aspect of the criticism of Conzelmann's "de-historizing" pertains to his rigid interpretation of history into three distinct periods. Bo Reicke calls such a view

evidently illogical and contrary to known facts. A total vacuum does not produce such a train of thought. Luke shows no interest in divisions of time. ... What interests him is the transition from the situation of the old covenant to the new.²⁸

Conzelmann arbitrarily starts the second period with the temptation of Jesus, and so for him the birth stories have no significance to his assessment of Luke's theology – a rather startling procedure for one who wishes to write a Theology of Luke.

Rather than emphasizing discontinuity between the periods of Heilsgeschichte, Luke actually stresses the unity and continuity. Braumann, in his thorough analysis of Conzelmann's epochal work, sees Luke's purpose not as a presentation of three distinct periods with Christ in the middle of time; rather, he supposes that Luke is showing "by the means of time" that John, together with the Old Testament prophets, as well as the church saints, though persecuted, are on God's side and shall find their reward at the parousia. Braumann concludes:

Luke does not comfort by pointing to an imminent cessation of the affliction, but he answers the problem which troubles the church by the means of time: The parousia brings the end of tribulation; not now, but in a future which is yet very far removed. Then shall come the true settlement of a situation which as yet is not normal.²⁹

Braumann, by placing the *parousia* into the remotest future, goes to a similar extreme. But he does show that a three-fold time division on the basis of a delayed *parousia* is untenable, indeed that with Luke the *parousia* is the important event, not a reinterpretation of the period of

²⁵ Conzelmann, *Theology*, pp. 27-28.

²⁶ Marshall, "Recent Study," 6.

²⁷ Stonehouse, "Hans Conzelmann," 168.

²⁸ Reicke, *Gospel*, p. 57.

²⁹ Braumann, "Das Mittel," 145.

delay.

Besides Conzelmann's mistake concerning the "delayed parousia" and his misconception of history, there is yet another criticism of his method, and that relates to his misrepresentation of Luke's intention of writing history. Marshall, commenting on the matter of historicity acknowledges that modern scholars are deceived:

It is a definite weakness of much recent Lucan study that this question is bypassed or answered in the negative. ... Study of Luke's preface to his Gospel shows that he regards sound history as an indispensable foundation for faith and there is no reason to think that he was "out on a limb" in adopting this attitude. Biblical religion rests upon an interpretation of historical facts in which God was believed to be active; if the events did not take place, or were radically different in character from the report of them, the Biblical interpretation of them cannot be sustained and faith that God has acted in history collapses.³⁰

Conzelmann discounts Luke's historical reliability foremost in the area of geography. He shows that the geographical elements in the Gospel are not primarily topographical, as definite places figuring in a biography, but religious and symbolic in significance. For example, "the mountain" in Luke 6:12 and 9:28-36 "is a mythical place, to which 'the people' cannot come;"³¹ "the plain" (Luke 6:17) is "The place of meeting with the people;"³² the lake (8:22-39) is the abyss on the edge of solitude;³³ the journey (after 9:51) is hardly a change of place, but it "primarily serves another purpose, that of representing a stage of Christological development."³⁴

The best which can be said for such a far-out theory of the Lucan writings which claim to be historical is that which W. Crannell remarked concerning another book on Luke:

A determined commentator with a theory can find or make, consciously or unconsciously, deliberately or "luckily," abundant confirmations of his theory. Such is the selective and transforming power of the human mind. "Mare's nests" are produced by the circular movement of a pivoted mind, in the tall grass of a luxuriant imagination.³⁵

³⁰ Marshall, "Recent study," 6-7.

³¹ Conzelmann, *Theology*, p. 44.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.

³⁵ Philip W. Crannell, "The Watering of Luke," *Review and Expositor*, XXIII (April, 1926), 168.

Conzelmann not only discounts Luke's intention of listing historical places; he also dismisses many statements as historically and factually untrue. A few illustrations must suffice. For one thing, Luke was mistaken about the location of Jericho:

It is true that according to Luke Jesus does come to Jericho, but it is questionable whether Luke knew that this town was in the region of the Jordan. As we shall see later, his acquaintance with Palestine is in many respects imperfect; and from the LXX, of which he made great use, Luke would find nothing to tell him that Jericho was situated in the neighborhood of the Jordan. ³⁶

But, observes F. F. Bruce, "even if Luke was personally unacquainted with that district of Palestine, he had presumably read Joshua and II Kings, where Jericho's proximity to the Jordan is made plain." ³⁷

Conzelmann doubts that Luke knew the position of Capernaum ³⁸ and wonders "whether Luke might not have had an inaccurate picture of the country." ³⁹ The transfer of Mark's resurrection appearances in Galilee to Jerusalem by Luke "has to be seen in the light of the Lucan misunderstanding," ⁴⁰ and the setting of the ascension at Bethany in Luke 24:50 "flatly contradicts the geographical reference in Acts 1:12." ⁴¹

Luke the historian is seen to be totally unreliable. He is ignorant of Palestine's geography and he introduces many discrepancies into the text. ⁴² These mistaken views of Luke betray Conzelmann's arbitrary methodology. Although he tries to play down the question of literary criticism, it is obvious that his own judgment is strongly formulated by his critical presuppositions. He holds to the two- documentary theory in a radical form,

according to which the materials in Luke which find no close parallels in Mark or Matthew are generally regarded as stemming from Luke's own very free manipulation of

³⁶ Conzelmann, *Theology*, p. 19.

³⁷ F. F. Bruce, "History and the Gospel," *Jesus of Nazareth: Saviour and Lord*, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids: Wm., B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966), p. 97.

³⁸ Conzelmann, *Theology*, p. 38.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 96.

his sources or free composition in the interest of setting forth his own point of view.⁴³

Because of this documentary approach, Conzelmann can reject the historicity of Luke while accepting his theology. The position is totally untenable. The idea of historian and theologian are compatible. Marshall's summary is much to the point:

Luke was not imposing an interpretation upon the tradition, but rather selecting and emphasizing certain elements which were already present in it. ... Theology and history need not be opposed to each other, as if it were impossible for a theologian to do justice to historical events.⁴⁴

Philipp Vielhauer. – In 1950, four years before Conzelmann's *The Theology of St. Luke* appeared, Vielhauer attempted to define the proper starting point for a Lucan Theology. In his article "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts"⁴⁵ he makes a critical comparison of the Apostle as he appears in Acts with the Paul of the epistles. He feels that there are four irreconcilable contrasts between the Lucan Paul and the historical Paul or between Luke's theology and Paul's theology.

The first difference is in the area of natural theology. The Areopagus speech, which Luke puts into the mouth of Paul, expresses Stoic natural theology, which is made the new missionary tactic. Whereas the historical Paul strongly condemned the sufficiency of natural theology (Rom. 1:17:ff.), Luke sees it as the "forerunner of faith."⁴⁶

Another point of difference is the matter of legalism. Luke fails to understand Paul's opposition to the law as a way of salvation. The Paul in Acts is a legalist. In Vielhauer's own words:

Luke did know that Paul proclaimed justification by faith, but he did not know its central significance and absolute importance; he thought it has valid primarily for the Gentiles. . . . As a Greek and Gentile Christian Luke had never experienced the Law as a way to salvation and therefore did not understand the Pauline antithesis law – Christ. . . . The whole problem of the law . . . was entirely foreign to Luke.⁴⁷

A third difference is that Luke's "Christology is adoptionistic, not a Christology of

⁴³ Stonehouse, "Hans Conzelmann:" 65.

⁴⁴ Marshall, "Recent Study," 7.

⁴⁵ Philipp Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander Keck and J. Louis Martyn (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 33-50.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

preexistence,"⁴⁸ and, furthermore, "nothing is said of the saving significance of the cross of Christ; and consequently also nothing of the reality of 'in Christ' and of the presence of the whole of salvation."⁴⁹ With Luke, salvation rests solely upon the resurrection of Christ.

The last point of conflict between Luke and Paul is in the realm of Eschatology. "Eschatology has been removed from the center of Pauline faith to the end and has become a 'section on the last things.'"⁵⁰ Here Vielhauer prepared the way for Conzelmann's idea of a "delayed parousia." The shattered hope for the return of Christ makes place for the sure hope of redemption in history (Heilsgeschehen).

Vielhauer's investigation attempts to find a starting point for Lucan Theology, but like Conzelmann's work, it does so at the expense of ignoring the most basic principles of Biblical Theology, that of failing to take into account the underlying motive of Luke's writing, that is, to accurately record – not arbitrarily distort – the beginning of the church. If Vielhauer is correct, Luke was a bad student of Paul as well as a bungling theologian.

Ernst Haenchen. – An introductory chapter, "Luke as Theologian, Historian, and Author" in his commentary on Acts (1959) sums up Haenchen's own views on Luke. He sees an unusually close connection between the three ideas discussed in that chapter. Two theological concerns prompt Luke to write: the nearness of the end and the freedom of the Gentile mission from the law.⁵¹

Haenchen follows Conzelmann in many particulars. He looks upon Luke-Acts as a consciously literary work and the Third Gospel as the first real life of Christ. For him too, Luke has given up the hope of an imminent parousia and is interested in writing Acts as a letter of edification (Erbauungsbuch) in light of the new interim period.⁵² Haenchen agrees with Conzelmann's division of time into three periods, but feels that there are two phases in the last period: the time of the Apostles, an ideal time free of heresy, and the time after the Apostles, or Luke's time.

Like Vielhauer, Haenchen can say: "The Lucan picture of Paul does not agree with that of the Pauline letters."⁵³ He gives three illustrations of this contradiction. For one thing, "Luke

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 84-85.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p 100.

paints Paul as the great miracle worker,"⁵⁴ whereas the real Paul made little use of his ability to perform miracles. Then too, "the Lucan Paul is an extraordinary orator . . . but the real Paul was – and he admits that himself – everything else but a master of improvised speech."⁵⁵ Finally, in Acts Paul is inferior to the twelve Apostles because he must constantly appeal to their authority (13:21), while the real Paul demanded to be recognized as a genuine Apostle, equal with the twelve (Gal. 2:8).⁵⁶

Haenchen considers Acts primarily as a creation by Luke himself who had no recourse to sources. Luke lived long after Paul and only had access to some of the *praxeis* of Peter and Paul. Luke contributes to Acts the speeches, of which eight are by Peter and nine by Paul; he expands an itinerary of Paul, not identical with the "we" sections; and he adds generalizing summaries which are designed to indicate the progress of the Gospel in the Roman world.⁵⁷

J. C. O'Neill. – O'Neill's book, *The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting*, appeared in 1961, and is another indication of the popularity of Lucan Theology. The failure of the author to state his reasons for writing this theology of Acts points either to an oversight on his part or to the obvious, namely, that Luke-Acts is in vogue and the bandwagon still has many empty seats.

O'Neill, as modern scholar, says the usual in the usual way. For example: "The *terminus a quo* for Luke-Acts is about A. D. 115 and the *terminus ad quem* is about A. D. 130, but the naming of these dates gives an air of precision to the case which is scarcely warranted."⁵⁸

O'Neill, like Vielhauer and Haenchen, acknowledges that the theology of Acts is un-Pauline, but he bases the late date on the similarity of outlook between Acts and Clement of Rome, the non-Pauline Pastorals, but especially Justin Martyr.⁵⁹

Furthermore, as H. H. Oliver notes: "It is a special feature of O'Neill's argument that Luke wrote at a time when the real origins of the church were unknown and when the theology of

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 101-2.

⁵⁷ Summarized by Fuller, *New Testament*, pp. 97-100.

⁵⁸ J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting* (London: S. P. C. K., 1961), p. 21.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-18. C. S. Williams, "Luke -Acts in Recent Study," *The Expository Times*, LXXIII (October, 1961-September, 1962), 133, has shown how untenable this view is.

early catholicism was the only perspective available.⁶⁰

O'Neill writes about the inevitability of Luke's catholicism:

Luke's theology shows these traces of "early catholicism" because he lived at a time when the organized church could scarcely entertain any other theology: the pressure of the End had given way to the pressures of a continuing historical future, and the rich and varied traditions of the past had to be fused, consciously or unconsciously, into a coherent body of doctrine.⁶¹

This differs from Conzelmann who views Luke as an independent theologian with an original point of view. But like Conzelmann, he fails to deal adequately with the nativity stories in Luke. They tell us nothing about Luke's theology. Rather, "it is important to see that Luke's primary aim was to preach the gospel to unbelievers,"⁶² and that one see the central purpose of Luke-Acts as being an apology:

The conclusion to which we have been driven is that Luke-Acts was primarily an attempt to persuade educated Romans to become Christians; it was an "apology" in outward form but, like all true apologies, it had the burning inner purpose of bringing men to the faith.⁶³

The fact that it was an apology does not imply "that Acts was chiefly designed to gain official recognition of Christianity,"⁶⁴ but an attempt "to win educated converts for the faith."⁶⁵ The purpose explains the importance of the cities of Rome and Jerusalem in Luke-Acts. "Rome is the goal of the work but Jerusalem is the centre to which the action of the gospel proceeds."⁶⁶ And just as the Gospel of Luke, so Acts ends not with a death, but a place – Rome.

Helmut Flender. – Since Conzelmann, Lucan studies have centered around various points in his expositions, supplementing and correcting them. H. Flender's *Heil und Geschichte*

⁶⁰ H. H. Oliver, "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke- Acts," *New Testament Studies*, X (1963-1964), 204.

⁶¹ O'Neill, *Theology*, p. 168.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 173.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

in der Theologie des Lukas (1965), which has recently been made available in English as *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History* (1967), is such a study. The main thrust of this book, a doctor's dissertation, submitted to the University of Erlangen in 1964, has been concisely summarized by Marshall:

Flender's book is not easy to read; this may be because he finds a "dialectical" method of presentation in Luke, and one reader at least has never been able to give a clear and unambiguous content to this adjective. What Flender tries to do is to show that Conzelmann's presentation of Lucan theology is somewhat one-sided and to lay bare a number of other themes which he considers to be of equal importance. He devotes a considerable amount of attention to Christ's heavenly and earthly modes of existence, but since he is more concerned with Luke's theology of history than with Luke's picture of the earthly Jesus, his work is less relevant for those whose interest lies in the Jesus of the Gospels.⁶⁷

For Flender, Luke belongs to the post-Apostolic age. He does not belong to Paul's period nor could he "simply reproduce the theology of the apostolic age."⁶⁸ Luke found himself in a dialectical dilemma. The shift in time meant that "the Proclaimer had to become the Proclaimed."⁶⁹ It is this two-sided truth which forms the theme of Lucan Theology. How would Luke present this to the people? He does so in three dialectic constructions:

- (1) The old fallen world and the new redeemed world. They are two spheres of existence whose gap is bridged by the Gospel.
- (2) The created church and yet the constantly recreated church through the Holy Spirit. These two ways of expression are superseded by the heavenly "Christ event."
- (3) The facticity of salvation in the past and the appropriation of the redemptive event in the present. This supernatural mystery and earthly visibility of Christ are the two aspects of our experience, united by a decision of faith.⁷⁰

In the eyes of Flender, Luke is an independent theologian because he tackles the problem "of relating the ongoing history of the world, in which the Christ event was staged, with the new

⁶⁷ Marshall, "Recent Studies," 5.

⁶⁸ Helmut Flender, *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*, trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 163.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 165-67.

world of God which Christ brought." ⁷¹

Rejection of the New Emphasis

In the discussion of Conzelmann it has already been indicated how far afield from the basic premises of Biblical Theology modern Lucan studies have gone. Writing of modern New Testament scholars, Lewis A. Foster incisively observes:

They adapt their materials to fit their preconceived framework dictated by the current world-view and interests of the hour. This is their basis. They strain as oarsmen rowing boats that are tied to the dock. Tied to a dock of their own making: naturalistic development, historical relativity, epistemological uncertainty. The only difference among them is that some have more rope than others, but they are still tied to the dock. A certain degree of the supernatural has even come into vogue with the new tendency. But it is noteworthy that resistance is still maintained against any Biblical miracles. ... It seems that one of the unwritten laws of modernity is that one cannot turn back to believe what a former age has accepted, regardless of whether it is true or false. ⁷²

There appear to be at least four reasons why current Lucan studies cannot be accepted.

Error concerning the purpose of Luke. – First, all modern attempts of a formulation of Lucan theology err in the area of the purpose of Luke. Luke claims to write accurate history; Lucan scholars assert that he does not. The attack on the trustworthiness of Luke's history follows two main lines, neatly summarized by Morgenthaler:

1. Luke's historical writing is a work of art, but is not truly historical; for art has to do with aesthetics, and has nothing at all to do with crude historicity.

2. Luke's historical writing is testimony, but is by no means truly historical; for testimony has to do with theology, and has nothing at all to do with crude historicity. ⁷³

Error concerning the person of Luke. – A further error of Lucan Theology relates to the person of Luke himself. Supposedly, the composer of Luke-Acts was neither a companion of Paul nor his contemporary. It is actually assumed by just about everybody that Luke -Acts belongs to the time after the destruction of Jerusalem the way partridges belong in pear trees.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

⁷² Lewis A. Foster, "Basis for the Historical Jesus," *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society*, VI (Fall, 1963), 111.

⁷³ Robert Morgenthaler, *Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis* (2 vols.; Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949), II, 25.

Kümmel lists those who deny the Lucan authorship of Acts: Wendt, Windisch, Beyer, Conzelmann, Haenchen, Vielhauer, Klein, Evans, and O'Neill.⁷⁴ This denial of the Lucan authorship makes the writer of Acts, who also claimed to have written the Gospel of Luke, something less than honest, because the "we" sections are consequently deceptive, being used to give the appearance of an eye-witness report, when actually the writer lived long after the time of Paul.

Error concerning the plainness of the Word. – A third error of Lucan theology deals with what may be called the plainness of the Word. Luke's message is plain enough. How could it be possible for scholars to arrive at such varied conclusions concerning Luke's theology? It appears that reason has exalted itself above revelation. The theological hemlines are adjusted to the latest fashion. Scholars constantly look for something new. Without a novel theory to propound New Testament scholars are as aimless as a chiropractor without a spine.

Morgenthaler humorously explains the fluctuating course of Lucan studies:

It so happened that on a certain day a certain scholar for certain reasons said concerning a certain point of the Lucan work that it is historically good. Whereupon there came another and proved that the subject was changed, altered, and stylistically transformed at specifically this point. Therefore it, is unhistoric. Then there came another one and on the basis of most careful studies came to the conclusion that *despite* the undeniable work of Luke on the passage, it is historical. Whereupon someone else came again who on the basis of this undeniable work of Luke proved the unhistoricity of the matter, but who, in turn, gave place to another who flatly maintained that the matter was so obviously historical, that it could in no way be viewed as Luke's work. The history of Lucan criticism is an endless *circulus vitiosus*: truth – composition – truth – composition – truth.⁷⁵

Error concerning the promise of Christ. – A final error of Lucan theology is its refusal to take seriously the promise of Christ⁷⁶ in John 16:12-15 which, although given to the Apostles,

⁷⁴ P. Feine, J. Behm, and Werner Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. A. J. Hattill (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 131.

⁷⁵ Morgenthaler, *Lukanische*, II, 94.

⁷⁶ Barrett, a Lucan scholar, may be taken as a representative of a total rejection of the authority of Christ and Scriptures. To him, Gospel "tradition itself is not interested in the niceties of accurate narrative; it is interested in God." "Jesus' human estimates [of his future vindication] fell . . . far short of the facts," but "by being mistaken in detail, Jesus was more effectively shown to be right in all that really mattered than he could have been by small-scale accuracy." C. K. Barrett, *Jesus and the Gospel Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), pp. 107-8.

equally applies to all those men who were by God foreordained to pen the words of sacred Scripture. Does not this promise of the superintending enablement of the Holy Spirit for accuracy apply to Luke as well, who in God's providence was found worthy to contribute more than any other individual to the New Testament canon?

CHAPTER IV

SPECIAL EMPHASES OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

A most enjoyable as well as a most necessary preliminary task to the study of the theology of any book is an exploration of the book for the special emphases of the writer. Especially each of the Gospels has its own characteristics because of the purpose and theological interest of the writers. It is well, therefore, to examine Luke's over-all emphases before making a detailed study of the theology of his Gospel.

Interest in Universalism

The primary distinctive emphasis of Luke's work is the universalism which colors it from beginning to end. The word universalism does not "imply that the devil too will be saved,"¹ but rather, that Luke represents the Gospel as a message for the whole race, and for all societies, classes, and conditions of men. The message which Luke presents is not merely for the Gentiles as such, as distinguished from the Jews, but for all men. This catholicity is rather interwoven with the Gospel but some specific instances will make clear Luke's universal outlook.

The destination

In the first place, the Gospel was written by a Gentile – the only Gentile to write Scripture – to a Gentile, namely the "most excellent Theophilus" (1:3). Moreover, it furnishes almost exclusively the connecting links between Gospel history and contemporary Gentile history (2:1-2; 3:1) in an apparent attempt to appeal to Gentile readers.

The genealogy

Another indication of Luke's universal outlook is found in his genealogy of Jesus. Matthew traces the genealogy back to Abraham (Matt. 1:2), the founder and father of the Jewish nation. Luke traces it through David and Abraham back to Adam, the father of the human race (3:38) and adds that Adam was the son of God. Luke shows that Jesus was a Jew and belonged to the Jewish race, but that He was more than that: He was a man, and He belonged to all.

The offer of salvation

¹ N. Q. King, "The 'Universalism' of the Third Gospel," *Studia Evangelica*, ed. Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Harald Riesenfeld and W. C. van Unnick (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), p. 1919. King rejects the idea that Luke is universal in outlook, so does W. A. Knight, "The Social Outlook in Matthew and Luke," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXVI (1909), 199-202.

Luke shows that the Gospel is for everyone. It is not provincial. Many expressions show this outreach. The good tidings came to "all people" (2:10) and to "men" (2:14); salvation was prepared before the face of "all peoples" (2:31) and to "the Gentiles" (2:32); "all, flesh" shall see God's salvation (3:6); Jesus came to seek and save "the lost one" (19:10); and the Gospel was to be preached to "all the nations" (24:47).

While Luke emphasizes that salvation is for everyone, he indicates that this includes all groups and classes:

Admission to the Kingdom is open to Samaritans (ix. 51-6, x. 30-7, xvii. 11-19) and pagans (ii. 32, iii. 6, 38, iv. 25-7, 1 vii. 9, x, 1, xxiv. 47) as well, as to the Jews (i. 33, ii. 10); to publicans, sinners and outcasts (iii. 12, v. 27-32, vii. 37-50, xix. 2-10, xxiii. 43) as well as to respectable people (vii. 36, xi. 37, xi.v, 1); to the poor (1, 53, ii. 7, vi. 20, vii. 22) as well as to the rich (x.u. 2, xxiii. 50), and to women as well as to men. So universal and all embracing, according to the Gospel, is the redeeming work of Christ!²

Old Testament quotes

Luke has fewer Old Testament quotes than any of the other Gospel writers. He says little about the fulfillment of prophecy, because that would not greatly interest Gentile readers (3:4; 4:21; 21:22; 22:37; 24:44). In all except the first passage Christ addresses Jews. Only eight of Luke's twenty-four references to the Old Testament are peculiar to him.³

All four Gospels quote Isaiah 40:3ff as foretelling the coming of the herald of the Messiah. Matthew 3:3, Mark (1:2-3), and John (1:23) have: "The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." But only Luke deliberately continues the quotation to include the universal promise, "and all flesh shall see the salvation of God."

Omissions

Barclay remarks that what Luke omits is as significant as what he includes:

He omits the saying in Matthew that that which is holy must not be given to dogs, and pearls must not be cast before swine (Matt. 7.6). Luke does not tell of the sending out of the Twelve, but he does tell of the sending out of the Seventy (Luke 10.1-16). The

² Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), p. 43.

³ For a complete table of quotes cf. John M'Clintock and James Strong, eds., "Luke," *Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1894), V, 556.

accounts are closely parallel, but Luke does not include the command not to go to the Gentiles or the Samaritans (Matt. 10.5). He omits the saying that many are called but few are chosen (Matt. 22.14). He does not tell the story of the Syro-Phoenician woman which he must have known, since he knew Mark's gospel [??] (Matt. 15.21-28; Mark 7.24-30), lest it be hurting to some Gentile.⁴

Luke selected his material and omitted that which could be misunderstood. Nothing was allowed to lessen or limit the universal love of God.

Explanations and Changes

Luke explains and transforms Jewish expressions of his sources to make them more intelligible for the wider Gentile world. He states that Nazareth was a city in Galilee (1:26), gives the same information about Capernaum (4:3), and explains that the feast of unleavened bread was called the Passover (22:1). Luke calls "scribes" "lawyers," substitutes "Master" for "Rabbi" and calls "the sea of Galilee" the "lake of Gennesaret."

The parables

It cannot be by mere chance that the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, the Great Supper, and the Pharisee and the Publican are peculiar to Luke's Gospel. Zahn observes that "a Greek who read the parables in ch. xv. would necessarily apply them to men like himself rather than to the Jews."⁵ **The introductory words of the parables peculiar to Luke** differ remarkably from those in the Gospel of Matthew. In Luke it is always "A certain man," "A certain man fell among thieves," "A certain man made a great supper," etc. Luke's Parables, in form and content, show the Lord as looking out broadly on man, especially on man as lost and yet cared for. Luke's universal Gospel indeed offers a universal salvation.

Interest in Medical Matters

Evidence of Luke's profession is abundant in his Gospel. The expressions he uses, the miracles he records, the parables which he alone tells, and the technical terms he employs, they all point to a physician's interest in medical matters.

Expressions

Healing is mentioned more often in Luke than in Matthew and Mark together. Christ's

⁴ William Barclay, *The First Three Gospels* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), p. 286.

⁵ Theodor Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. John Moore Trout et al. (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1953), III, 71.

first text is: "He hath sent me to heal" (4:18). Luke also quotes the proverb from Christ's lips: "Physician, heal thyself" (4:23). Luke alone records that the power of the Lord was present to heal (5: 17).

Luke's expressions used in the diagnoses of cases emphasize his medical interest. Baxter has summarized some cases:

Peter's mother-in-law had a "*great fever*" (physicians used to distinguish fevers as the "great" and the "small" fevers); the leper was "*full of leprosy*" (v , 12); the paralytic was "taken with a palsy" – in the Greek a technical term, "*struck with paralysis*" (v , 18); the centurion's servant was "sick and *ready to die*" (vii. 2); the woman "with an infirmity was "*bowed together*" and could "*in no wise lift up herself*" (xiii. 11) – and so on. ⁶

The miracles

Of the six miracles recorded by Luke alone, four are miracles of healing. They are the healing of the woman who had a spirit of infirmity for eighteen years (13:10-17), the healing of the man afflicted with the dropsy (14:1-6), the cleansing of the ten lepers (17:11-19), and the restoration of Malchus' severed ear (22:51). Luke is more circumstantial in his description of disease than any other Evangelist, giving the symptoms of the disease, the duration of the sickness, and the patient's recovery.

The parables

In the parable of the Good Samaritan which Luke alone records, the expressions "half dead," "bound up his wounds," "pouring on them oil and wine," and "took care of him" indicate Luke's medical interest.

The story of the Rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31) contains a number of medical terms as well, as shown by Robertson:

Lazarus was "full of sores." The word is peculiar to Luke in the New Testament and is "the regular medical term for ulcerated." Hippocrates has a treatise on "ulcers." "The physician thinks of the absence of medical help: the dogs licked his sores." The dogs gave "the only attention, and, so to speak, medical dressing, which his sores received" (St. Cyril). The words for "cool" and being "in anguish" are common in medical writers, the latter for pain and the former for alleviation. ⁷

⁶ J. Sidlow Baxter, *Explore the Book* (6 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1964), V, 262.

⁷ A. T. Robertson, *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), pp. 97-98.

Technical terms

Hobart's book, *The Medical Language of Luke*, which has been mentioned before, contains some four hundred terms used mostly or solely by Luke among the New Testament writers. Most of these terms are of a strictly technical nature appearing primarily in professional circles. One illustration is the term "needle." While Matthew and Mark have the more common word for "needle," ῥαφίς, Luke (18:25) uses the exclusive word for the surgical needle, βελόνη.

Special Interest in People

Women

Luke has been called the Gospel of Womanhood, and rightly so. The word "woman" appears in Matthew thirty times, in Mark and John nineteen times each, but in Luke forty-three times. Luke mentions thirteen women not mentioned elsewhere in the Gospels, including two whom Christ mentioned in parables (15:8ff; 18:3ff). Luke pictures Christ's love and graciousness as it extended to women and it is remarkable that the Gospel records not a single instance in which a woman actually opposed Jesus during His ministry.

Barclay draws the somber background for the low place of women in the ancient world from which they were rescued by Christ:

There are certain spheres in life in which a woman must always be supreme. The mother will always be queen in her own family, and the good wife will always be the help and support of her husband. But both among the Greeks and the Jews in public life the woman had no place at all. She had no legal rights; if ever she was involved in anything to do with the law her guardian had to act for her. She was not educated. To educate a woman, so the Jewish rabbis said, was to cast pearls before swine. In the normal form of Jewish morning prayer a man thanks God that he has not made him a Gentile, a slave, or a woman.⁸

It is Luke alone who tells of Elizabeth, the wife of Zachariah, the mother of John the Baptist, and the kinswoman of Mary (1:5, 24-25, 27, 58). Luke gives the loveliest picture of Mary the mother of Jesus (1:26-56). It is Luke alone who introduces Anna the prophetess who in the temple rejoiced to see the baby Jesus (2:36-38), who mentions the woman in the house of Simon the Pharisee whom Jesus absolves from her sins (7:36-50). Luke alone mentions the fact that women supported Christ and His disciples: Mary Magdalene out of whom twelve demons had been cast (8:2), Susanna, and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and, consequently, a lady of high society (8:2). Luke alone records the healing of the woman with the issue of blood (8:42-48), the contrasting natures of Martha and Mary (10:38-41), the woman with the two mites (21: 1-4), the weeping daughters of Jerusalem (23 :27-31), and the women at the tomb

⁸ Barclay, *First Three*, pp. 289-90.

(23:55-24:11).

Luke also mentions more widows than the other three Gospel writers together:

Here only we meet Anna the "widow" (ii.); and hear Jesus speak about the "many widows in Israel," and the Sarepta women who "was a widow" (iv.). Here only we meet the sorrowing "widow" of Nain (vii.) and here alone the determined "widow" who would give the judge no rest (xviii.).⁹

Children

The Third Gospel is also a Gospel of infancy and childhood. Only Luke speaks of the birth, infancy, and childhood of John the Baptist and of Jesus. He also gives us glimpses of the boy Jesus at His first Passover (2:40). On three occasions he mentions "only children": the "only son" of the widow of Nain (7:12); Jairus' "only daughter" (18:42); and "the only child," a demon-possessed son whom the disciples could not heal (9:38). Mark and Matthew tell of the little children (παῖδια) that were brought to Jesus, but Luke notes that they were babes (βρέφη; 18:15).

Hayes pays tribute to the Gospel of children with these appropriate words:

The first two chapters of the third Gospel will always be the chapters we will most delight to read to the children, and the chapters which the children, will be most delighted to hear. They will always love best the Gospel with the story of the shepherds and the angels, the Gospel which tells how Jesus allowed the mothers to bring their babies to him, the Gospel written by the beloved physician who loved the little folks and so thought it worth while to write a part of his story for them.¹⁰

Outcasts

As a Christian and as a physician Luke is interested to show that salvation is of immediate concern to the needy classes. He sees their need and applies the remedy.

The poor. – Carpenter writes that "S. Luke's conception of the Church was that it was a body in which the poor and needy for the first time had a fair and equal chance."¹¹ Luke's

⁹ Baxter, *Explore*, V, 252.

¹⁰ D. A. Hayes, *The Most Beautiful Book Ever Written* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1913), p. 115.

¹¹ S. C. Carpenter, *Christianity according to S. Luke* (London: Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1919), p. 201.

sympathy with the poor is so pronounced that his Gospel has actually been charged with Ebionism and with class prejudice.¹² This is far from the truth. Luke is interested in the rich (19:2; 23:50), but he sympathizes with the poor because they need a friend.

Robertson gives a fine sketch of Luke's concern for the poor:

Luke records Jesus as saying at Nazareth that the spirit of the Lord had "anointed me to preach good tiding to the poor" (4:18). Luke has simply "Blessed are ye poor" in 6:20. In the story of Lazarus and the wicked Rich Man the beggar comes out ahead in the end (16 :19-31). No fiercer indictment of a rich fool was ever drawn than in the parable of Jesus recorded by Luke in 12:16-21. Luke represents Christ as inviting lithe poor and maimed and blind and lame" to the supper in the parable (14:21). One of the amazing things about Jesus was his interest in the poor. This great fact was reported to John the Baptist as proof that Jesus was the Messiah (7:22).¹³

Sinners. – The gracious attitude of Jesus toward sinners is usually set in sharp contrast to the moral arrogance and exclusiveness of the Pharisees. Luke showed that while sinners were regarded with contempt by the religious elite, Jesus accepted them genuinely and completely. Various passages illustrate this. Among them is the story of the penitent woman (7:36-50), the three parables of Luke 15, the conversion of Zacchaeus (19:1-10), and the prayer of the outcast publican (18:13). Luke alone records the story of the forgiveness of the thief on the cross (23:40-43).

Samaritans. – The whole Gospel is permeated with a compassionate outreaching towards the outcasts, especially the despised Samaritans. In the accounts of the ten lepers Luke places all the stress on the fact that the only grateful one was a Samaritan (17:18). So too, in complete contrast to Jewish prejudices, Luke records that Christ purposed to travel through one of the Samaritan cities (9:51-56) and tells of Jesus' rebuke to those disciples who wished to bring fire down upon the rejecting Samaritans. Further, the main point of Luke's exclusive parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-37) is that he, a despised half-foreigner, acted in a neighborly manner and therefore fulfilled the Law, unlike the Jewish priest and Levite who refused to show mercy.¹⁴

¹² Knight, "Social Outlook," 205, for those who make these charges: Renan, Keim, Colin Campbell, and Rogge.

¹³ Robertson, *Luke*, pp. 236-37.

¹⁴ M. Kiddle, "The Admission of the Gentiles in Luke's Gospel and Acts," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVI (April, 1935), 165-66. "It requires an effort of mind in the twentieth century to realize that in the first century the significance of this parable was the contrast between the conduct of the despised stranger and that of the representatives of Jewish orthodoxy, and that all the emphasis was on the teaching that the whole question of the

Interest in Prayer

Luke emphasizes prayer more than do the other Evangelists. Presenting Jesus as the Son of Man, he stresses the examples of Christ's prayers. Presenting Jesus as the Great Teacher, he stresses the teaching of Christ concerning prayer. And presenting Jesus as the Great Physician, he emphasizes in his narratives the efficacy of the prayers of others.

While there are occasions when **all** the Synoptics show Jesus at prayer (e. g , in Gethsemane, Matt. 26:39; Mark 14:35; Luke 22:41) and Matthew and Mark show Him retiring to prayer after the feeding of the five thousand (Matt. 14:23; Mark 6:46), there are seven occasions when only Luke shows Jesus at prayer: at His baptism (3:21), before His first conflict with the Jewish leaders (5 :16), before the calling of the Twelve (6:12), before his first prediction of His passion (9:18), before the transfiguration (9:28-29), before He taught His disciples to pray (11:1), and on the cross (23:46). Only Luke records that Jesus prayed for Peter that Peter's faith might stand the test (22:32). Luke shows the True Man praying at each crisis in His life.

The subject of prayer appears also in the Lord's teaching. Only Luke records the three parables of prayer; the parable of the Midnight Appeal (11:5-10), the parable of the Unjust Judge (18:1-8), and the parable of the Pharisee and Publican praying in the temple (18:9-14). Only Luke tells of Jesus' charge to His disciples, "Pray that ye enter not into temptation" (22:32, 40).

Luke's narratives also stress the importance of prayer. Only he records that while Zacharias was in the temple the multitude prayed (1:10) and that Zacharias' own prayers had been heard (1:13). We know through Luke that Anna served God "with fastings and prayers night and day" (2 :37), that John's disciples fasted and prayed (5:33) and that Christ's disciples requested, "Lord teach us to pray" (11: 1).

Interest in Praise and Rejoicing

The Third Gospel begins and ends with worship in the temple. The first chapters record the unique hymns of praise, Mary's *Magnificat* (1:46-55), Zacharias' *Benedictus* (1:68-79), the angel Gabriel's *Ave Maria* (2:14), and Simon's *Nunc Dimittis* (2:29-32). Schaff says concerning these, "They are the last of Hebrew psalms, as well, as the first of Christian hymns."¹⁵

While Matthew's Gospel begins with the wailing for the slaughtered children at Bethlehem and ends with sevenfold "woes" upon the Pharisees who would not believe, Luke

fulfillment of the Law was involved."

¹⁵ Cited by Hayes, *Book*, p. 177.

begins with songs and ends with songs and has rejoicing and praise throughout. ¹⁶

Plummer notes the emphatic theme, of praise:

The expression "praising God" (αἰνεῖν τὸν θεόν) is almost peculiar to Luke in N.T. (ii. 13, 20, xix. 37, xxiv. 53?; Acts ii. 47, ii. 8, 9). Blessing God" (εὐλογεῖν τὸν θεόν) is almost peculiar to Luke (1. 64, ii.28, XXIV. 53?): elsewhere only Jas. iii.9. "Give praise (αἶνον διδόναι) to God" occurs Luke xviii.43 only. So also χαίρειν, which occurs eight times in Matthew and Mark, occurs nineteen times in Luke and Acts; χαρά seven times in Matthew and Mark, thirteen times in Luke and Acts. ¹⁷

Noting this strong emphasis on joy, Hayes asks: "Do not these facts suggest that Luke was about twice as joyful as the ordinary man, and that he was praising God and glorifying God so continually that it seemed to him to be the natural thing to do?" ¹⁸

Again, it is Luke who has various words expressing joy, as Plummer points out above: "exult" and "exultation" (1:14, 44, 47; 10:21), "leap for joy" (4:23), "laughter" (4:21), and "merriment" (15:23, 32). The whole Gospel breathes an air of exultation and joy:

Zacchaeus received the Lord "joyfully"; the shepherd brought home the lost sheep "rejoicing," and would have all his friends and neighbours "rejoice" with him; there is "joy" in the presence of the angels of God over every sinner that repents; the father bids the household "make merry," because the prodigal had come back; and the Gospel ends with "they returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the temple praising and blessing God" (xxiv. 52, 53). ¹⁹

Sympathetic Interest

Hayes remarks that Dante called Luke "the writer of the story of the gentleness of Christ" and adds himself that "only a gentle and lovable spirit could have written a story so beautiful in

¹⁶ The theme of joy, which can receive only scant treatment here, is discussed in great detail by John Navone, "Lucan Joy," *Scripture*, XX (April, 1968), 49-62.

¹⁷ Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), p. xlvi.

¹⁸ Hayes, *Book*, p. 180.

¹⁹ W. Graham Scroggie, *A Guide to the Gospels* (London: Pickering and Inglis Ltd., 1965), p. 372.

style and content as this." ²⁰ Luke shows his own sympathetic heart by recording the sympathy which Christ had for the sinners and the love which He had for the lost. As Scroggie points out so well:

In this Gospel Jesus is the Good Shepherd seeking lost sheep, and the Good Samaritan caring for wayside victims. He did not reject the immoral woman of chap. vii. 36-50; nor hesitate to befriend the unethical Zacchaeus of chap. xix, 5; nor to forgive the repentant robber of chap. xxiii. 42, 43. He pardons a helpless debtor (vii.42); aids a needy friend (xi. 5-8); entertains outcasts (xiv. 21), and listens to the cry of widows (xviii. 1-8). ²¹

The Son of Man whom Luke presents is the friend of sinners. His sympathy, however, is discriminating. He can be severe when arrogance, self-sufficiency, and levity are displayed (12:19; 13:1, 11; 16:19-31) but He is sympathetic to every sincere and seeking heart.

Interest in Forgiveness

The Christ of Luke's Gospel is ever proclaiming the forgiveness of God to the penitent sinner. A mere glance at the passages which are unique to Luke shows how important this aspect of the Lord's teaching and preaching was to him. It is Luke only who tells of the woman who was a sinner who washed the feet of Jesus with her tears and loved much because she was forgiven much. Luke's unique parables are I also permeated with the idea of forgiveness, among them the parable of the Two Debtors, the Pharisee and the Publican, and, preeminently, the parable of the Prodigal Son. It is significant that only in this Gospel is mention made of the Lord's beautiful prayer on the cross, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do" (23:34).

Forgiveness is also shown in the Third Gospel where the word itself is not found. The distraught Peter (5:8-10), the returning prodigal son (Luke 15), the praying publican (Luke 18), the repentant Zacchaeus (Luke 19), and the dying thief (Luke 23), are all forgiven. Christ declares that "repentance and remission of sins" should be preached in His name among all nations (24:47). It is Luke who emphasizes the forgiving spirit of Christ. It is the forgiving Son of Man who draws sinner and saint alike to the pages of this Gospel and thus to Himself.

Interest in History

History and chronology are points to which Luke devotes particular attention. He gives two very distinct dates by referring to well-known secular events after the manner of historians of his day. These dates are the "decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed"

²⁰ Hayes, *Book*, p, 183.

²¹ Scroggie, *Guide*, pp. 368-69.

(2:1-2) and "the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberias Caesar" (3:1). Luke also gives a Jewish dating for the vision of Zacharias, as he served with his particular course in the temple (1:5, 8, 11).

Other important historical notices have been pointed out by McDowell:

See how carefully Luke endeavors to date and give a historical setting to the beginning of John the Baptist's ministry, by the mention of the secular rulers, along with the reigning high priests (3:1-2). Luke makes frequent mention of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee, and in one passage called him a fox. Only Luke records the appearance of Jesus before Herod during his trials (23:6-16).²²

In his prologue, Luke himself claims to be writing history, thus it is not surprising to encounter many chronological references in his Gospel. Some of these specific indications of chronology have been assembled by Mackinlay:

Our Evangelist also tells us that our Lord came to the Temple at the age of twelve (ii. 42), and that He began His Ministry when He was "about thirty years of age" (iii.23). The fulfillment, of periods of time (i.57; xxi. 24), also of years (ii. 37; iv. 25; viii. 42, 43), months (i.24, 26, 56), days (i. 59; ii. 6, 21, 22, 43, 44; iv. 2, 25; ix. 28, 37, etc.), and hours (xxii. 14; xxiii. 44; xxiv. 33), are each referred to repeatedly; the near approach of summer (xxi. 30) is pointedly alluded to on one occasion, and at another time the narrative of the plucking of the ears of corn clearly shows that season actually at hand (vi. 1). Even in the central chapters of the Gospel, where chronological references are generally considered to be very vague, we find allusion made to periods of years (xiii. 7, 11), and of days (ix.51; x.35; xi.3). These passages are in addition to those just mentioned.²³

The same writer also sees indirect references to time in the Third Gospel:

Our Lord constantly referred in His parabolic teaching to persons or things actually present, for instance to children (xviii. 15-17), to money (xx, 23-25), etc.; hence we may fairly judge that when Luke records our Saviour's allusion to the beauty of the lilies of the field (xii.27), that they were then actually in bloom, indicating that it was summer time. Similar deductions can also be formed from various other indirect

²² Edward A. McDowell, "The Gospel of Luke," *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, XVIII (Fall, 1967), 18.

²³ G. Mackinlay, *Recent Discoveries in St. Luke's Writings* (London: Marshall Brothers Ltd., 1921), p. 66.

allusions to the seasons in the third Gospel.²⁴

Interest in Social Life

Much of Luke's story takes place in ordinary houses and on ordinary occasions. It takes place in a domestic atmosphere. References to social life abound, as Burton illustrates:

References to social life, every day occupations, and articles of common use are very frequent, so much so as to constitute a characteristic of this gospel as compared with other gospels. Thus the house is spoken of in 5:19; 11:7; 12:39; 13:25; 17:31; 22:11; various household utensils are mentioned in 1:63; 5:18; 8:16; 11:7, 33; 15:8; 17:34; clothing in 9:3; 10:4; 22:35f.; the meals of the day, in 7:36; 11:37; 14:1, 7, 8; 20:46; articles of food, in 6:4.4; 9:13; 11:5, 11, 12; 13:21; 15:23; 17:35; 22:19; 24:30, 42; beverages, in 1:15; 5:37; 7:33; 23:36; oil and ointment, in 7:37, 38, 46; feasts and similar social customs, in 7:44-46; 14:7-10; 15:22-25; funeral customs, in 7:12, 14; 8:52; exigencies of travel, in 9:3-5; 10:4-6, 10, 11, 34, 35; 11:5-7. Men of various occupations are mentioned: shepherds, in 2:8; 15:4; 17:7; swineherds, in 8:34; 15:15; plowmen, in 17:7; fishermen, in 5:2-11; corn grinders, in 17:35; spinning, in 12:27; cf. also 14:17; 15:17; servants and their duties, in 12:35ff., 42ff.; 13:6-9.²⁵

Luke shows Christ more in social intercourse than the other Gospels. He alone records the Lord's stay in the house of Simon the Pharisee (7:36-50), of another occasion in the house of a Pharisee where He healed a dropsical man on a Sabbath day (14:1-4). In Luke alone Jesus promises His disciples that they would eat and drink at His table in the Kingdom (22:30). With great simplicity Luke pictures Christ in the home at Bethany (10:38-42), in the house of Zacchaeus (19:1-10) and at meal with the two Emmaus disciples (24:30-32).

Even Christ's parables speak of social life, specifically hospitality:

The parable of Dives and Lazarus seems to turnabout the question of inhospitality, while in another parable the shrewd but unjust steward is chiefly concerned that when he is discharged there should be people to welcome him into their own houses. The moral is that the children of the light should be making friends who will receive them into everlasting tabernacles.²⁶

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Ernest D. Burton, *A Short Introduction to the Gospels* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1904), pp. 51-52.

²⁶ Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 251.

Interest in Poverty and Wealth

A final characteristic emphasis of Luke's Gospel is the matter of poverty and wealth. While a special chapter will be devoted to the ethical aspects of this and other subjects, it is not amiss to point out here the importance which Luke places on this problem. Matthew relates Christ's intensified warnings against the Pharisees. Luke, on the other hand, records Christ's intensified warnings against the danger of the Mammon. Riches are not evil in and of themselves but can easily become a spiritual handicap. Luke emphasizes Christ's preference for the helpless poor as over against the haughty rich.

In a special way Luke's parables stress a person's right relationship to wealth, as Barclay indicates:

It has often been pointed out that many of Luke's parables turn on the right attitude to, and the right use of, money. He has the parable of the two debtors (7.40-43); of the rich fool (12.16-21); of the rash builder of the tower (14.28-30); of the unjust steward and his astute financial manipulations (16.1-9); of the rich man and Lazarus (16.19-31); of the servants and the pounds (19.11-27). It was clearly Luke's opinion that **there are few better tests of a man than the way in which he uses his money.**²⁷

Luke is the only Evangelist to record the words of Mary, "the rich he hath sent empty away" (1:53); also the command not to invite rich neighbors to a dinner or supper, to avoid receiving a recompense (14:12). Luke is the only one to report that the man who wanted to know how to obtain eternal life went away exceeding sorrowful, when told to give up his riches (18:23); he is also the only Evangelist who tells of the rich Zacchaeus, who gave alms to the poor and purposed to restore fourfold if he had "taken any thing from any man by false accusation" (19:8). It is noteworthy that in the Gospel of Luke the first of the beatitudes relates to the poor, and the first of the "woes" to the rich (4:20, 24), yet blessings are not the result of poverty neither are curses the result of wealth. What Christ condemns is "the mammon of unrighteousness" (16:9).

As a summary of this chapter, Farrar's words of tribute to the Gospel seem an appropriate conclusion of the section on the special emphases of Luke. He writes:

Such, then, is the Gospel of st. Luke; – the Gospel of the Greek and of the future; of catholicity of mind; the Gospel of hymns and of prayers; the Gospel of the Saviour; the Gospel of the universality and gratuitousness of salvation; the Gospel of holy toleration; the Gospel of those whom the religious world regards as heretics; the Gospel of the publican, and the outcast, and the humble poor, and the weeping Magdalene, and the crucified malefactor; the Gospel of the lost piece of money, and of the lost sheep; the Gospel of the Good Samaritan, and of the Prodigal Son; the Gospel of the saintly life, of

²⁷ Barclay, *First Three*, p. 288.

pity, of forgiveness obtained by faith, of pardon for all the world ; the Gospel of grace and of the glad tidings of free salvation; the Gospel of Him who was, as we all are, the Son of Adam, and Who died that we all might be the sons of God. Such are its lessons. Have not some of us very much misread and mistaken them? Has the best Christian among us all done more than just begun to spell out their meaning? ²⁸

²⁸ Cited by Scroggie, *Guide*, p. 381.

CHAPTER V

THE LUCAN PORTRAIT OF THE PERSON OF THE SON OF MAN

The Incarnation of the Son of Man.

The forerunner of the Son of Man

The life and ministry of John the Baptist are of vital importance to the ministry of the Son of Man. There is a close connection between the two persons inasmuch as John is Christ's forerunner. Recent Lucan scholars, however, omit the nativity stories of both John and Jesus from their presentation of Lucan theology and base their whole analysis upon the ministry of Jesus. Conzelmann, for example, denies that John is the forerunner of Jesus who belongs to the new era of salvation. He sees John as the last of the old period of Israel. The role of John is interpreted as an attempt to dissociate Jesus from the activity of John both geographically and theologically.²⁹ But, it can be asked with Oliver, "Is it not possible for John to belong to the Period of Israel and still be a forerunner?"³⁰ It is indeed possible. Moreover, this is the only justified interpretation which the text permits. John forms the link between the Old Testament revelation through the prophets and the New Testament revelation through Christ.

The announcement. – Four hundred years had passed without a direct revelation from God. Suddenly, the silence of God was broken in a remarkable manner. It was remarkable because of who brought the message. God sent the angel Gabriel who appeared in the temple at the place of prayer in answer to prayer. It was further a remarkable event because of "who received the message. The priest Zacharias had been chosen by lot to offer incense that day. The priesthood was divided into twenty-four classes, of which the class of Abijah was the eighth (I Chron. 24:10).³¹

Another remarkable aspect of this event was the content of the message which the angel brought. Gabriel came in answer to prayer. Although it is not certain what the request had been, the condition of Zachariah and Elisabeth, as well as the context of the temple point to a two-fold

²⁹ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 18-27.

³⁰ H. H. Oliver, "The Lucan Birth Stories and Acts," *New Testament Studies*, X (1963-1964), 203.

³¹ This order survived the exile and Zacharias belonged to the class of Abijah. Zacharias' wife, Elisabeth, was likewise a member of the family of priests descended from Aaron. To be a priest and to be married to a priest's daughter was considered to be of special significance. Both were righteous before God, indicating that their piety was genuine, not merely external.

request: a physical son for barren aged Elisabeth and a spiritual Savior for Israel. The message promised an answer to these requests. They would have a son whose name would be John. Morgan remarks on the great significance of the names of both parents and son:

The angel tells his name. His name shall be called John. John simply means the grace of God. The father, Zacharias, Jah remembers; the mother, Elisabeth, the oath of God; and now the boy, John, the grace of God. They did not choose the name; the angel declared it as heaven's name for him, the grace of God; the offspring of the remembrance of God and the oath of God.³²

This son would be great in the sight of the Lord and ,would be filled with the Holy Spirit from the womb (1:15). He would be a special prophet in fulfillment of Malachi 3:1, sent to prepare the way for the Messiah. His ministry would resemble that of Elijah.

The advent. – After Zacharias completed his priestly ministry in the temple he returned to his house in the hill country of Judea (1:24-25, 39, 65). Elisabeth, his wife, conceived³³ and hid herself for five months, no doubt for the purpose of meditation and praise.

Finally, her time was fulfilled. The promised son was born (1:57). The supernatural birth of the forerunner of Israel's Messiah occasioned the joy among the people (1:58) which the angel had predicted (1:14). The people perceived that since the forerunner was here, the deliverer Himself must be very near.

Zacharias, who had been made dumb when he questioned the possibility of God's promise of a son regained his speech at the circumcision of John (1:64). He breaks forth into a song of joy, the *Benedictus* (1:67-79).

Luke records that "the child grew and waxed strong in spirit" (1:80). The preparation for his task as a forerunner did not take place in the presence of the Scribes and Pharisees but in seclusion. The Holy Spirit who filled him from the day of his birth undoubtedly taught him for the day of his ministry. His separation in solitude as a Nazarite (1:15) prepared him for a demanding ministry.

³² G. Campbell Morgan, *The Gospel According to Luke*, Vol. III: Studies in the Four Gospels (4 vols.; Fincastle: Scripture Truth Book Company, n.d.), p. 18.

³³ "συνέλαβεν. The word occurs eleven times in Lk. against five times elsewhere. He alone uses it in the sense of conceiving offspring, and only in these first two chapters (vv. 31, 36, ii. 21). This sense is common in medical writers and in Aristotle. Hobart remarks that the number of words referring to pregnancy and barrenness used by Lk. is almost as great as that used by Hippocrates." Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark , 1896), p. 19.

The birth of the Son of Man

The announcement. – The announcement of the birth of the Son of Man is the counterpart of the announcement of the birth of John. There is remarkable similarity in the two annunciations:

Among the parallelisms are the note of chronology (5,26), the angelic visitation (11,28), the reaction of distress (12,29), the angelic reassurance (13,30), the promise of a son (13,31), the angelic naming of the child (13,31), the revelation of the child's future role (14-17, 32-33), the question to the angel (18,34), the giving of a sign (20,36-37), and the journey after the vision (23, 39).³⁴

The contrasts between the two accounts are even more vivid:

John's parents are righteous in the law (6), but Mary is the object of grace (28); prayer occasions the appearance to Zacharias (13), but divine initiative is the basis of Gabriel's coming to Mary (26,30); Zecharias is a priest, serving in the Holy City (5,8), but Mary is an unmarried virgin (27,34); the conception of John is miraculous (13, 18, 25, 36-37), but the conception of Jesus is even more amazing and is due directly to the Holy Spirit (35); Zacharias is left mute out of unbelief (20), but Mary responds with noble faith (38); Gabriel reveals his name to Zacharias to convince him (19), but Mary has no need to learn the name (29,38); John is to be great before the Lord (15), but Jesus has an unqualified greatness as the "Son of the Most High" (32); and finally, John's mission is defined as temporary, preparatory, and prophetic (14-17), while the role of Jesus is to be eternal and messianic (32-33).³⁵

As with the birth of John, so here too the persons involved in the announcement are important. Apart from Gabriel, two personalities are involved in the story: Mary, and Joseph to whom she was betrothed. Both were descendents of David (2:4). But the important point of the story is that Mary was a "virgin" (1:27). Although in Matthew 1:14 Joseph is called "her husband," her reply of puzzlement to Gabriel who announced that she would bear a son indicates that she had not yet entered into sexual union with him (1:34). The angelic message dealt with Mary's miraculous conception and her son's special calling.

Mary was called "highly favored" (1:28). The passive voice of this perfect participle *κεχαριτωμένη* makes it clear that God is the agent and she is a special recipient of the favor and

³⁴ Harold S. Songer, "Luke's Portrayal of the Origins of Jesus," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (Fall, 1967), 456.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

grace of God. She had been chosen to be the mother of the Savior.³⁶ Four things are said concerning Him: He shall be called the Son of the Highest; the Lord will give Him the throne of His father David, He shall rule over the house of Jacob forever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end (1:32-33). That absence of the article with "Son of the Highest" "indicates the absolute uniqueness of highness of his divine Sonship."³⁷ The angel indicates that the coming Son would inherit the royal sovereignty promised in the Old Testament, to the Messiah-king of the lineage of David (II Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2:7; 89:26-27). The angel informs Mary that Jesus is to be His name. "Jesus," the Greek form of the Hebrew "Joshua," means "Yahweh is salvation," or "Yahweh saves." ³⁸ As has been so well remarked:

The name itself was a message. Every time Mary and Joseph called his name, the gospel was proclaimed, 'Yahweh is salvation.' Here is a second Joshua who will lead Israel into the promised land of salvation and the kingdom.³⁹

The miraculous birth of Jesus is explained by Gabriel with deep simplicity. To Mary's inquiry how these things can be, the angel replies that the word of the omnipotent God (1:38) which was able to work the impossible in Elisabeth's body (1:36), would bring about the miraculous conception of the God-man through the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit (1:35).

The virgin birth rests on the omnipotence of God. It is a doctrine which is often lightly dismissed as unimportant and irrelevant.⁴⁰ But, in fact, as Guiton states succinctly:

It is not sufficient to say that the fact of the Virgin Birth is absolutely true; we

³⁶ For a detailed discussion of Mary in the Scriptures as over against the deviating dogma of the Roman Church cf. Norvelle Sharpe, "A study of the Traditional 'Virgin Mary' in the Light of the Word," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXX (January, 1923), 74-96.

³⁷ Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), p. 76.

³⁸ Hermann Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasche* (5 vols.; München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), I, 64.

³⁹ S. Lewis Johnson, "The Genesis of Jesus," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXII (October-December, 1965), 336.

⁴⁰ H. E. W. Turner, "The Virgin Birth," *The Expository Times*, LXVIII (October 1956-September 1957), 17: "An individual might well reject the doctrine and yet remain a sincere and convinced Christian whose membership of the Church probably ought not to be called in question;" and Hugh Martin, *Luke's Portrait of Jesus* (London: S. C. M. Press Ltd., 1949), p. 24: "I am quite sure that the Virgin Birth is not a necessary, fundamental part of the Christian Faith, and that Christians who indulge in heresy hunts on this score are wrong." Both men subscribe to the virgin birth but assign it an unimportant place.

must say also that it is fundamental to the Christian faith, and that nothing is more unwise, more dangerous, more anti-scientific in the true sense of this word, than to regard this matter as of no importance! How many facts or doctrines seem to be without any importance nowadays! Sometimes we are tempted to ask ourselves if there is anything really 'important' in the eyes of some men, except perhaps that we share the high opinion which they hold of their own sagacity. ⁴¹

The doctrine is important in relation to the word of God because if Luke was wrong on this first important matter which he claimed to have investigated, what confidence can one place in the other events of his story? Further, the doctrine is important in relation to the Son of God. It was not necessary that Christ have a human father to be completely human, as modern theologians suppose. Then too, the only other alternative to the virgin birth is an illegitimate birth, for Joseph knew that he was not the father of Jesus. Thirdly, the doctrine is important in relation to the salvation of God. Had Christ been born of two human parents, He would have possessed a sin nature and could never have become the sinless Savior. And finally, the doctrine has implications in relation to the kingdom of God. The curse placed upon Coniah's line (Jer. 22:30), coming down through Joseph as a physical descendent, would have disqualified Christ from sitting on the throne of David. ⁴²

Sometime after Mary had been informed about her divine honor, she visited her relative Elisabeth. From a Lucan perspective, the visit served two purposes. First, it showed the subordination of John to Jesus. "The unborn child, the forerunner of the Messiah, filled with the Holy Spirit, greets his Master, who had come in the womb of Mary." ⁴³ Second, the visit pointed out that the two annunciations and the two promised sons represent the one purpose of God. The movement of John accompanied by the filling of the Spirit, enabled Elisabeth to recognize Mary as the mother of the Messiah (1:41-44). She blessed Mary (vss. 42-45) and Mary, in turn, responded to this dramatic and unexpected welcome with the Magnificat (vss. 46-55), expressing her gratitude (vss. 46-50) and dealing with the redemptive acts of God for His people (vss. 51-55).

Luke's purpose in relating these incidents

is recognized only when it is observed that the intimate details concerning Mary and the Baptist and the other secondary figures of the story are set forth only because they illumine the significance of the birth of Christ, and so contribute to the proclamation of

⁴¹ W. H. Guiton, "The Virgin Birth of Our Lord," *The Reformation Review*, VIII (January, 1960), 114.

⁴² Johnson, "Genesis of Jesus," 339-341.

⁴³ William F. Arndt, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), pp. 56-57.

the gospel. In particular these historical details provide the occasions for a long series of inspired disclosures which cast a brilliant light upon the Child who was born in Bethlehem.⁴⁴

The advent. – God's time had come. The stage was set for the birth of the Savior. And instrumental in these final preparations, as Luke records, was none other than the pagan Augustus Caesar (2:1). His decree for tax registration⁴⁵ assured the fulfillment of the prophecy that Joseph and Mary were to be in Bethlehem when Jesus would be born. Joseph and Mary are pictured as journeying together, indicating that betrothal had merged into marriage. The fact that Mary is termed "the one betrothed to him" (2:5) is a delicate expression for the unusual circumstances: Mary was Joseph's wife and a virgin.

The story of the birth of Christ as related by Luke (2:1-20) is in marked contrast with that of Matthew. The latter depicts Jesus as the King and at His birth He was worshiped as a king by the magi while the reigning Herod was troubled. Luke presents Jesus as the ideal Man and the story is filled with human interest. Jesus as a redeemer of men must be identified as a man among men and Luke records facts and events which would show Him as this Son of Man.

In Bethlehem, Joseph and Mary found shelter in a stable where Mary gave birth to her firstborn⁴⁶ (2:7). The fact that Luke omits particulars concerning the exact date of birth throws light on his purpose, namely, to write history with a theological emphasis. Luke therefore stresses the person who was born rather than the period when the birth took place, although he would

⁴⁴ Ned B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Luke to Christ* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951), p. 47.

⁴⁵ The reference to Cyrennius (Latin, Quirinius) as governor of Syria at the time of the birth of Christ has been questioned in light of Josephus' remarks that Quirinius was governor of Syria in A.D. 6. Papyri evidence suggests, however, that a census was made every fourteen years. Cf. William M. Ramsey, *The Bearing of Archaeological Discoveries on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915), p. 235. In Stauffer's view Quirinius went to the East in 12 B.C., commenced the census in 7 B.C. and did not complete it until A.D. 7. Cf. Ethelbert Stauffer, *Jesus: Gestalt und Geschichte* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1957), p. 34. An illustration of a census is given by Deissmann: "The enrolment by household being at hand, it is necessary to notify all who for any cause soever are outside their houses to return to their domestic hearths, that they may also accomplish the customary dispensation of enrollment and continue steadfastly in the husbandry that belongeth to them." Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, trans. Lionel R. H. Strachan (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1922), p. 271.

⁴⁶ A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (6 vols.: Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930), II, 22: "The expression naturally means that she afterwards had other children and we read of brothers and sisters of Jesus."

certainly know the year and day.

The adoration. – When the birth had taken place, an angel of the Lord appeared to the shepherds of Bethlehem, giving them a significant message. This revelation dispelled their fear, disclosed that the infant just born would favor all people and would bring forgiveness of sins, and described the place where they could find Him. Angels and shepherds alike adored this person who, according to the announcement, unites Saviorhood, Messiahship, deity, and humanity in one person ("For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord" 2:11). It is of special importance that this revelation was made to shepherds:

The significance of the revelation to the shepherds (8-20) should be interpreted in the light of the social position of shepherds. In the earlier history of Israel they were generally despised. Rabbinic lists of scorned occupations include shepherds in the category of tax collectors and dice players. The importance of the inclusion of shepherds is stressed by the combination of shekinah or glory of God (9), annunciation (10-12), sign (12), and heavenly host (1.3-14). Zacharias received only annunciation and sign; and Mary's experience did not include the heavenly host. Luke's emphasis is clear – what began with the righteous priest in the Temple has now broadened to include the outcasts of society in the open fields. The salvation that is being revealed is for all men in every place.⁴⁷

The angelic revelation demanded an individual response. The shepherds' speedy visit to the infant (2:16-20) manifested their faith and prompted them to adore the infant and glorify and praise God.

Luke, intensely interested in the humanity of the Savior, alone mentions the circumcision of the child. According to the word spoken by the angel He received the name Jesus, which means "Jehovah is Savior."

Forty days after the birth, in obedience to the law, Joseph and Mary brought the child to the temple in Jerusalem for the performance of the required ceremonies. This included the purification of Mary⁴⁸ and the presentation of Jesus for His consecration to the service of God (cf. Exod. 1.3: 2, 12ff.). In the temple two godly Jews, Simeon and Anna, adore this child and testify to its future role. Simeon, in his beautiful hymn which is known as the *Nunc Dimittis* (29-32) expresses his certainty that the child is Christ by the confession that he can now die in peace (29-30) and extols Christ's ministry to the Gentiles and Jews. The universality of Christianity, while its full implications and realization await a historical development, is thus rooted in the revelation contemporaneous with the birth of Christ. Stonehouse observes:

⁴⁷ Songer, "Luke's," 460.

⁴⁸ 2:22, Joseph was included (ἀντὼν) because as the head of the household he had to see that this ceremony was duly carried out.

It is not insignificant that Luke, who was to show how the universalism of Christianity came to be realized in the early history of Christianity, underscores here at the beginning the universality of the gospel as a note of the revelation contemporaneous with Christ's birth.⁴⁹

The aged Anna worshipped the redeemer and witnessed of the redemption which He brought. Robertson comments on this:

There was evidently a group of such spirits that gathered in the temple either men around her and Simeon or whom she met from time to time. There was thus a nucleus of old saints in Jerusalem prepared for the coming of the Messiah when he at last appears as the Messiah in Jerusalem (John 2 and 3). These probably all passed away. But they had a happy hour of hope and joy. . . . What is meant by the "redemption of Jerusalem" is not clear, whether political or spiritual or both. Simeon was looking for the consolation of Israel (2:25) and Zacharias (1:68) sang of redemption for Israel (Isa. 40:2).⁵⁰

The boyhood of the Son of Man

Little information is given concerning the boyhood of the Savior. Years of silent growth followed His presentation in the temple, yet Luke is the only one who tells of Christ's infancy and youth.

His development. – Luke shows how Jesus became what He was by pointing out successively the καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας (1:42), the παιδίον (2:16), the βρέφος (2:27), the παῖς (2:40), and the ἀνὴρ (3:22). Luke marks the successive stages of development but, as Morgan says, "The whole story of the childhood of Jesus from infancy to His religious coming of age is contained in one verse."⁵¹ The text reads: "And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him" (Luke 2:40).

The Importance of this testimony to Christ's childhood is explained by Johnson:

The word *grew* is the broad term Luke uses for His growth, while the remaining words of the verse spell out the details. The "waxed strong" refers to the physical, while "filled with wisdom" and "the grace of God was upon him" refer to the mental and spiritual. There was a beautiful harmony in this man's development, touching all the

⁴⁹ Stonehouse, *Witness*, p. 55.

⁵⁰ Robertson, *Words*, II, 31.

⁵¹ G. Campbell Morgan, *The Crises of the Christ* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1903), p. 86.

facets of His being.⁵²

The incident of the twelve-year old Jesus in the temple affords a brief gaze into the silent years, especially into Christ's relationship to Joseph and to God, as contrasted in Luke 2:40-50.⁵³ That Joseph was Christ's legal father and had a definite influence on his son is beyond doubt. Garvie gives expression to that fact:

Joseph is rightly described as one of Jesus' parents, and referred to as His father, for in the home he provided and protected, he filled a parent's place and played a father's part. For this position and function he too was Divinely prepared. To him also God committed a trust and task; on him as well God made a demand for confidence and submission.⁵⁴

But more importantly, Christ's self-confidence seems to have been developed to a large degree when He referred to His true Father and claimed a unique sonship. The definite article before Father in 2:49 shows, in the words of Morgan, that "God was in a special sense His Father, and the special relationship is suggested in the method of reference – 'The Father of Me.'"⁵⁵

The next eighteen years of Christ's life, His youth, are given in the brief but pregnant statement in Luke 2:52: "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." Jesus grew as a normal person. As Getz shows, Luke, like a true physician, delineated four specific areas of human growth and development:

First, Jesus increased in wisdom – mental growth. How He who was the omniscient Creator could voluntarily restrict His knowledge and develop intellectually is beyond our ability to comprehend. Yet He did.

Second Jesus increased in stature – physical growth. He who was the invisible God took upon Himself the form of man. Though conceived by God the Spirit in the Virgin Mary, He had a normal human birth. He manifested all the natural maturational patterns of childhood and adolescence.

Third, Jesus increased in favor with God – spiritual growth. Even more difficult to understand is the development of our Lord's human spirit. As the only perfect

⁵² S. Lewis Johnson, "The Baptism of Christ," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXIII (July-September, 1966), 221.

⁵³ Norvelle Wallace Sharpe, "A Message of Grace to Be Found in Lu. II. 49 – 'My Father's Business'" *Bibliotheca Sacra* LXXVII (1920), 229-33.

⁵⁴ Alfred E. Garvie, "Studies in the 'Inner life' of Jesus," *The Expositor*, V (1902), 261.

⁵⁵ Morgan, *Studies*, III, 46.

human since Adam's fall, He "grew, and waxed strong in spirit" and "the grace of God was upon him" (v. 40).

Fourth, Jesus increased in favor with man – social growth. This statement in context reveals that Jesus had just amazed the doctors in the temple with His wisdom and knowledge (vv. 46-47). Jesus grew in relationship to people around Him. His personality showing through His humanity was gracious.⁵⁶

His deportment. – Christ's exemplary conduct during His formative years has been well summarized in the following words:

Those years of maturing still stand as an example for all (Heb. 5:8). He faithfully obeyed the Law (er , Deut. 16:1-3); He obeyed His parents (Luke 2:51; this included the time when He was alone in the big city of Jerusalem for three days); He worshiped God (Luke 2:49); and His development during those years was a complete one (physical, mental, social, and spiritual; Luke 2:52).⁵⁷

Luke has given a glimpse of the infancy, childhood, and youth of the Savior. The reason for this distinctive emphasis is given by Gardner:

Who can compare this with the opening of the other Gospels, and not see that, Luke is preparing to give us a deeper insight into Christ's human nature than the others? We feel that we know a man better if we have been acquainted with him as a child, and we feel that we shall better understand Christ's manhood for these glimpses into his childhood's life.⁵⁸

The Preparation of the Son of Man

The transition of the Son of Man from private life to public ministry comprises four sections: the ministry of His forerunner (3:1-20), His baptism (3 :21-22), His genealogy (3:23-38), and His temptation (4:1-13).

The ministry of the forerunner of the Son or Man

⁵⁶ Gene A. Getz, "The Christian Home – II," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXVI (April-June, 1969), 110-111.

⁵⁷ Charles C. Ryrie, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1959), p. 45.

⁵⁸ Edward P. Gardner, "Christ in the Four Gospels," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXV (April, 1912), 231.

The opening of the ministry. – Whereas Matthew (3:1) introduces the appearance of John the Baptist without any definite note of time, Luke (3:1) gives for that highly important starting point of the proclamations of the Gospel a date specified by a sixfold reference to the history of the period, indicating the emperor at Rome and the governors of Palestine, as well as the high priest at the time.⁵⁹ The political situation intimated in verse one and the spiritual situation implied in verse two were both debased and degenerate. During such dark and desperate times God broke His silence and called John out of his seclusion as too forerunner of the Son or Man. In commenting on the importance of the ministry of the forerunner to the Messiah, Stonehouse writes:

The prominence assigned to the Baptist is therefore not gained at the expense of Jesus; on the contrary, the greater the significance attached to John's mission, the greater the glory of the One whom he was sent to herald. And Luke's very readiness to allow the spotlight to rest upon John at the beginning of his ministry is another proof that Luke was not writing a secular biography with Jesus as his hero. Rather he is occupied here with his task of publishing the gospel of Jesus Christ which came to public expression in history with John's witness to, and baptism of, Jesus.⁶⁰

The outline of the ministry. – John's ministry was only preparatory, therefore Luke gives only a general outline of his work. His message included a proclamation concerning universal repentance (3:3-6), exhortations in view of this message (vv. 7-14), and a promise concerning the one who was to come for salvation and for judgment (vv. 15-18). The function of John's ministry was threefold. He prepared the way for the Messiah by preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins (vv. 3ff.). He witnessed to the nature of Messiah's mission (vv. 6, 16f.). And by baptizing Jesus he inaugurated the ministry of the Messiah (vv. 21-22).

It is interesting to note that in Luke's account John's message contains no reference to the kingdom being at hand. Commenting on this feature of Luke's account concerning John, Conzelmann declares:

In Matt. iii, 2 the idea of the Kingdom appears in John the Baptist's preaching. Such a thing is not possible in Luke, as he himself states in xvi, 16. It is Jesus who begins the preaching of the Kingdom. Luke maintains this view consistently.⁶¹

The same author further states:

⁵⁹ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 135: "All these chronological data, taken together, show that John was called to appear as forerunner of Christ in public between the years A.D. 26 and 29. Probably the exact year was A.D. 27."

⁶⁰ Stonehouse, *Witness*, p. 61.

⁶¹ Conzelmann, *Theology*, pp. 113-14.

John the Baptist, according to Luke does not proclaim the Kingdom of God, and Luke xvi, 16 shows why: it is not yet possible for him to know anything about it. Only Jesus possesses this knowledge, for it is the message of the Kingdom of God that constitutes the new element in the present epoch of salvation, in contrast to the old epoch whose last representative was John the Baptist.⁶²

Rather than explaining the absence of kingdom truth in John's message on the basis of the strict separation of the ministry and mission of John and Jesus, as does Conzelmann, it is better to see it in light of the distinctive Gentile emphasis of Luke. The deliverance which John proclaims is both personal and national:

John preached both a personal salvation, involving the remission of sins (Mark 1:4), and a national salvation, involving the establishment of the millennial kingdom with Israel delivered out of the hand of their enemies (Matt. 3:2; Luke 1:71-75).⁶³

The exhortations were stern because the multitude desired to escape the coming judgment and to receive forgiveness of sins without a forsaking of sins. John's preaching brought expectation and suspense (v. 15). Some supposed him to be the Messiah, but true to his role as a forerunner he pointed to the Messiah who was about to appear.

The opposition to his ministry. – Differing from Matthew and Mark, Luke concludes at this point the story of John. His death is not expressly mentioned, but it is presupposed in 9:7ff. Luke merely calls attention to the fact that Herod Antipas arrested John and cast him in prison because he condemned his iniquitous marriage to Herodias, his brother Philip's wife.

It is important for Luke that opposition comes to John in the course of his ministry who, after the message had come to Zacharias (1:19) and to the shepherds (2:1), was to announce the glad tidings of the coming Messiah to all the people (2:10). His responsibility therefore included Herod Antipas. John lost his life as a result but he remained faithful to his task. The opposition to the forerunner was a foreshadowing of the opposition that the Messiah would encounter on the part of the nation of Israel.

The baptism of the Son of Man

Just two Verses describe the baptism of Christ, so that Zahn's observation is to the point:

It cannot be called a story of the baptism of Jesus. . . . He does not say where Jesus comes from or where he goes; neither does he indicate the place of action, which

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ S. Lewis Johnson, "The Message of John the Baptist," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXIII (January- March, 1956), 36.

could only be guessed from v. 3. He does not even mention John as the one who baptized Jesus, let alone does he point to any mutual relationship or conduct of both men. Luke mentions the act or baptism only in a secondary manner; the main emphasis is placed solely on the remarkable accompanying signs.⁶⁴

The signs at the baptism. – Four facts give importance to Christ's baptism. First, all the people were being baptized. The implication is that John was baptizing and Jesus was one of the many who submitted to this rite. For the first and only time these two persons whose ministry was so closely related met face to face. Further, Luke alone records that it was while Jesus prayed that heaven was opened. This is significant in a Gospel where prayer is given much emphasis. Thirdly, the Holy Spirit descended visibly in the form of a dove. And, lastly, the divine voice spoke.

The significance of the baptism. – Only Matthew (3:15) gives the sole reason for Christ's baptism: "to fulfill all righteousness." The significance of the baptism is derived from this explanation and the accompanying signs. John preached a message of repentance and the people who identified themselves with this message were baptized by him. For Christ, the baptism meant, first of all, His identification with Israel:

He, too, belongs to this people, although He is their King, and must demonstrate His willingness to do the will of God. The baptism, then, is a phase of his humiliation under the law, just as the circumcision and presentation. He acknowledged John's authority at this stage in the unfolding of the program of divine revelation. He went, then, to the baptism as a representative person, convinced that this was a divinely imposed duty for every Israelite.⁶⁵

Christ's baptism was also His inauguration into the Messianic office. By submitting to the rite He was manifest as the Messiah to Israel and was consecrated to the Messianic ministry by the anointing of the Spirit⁶⁶ and acknowledgement of the Father.

⁶⁴ Theodor Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas* (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920), p. 199.

⁶⁵ Johnson, "The Baptism of Christ," 227-228.

⁶⁶ The dove as a form of the Spirit has three possible meanings: "First, the dove was symbolic of sacrifice. So Jesus was anointed for sacrifice. Second, the Spirit was the revelation of God's power. And Jesus wrought in the power of the Holy Spirit (4:1, 14). Third, the 'bodily form' was for John's benefit (cf. John 1:32-33). So in the coming of the Spirit Jesus was made known to John, and He was anointed as a king and a sacrifice for His ministry." Herschel H. Hobbs, *An Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), p. 76.

Finally, Christ's baptism is the illustration of the goal of His ministry. In a sense in His baptism Jesus symbolized His death, burial, and resurrection – that which He did for man's redemption. As Johnson explains:

Thus" John's baptism foreshadows His death, Calvary is His baptism in death, the Great Commission is a charge to preach with a view to uniting men with His death, while Paul in Romans six explains the subject in detail theologically. John's baptism, then, mirrors the event of the cross.⁶⁷

The genealogy of the Son of Man

The problem of Luke's genealogy. – The genealogies of Christ as given by Matthew (1:1-17) and Luke (3:2-8) have formed the subject of endless discussion and debate. Dean Alford supposes that a solution of the difficulties is impossible from lack of sufficient data. The attempt to reconcile the two genealogies, he observes, "has never yet been accomplished; and every endeavor to do it has violated either ingenuousness or common sense."⁶⁸

Although it is beyond the scope of this present study to deal with all the problems connected with the genealogies,⁶⁹ it is important to determine Luke's purpose for introducing this genealogy. Thus it is necessary to touch at least on some difficulties.

There are three peculiarities of Luke's genealogy which should be noticed. The first relates to the position of the genealogy in the Gospel. In Matthew the genealogy opens the Gospel narrative, but in Luke it appears at the close of the third chapter. Since it is Matthew's purpose to present Jesus as the King of Israel, the pedigree of the King is of importance to him. He introduces the genealogy early to show that Christ descended directly from Abraham and David. Luke, however, places the genealogy at the beginning of Christ's public ministry after the account of the ministry of the forerunner has been given. Properly speaking then, the opening chapters are only introductory and Luke's Gospel actually begins with the genealogy. Plummer observes:

The use of ἀρχόμενος here implies that the Evangelist is now making a fresh start. Two of the three introductory chapters are the history of the Forerunner, which Luke completes in the third chapter before beginning his account of the work of the Messiah. Not until Jesus has been anointed by the Spirit does too history of the Messiah, i.e. the

⁶⁷ Johnson, "The Baptism of Christ," 228.

⁶⁸ Henry Alford, *The New Testament for English Readers* (5 vols.; Boston: Lee and Shephard, 1872), I, 313.

⁶⁹ For a detailed discussion of problems, representatives, and views cf. Paton J. Gloag, *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895), pp. 249-68.

Anointed One, begin; and His genealogy then becomes of importance.⁷⁰

A second point of difficulty between the two genealogies is the progression of names. Matthew's genealogy follows the order of descent from father to son, whereas Luke's progression moves from son to Father. From the annotations found interspersed in Matthew's genealogy, as well as from its omissions, it is not improbable that he constructed his genealogy without having access to the public registers. On the other hand, Luke has none of these notes and omissions, so that it is not improbable that he obtained his genealogy from the public registers. But both Matthew and Luke arranged the genealogy to serve their specific purpose. Moorehead writes:

Matthew's genealogy descends from Abraham to Jesus, in accordance with his main purpose; for all the promises and predictions made to Abraham and David (Matt. 1:1) must find their accomplishment in the Lord Jesus. Luke's genealogy ascends from Jesus to Adam, in accordance with the chief design of the Spirit here – viz. to show the close relationship of the Redeemer with mankind – sinners.⁷¹

One other problem concerns the persons listed in the genealogies. From Adam to Abraham Luke is alone in recording the names in the genealogy. From Adam to David the genealogies coincide, then they branch off for at least eighteen generations, the one in the line of Solomon and the other in the line of Nathan, to meet again, after a lapse of four centuries, in the persons of Shealtiel and Zerubbabel (Matt. 1:12, 13; Luke 3 :27). It is generally taken for granted that these persons are identical in both genealogies. This latter problem has given rise to much speculation as to which parent's genealogy is given in Matthew and Luke.

The parent of Luke's genealogy. – Two main theories of reconciliation have been offered to bring these genealogies into accord: the theory of a levirate marriage, that is, that **both Matthew and Luke actually gave the genealogy of Joseph**, and the theory that while Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph, **Luke gives the genealogy of Mary**.

Gloag explains the first theory thus:

The hypothesis of a levirate marriage proceeds on the assumption that Jacob was the father of Joseph by a levirate marriage, and that Heli was his real father, and Heli his putative or legal father. According to the Mosaic law, it was enjoined that if the of two brothers died having no children, his brother should take his wife, and the firstborn should succeed to the deceased brother (Deut. xxv. 5, 6). It is supposed that such a case occurred here. Jacob and Heli were brothers, and the one married the widow of the other; Matthew gives the genealogy of Jacob, the legal father of Joseph, and Luke that of Heli,

⁷⁰ Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 45.

⁷¹ William G. Moorehead, *Studies in the Four Gospels* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1900), p. 151.

his real father; or conversely.⁷²

This solution was advanced as early as the middle of the third century by Julius Africanus.⁷³ The first theory, whatever its ramifications, has one insuperable difficulty:

Neither of the genealogies gives that of Jesus. Jesus was, according to both Matthew and Luke, by reason of His miraculous birth, only the supposed son of Joseph and the real son of Mary. We have then according to this theory, so far as the genealogies are concerned, no proof that Jesus was the son of David. The Davidic descent of Jesus is repeatedly affirmed in Scripture.⁷⁴

The second view, that Matthew's genealogy is through Joseph and Luke's is through Mary has much to commend itself. Matthew states distinctly that Joseph was the son of Jacob and although Joseph's, not Mary's name appears in Luke's genealogy, an important observation must be made in Luke's text. This centers around the clause $\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \text{I}\omega\sigma\acute{\eta}\phi$. The use of $\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron$ ⁷⁵ suggests something unusual in the genealogy. Christ was not the real son of Joseph as was supposed by them; conversely, then, Joseph was not the real father of Jesus. If punctuation were to be used in this connection, it would read, "Jesus . . . being (the son as was supposed of Joseph) the son of Heli." According to this reading the meaning would be that Jesus was the supposed son of Joseph, but through His mother, omitted in the genealogy according to custom,⁷⁶ the real grandson of Heli.

⁷² Gloag, *Introduction*, p. 260.

⁷³ J. Gresham Machen, who gave thorough attention to all the differences between the two genealogies, likewise concluded that both were of Joseph. Matthew is said to give the legal descendents of David, whereas Luke gives the particular line to which Joseph, the husband of Mary belonged. J. Gresham Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930), pp. 202-9. While this view still enjoys some popularity, John F. Walvoord speaks for too majority of contemporary evangelical expositors when he writes in his recent volume, *Jesus Christ Our Lord* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1969), p. 104: "The most common explanation of this seems to be the best, that is, that Joseph as the son-in-law of Eli was considered in the descent from Eli through his marriage with Mary and that the lineage therefore is that of Mary rather than of Joseph."

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

⁷⁵ "The word 'supposed' of Luke iii. 23 fails to convey the correct shade of meaning from the Greek. The word $\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ signifies to regard or acknowledge as custom, to have or to hold customary; hence to assume, to suppose." Sharpe, "Message," 230.

⁷⁶ Among the Jews too adage was: *Genus matris non vocatur genus*" (*Baba Bathra*, 110, a).

It should further be mentioned that the article τοῦ is omitted before the name Joseph,⁷⁷ whereas it is to be found before all the other names belonging to the genealogy. From this it may be inferred that the name Joseph belongs to the parenthetical clause introduced by Luke. His genealogy, then, is not that of Joseph, but of Heli, the grandfather of Jesus.

The purpose of Luke's genealogy. – Luke's genealogy of the Son of Man fits in beautifully with his purpose of presenting a universal Savior, as noted by Geldenhuys:

For he has his eye throughout on the universal, all-embracing significance of Jesus. For this reason, in the family tree, he draws attention very expressly to the fact that Christ (through Adam) is, in His manhood, related to the whole human race. As the second Adam, born of a woman but conceived of the Holy Ghost, His coming and appearance have a universal significance – not only for Israel but for the whole world.⁷⁸

The line through Adam stresses the universality of His relationship. He was in truth the Son of God and the Son of Man.

The temptation of the Son of Man

The time. – Luke and the other Synoptics (Matt. 4:1-11; Mark 1:12-13; Luke 4:1-13) indicate that Christ's temptation followed His baptism. It was the last great event before the entrance into public ministry. Tradition locates the place as Quarantania, a mountain just west of Jericho.

All three Gospels agree that at the time of the temptation Jesus is under the influence of the Holy Spirit. It is He who planned the time and the place. The three Gospels further agree in using the term περᾶζω to describe His temptation, in attributing the temptation to the devil, in making the desert the location of the temptation and in describing it as being forty days in duration. Both Luke and Mark agree that the temptation took place during the entire forty days. It is not indicated of what nature these temptations were. The three temptations follow the forty

⁷⁷ F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans. M. D. Cusin (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1870), I, 199. Godet draws the following conclusions from the omission of τοῦ :

1. That this name (Joseph) belongs rather to the sentence introduced by Luke.
2. That the genealogical document which he consulted began with the name of Heli.
3. And consequently that this piece was not originally the genealogy of Jesus or of Joseph, but of Heli. Godet further notes (p. 202) that in the Talmud Mary is called the daughter of Heli. The Jewish scholars either took the genealogy in Luke as that of Mary or they must have known from independent source that Mary was the daughter of Heli. In either case, this information confirms the second view.

⁷⁸ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 153.

days for "it is then that Christ becomes aware of his hunger as the spiritual agitation in which Christ found Himself subsided." ⁷⁹

The testing. – The "testing" corresponds to the imperfect passive verb "was led" and is a present passive participle suggesting a continuous tempting. The Lucan text indicates that both the action of the Spirit as well as the temptation extended over a period of forty days. The verb *πειράζω* means "to test." It is a neutral word and may refer to being tempted in a good sense (Heb. 11:17) or a bad sense (James 1:13-14). Depending on the one doing the testing, it may mean to test to prove a thing genuine or false. In the former sense God tests but in the latter sense Satan puts them to test.

This definition of testing reflects on the temptation of Christ, which had a twofold aspect. He was tempted by Satan and yet He was led there by the Spirit, indicating that both Satan and God pursued a certain purpose in the temptation.

Satan tested Christ in the area of three basic legitimate desires. Satan tested Christ in the area of physical appetite. He commanded Christ to turn a stone into bread for His own benefit; something which would have been done in disobedience to the Father's will. Jesus chose the will of God rather than the will of Satan.

The second temptation involved spiritual ambition. Satan, the prince of this world, offers Christ the kingdoms of this world apart from suffering. Christ's legitimate aim to possess the kingdoms someday were to be accomplished by specific means, namely His suffering and death. Satan's illegitimate short-cut would have made Christ a vassal of Satan. In the words of Plummer: "He rejects Satan as an ally, and thereby has him as an implacable enemy. The end does not sanctify the means." ⁸⁰

The third temptation dealt with Jesus' aesthetic nature. Satan suggested that Christ cast Himself down into the courts of the temple so that all the priests and people might see Him. This spectacular display of power would convince them of His Messiahship.

To have yielded to any of these temptations would have meant a circumvention of the will of God and a submission to Satan's will. Legitimate ends were offered by illegitimate means.

The triumph. – God's purpose in the temptation can be seen in the account of the temptation as well as its triumphant outcome. In effecting the testings Satan's part was merely that of an instrument.

⁷⁹ Zahn, *Das Evangelium*, p. 222.

⁸⁰ Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 112.

First of all, the testing showed Christ's true sonship. This is seen by Satan's "If thou be the son of God" in connection with "Thou art my beloved Son;" it is seen by the Bible references to Moses' exposition of the wilderness wanderings when Israel was tested as God's true son; it is seen by the striking parallels between Christ and Israel. McPheeters shows this parallelism:

Like Israel, Jesus found Himself in the wilderness; like Israel also, He found Himself there neither, as we say, by accident nor by His own deliberate choice; like Israel, He had been led into the wilderness by God; like Israel, He had been led there for a specific purpose; and, like Israel, the specific purpose for which our Lord had been led into the wilderness was that God might put Him to test, might prove Him. Here we may pause. So far at least the parallel between the experience of Israel and that of our Lord is complete, and too obvious to admit of question.⁸¹

Christ, as God's Son and Messiah, demonstrated His sinlessness through obedience to God's will.

The testing was further instrumental in equipping Christ as man's priest (Heb. 4:15). He was tempted in all points like as we are. His temptation may not have had a one-to-one correspondence with our temptations, but His testings were real. This does not mean that "Jesus could have yielded to them."⁸² The reality of a temptation does not depend on the possibility of a response. It is possible to attempt the impossible, as, for example, it is perfectly possible for a row boat to attack a battleship. Even though the outcome is certain in advance, it would not make the attack any less real.

Christ could not have sinned (I John 3:5b), but He did have the ability to do those things demanded of Him by Satan, although under the circumstances they would have been sin. Sin, as anything contrary to the nature of God would be impossible for God, for this would involve a logical contradiction of God violating His own nature which makes Him God, of God being not God.

The testing also left an example for believers. As Satan's power was limited with Christ so it is limited with us. "He can take Jesus to the pinnacle of the temple but he cannot push Him off. He would not even if he could. His result is reached only by appeal to man's desire."⁸³ The important thing in the example of Jesus is His showing by what means temptation may be revealed. The weapon is the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.

⁸¹ M. William McPheeters, "The Testing of Jesus," *The Biblical Review*, IV (October, 1919), 519.

⁸² Hobbs, *Exposition*, p. 80.

⁸³ John I. Armstrong, "The Temptation of Jesus," *Bible Magazine*, II (September, 1921), 809.

A final result of the temptation which may be mentioned and which is given special emphasis by Luke is that the temptation foreshadows Christ's final victory over Satan on the cross. Luke alone adds the words of verse thirteen: "And when the devil had ended every temptation, he departed from him for a while." The victory of Jesus is definite: the devil could not really make Him sin. But the devil's retreat is merely temporary; He will return at the Passion with all his satanic power. Luke alone cites the moment of Satan's return: "Satan entered into Judas" (22:3); and, when Jesus is apprehended at Gethsemane (22:53), He declares "This is your hour and the power of darkness."

Also the fact that Luke alone mentions that Jesus is taken to Jerusalem, which is the city of salvation in Lucan Theology, indicates Luke's soteriological purpose. He situates the last temptation in Jerusalem, not merely for stylistic reasons, but, as Navone concludes,

to stress the close connection between the desert episode and the Passion. In both cases Jesus is attacked by the devil. The Passion, in the Lucan account, is especially the devil's "hour." The Temptation prefigures the Passion in Jerusalem and underscores its importance.⁸⁴

The truthfulness of the account. – At a time when it is the fashion of the day to de-mythologize the life of Christ, a word about the historicity of the temptation account seems in order. The interpretations of the account vary greatly⁸⁵ and are still a matter of incessant discussion. Above all, however, the historicity of the temptation has been questioned. The account is looked upon as a parable,⁸⁶ as a mythological composition,⁸⁷ as an internal psychological experience – anything but an historical event. Kluge reminds us of the detrimental consequences of such interpretations:

The reinterpretation and elimination of the temptation of Jesus as an external event in his life has as its presupposition a complete ignorance of that which the devil

⁸⁴ John Navone, "The Temptation Account in St. Luke (4:1-13)," *Scripture*, XX (July, 1968), 71.

⁸⁵ For the various interpretations in the history of the church, cf. Navone, "Temptation," 65.

⁸⁶ Hugh Martin, *Luke's Portrait*, p. 36: "The Story is told in the parabolic form which was His customary way of speaking of spiritual things: it is a symbolic account of inward struggle. To interpret the story literally would be to make it grotesque."

⁸⁷ C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), p. 52: "The temptation narratives are indeed compounded of diverse elements. Their basis is mythical; it is the old story of a war of the gods, adapted to a particular Messianic conflict."

really is. . . . With the story of the temptation as a myth, i.e. without factual basis, the sin and the originator of sin himself become without any basic content or actual existence. Semler has thrown out the devil and a century later the same thing happens with sin, with which one knows to do just as little in this century as Semler in his with the devil. The elimination of the story of the temptation is a further step towards the disintegration of Christ himself, towards the dissolution of his divine authority as redeemer of humanity from sin.⁸⁸

The fact of the temptation cannot be convincingly explained unless it had its basis in historical reality. It could only be known if Christ Himself had related it. To charge Him with distortion in relating the event would mean the violation of the whole purpose of the temptation, namely, that Christ as a sinless Son, authenticated by the Spirit and the Father at His baptism and approved at His testing, was now ready to enter His public ministry of proclaiming the truth of God.

The Appellations of the Son of Man

The names which were used of the Son of Man by Himself and others form the strongest proof for the authentication of His person and purpose. The biblical teaching concerning names has been stated by Motyer in three propositions: "The name is the person; the name is the person revealed; and the name is the person actively present."⁸⁹ When this is applied to Christ it simply means that His names speak of His person, His program, and His presence. Many of the names and titles of Christ in Luke have a direct bearing on Luke's distinctive Christology.

Jesus

The personal name of the Lord was "Jesus" which means "Jehovah is salvation." The name is used in too narrative sections as the common appellation. However, there are several significant exceptions which show that the writers used the name of Jesus as a title, referring to His work of salvation. Especially Luke stresses this usage of the name. The careful repetition of the name at important stages of Christ's life bears out the observation that the name is the person revealed. Christ was called "Jesus" prospectively by Gabriel unto Mary (1:31:) and Luke himself uses it of Christ at His circumcision (2:21), baptism (3:21), and entrance into His public ministry (3: 23).

Luke also uses the simple name "Jesus" in combinations of clearly Messianic character. The Gadarene demoniac calls Him "Jesus, Son of God (8:28); the ten lepers addressed Him as

⁸⁸ Karl Kluge, "Zu der Apologie der Versuchungsgeschichte," *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, XXIII (1878), 123-124.

⁸⁹ J. A. Motyer, "Name," *The New Bible Dictionary*, ed. J. D. Douglas (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), p. 862.

"Jesus, Master" (17:13); the blind man at Jericho called Him "Jesus, Son of David" (18:38). Sinful men and satanic forces alike recognize that Jesus was more than a mere man, that His ministry was to save.⁹⁰

Son of Man

Jesus is also called the Son of Man and in all but a few instances the title is used by Jesus of Himself. It occurs in the New Testament eighty-six times and of those seventy-two are in the Synoptics. Luke uses the title twenty-six times.

The title emphasizes Christ's humanity:

With this formula Jesus usually addresses himself to the apprehension of his disciples. The reasons are quite obvious: Jesus was in his condition of humility; he was, as yet, thus best known to his followers in his humanity. He was to be recognized as the promised "seed of the woman," and withal, he was that Perfect Man whose unique mission into this world was to be the Redeemer of lost mankind.⁹¹

The title "son of man" is used frequently by Ezekiel as a self-designation (2:1; 3:1) but Christ's title goes further than "a son of man" as Ezekiel was. He is "**the** Son of man" in some very definite and emphatic sense, as explained by McCaig: "If 'son of man' is equivalent to 'man,' then '**the** Son of man' must be equivalent to The Man, the man preeminently, the distinguished Man."⁹²

But the title as used by Christ has a still greater significance. Jesus' use of the title was derived from the basic Old Testament passage, Daniel 7:13-14 (cf. Luke 22:67ff.), where the Messianic title is used in relation to the setting up of the kingdom. Christ's usage stresses more than His mere humanity, McCaig remarks:

Why should He so solemnly and emphatically claim to be Son of man, unless He knew that He was something more than man? If He were only a man, whence the need for the perpetual assertion of that fact? If He were indeed the ideal man, the representative man, the pattern man, how came He to be that? Must there not be something supra-human behind the human manifestation? Must He not be different from all other men in order to be the summation of humanity, the crown and flower, the ideal,

⁹⁰ Luke 8:39 is probably an identification of Jesus as God.

⁹¹ Merrill F. Unger, "Jesus Christ," *Unger's Bible Dictionary*, ed. Merrill F. Unger (Chicago: Moody Press, 1965), p. 581.

⁹² A. McCaig, "The Title 'Son of Man' in Its Lofty Associations," *The Biblical Review*, XII (1927), 45.

archetypal Man? I think we are compelled to see in the adoption of this title a confession of the intrinsic and divine dignity of His nature. It points to the condescension which brought the divine One into human conditions; it stands in implied antithesis and closest relation to His other august title, Son of God.⁹³

The usage of the title "Son of Man" in Luke confirms its Messianic character:

His Messianic claim could not have been more uncompromisingly made; and it is plain that for Him the title "The Son of Man" was primarily one which denoted His Messianic dignity – one, moreover, which He habitually preferred to "Messiah" because of the political connotation which the latter bore in the popular mind of His day.⁹⁴

Christ said that "the Son of man has power to forgive sins" (5:24), that "the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath" (6:5), that the Son of Man is a divine sign to His generation (11:30), that the Son of Man saves (19:10) through His death (22:22), that He shall finally return in glory (21:27), and, supremely, that the Son of Man is the Son of God, that is, deity (22:69-70).

While Luke is the Gospel of the Son of Man in His lowliness and humility, a man among men, the title "Son of Man" itself suggests primarily dignity rather than lowliness and assigns Christ a soteriological and eschatological work transcending human power.

The references to Jesus as the Son of Man emphasize that the human person who was to die was the divine King who would come to reign. This title is also somehow linked to the earth as the sphere of the King's activity.

The Son of God

Luke stresses the humanity of Christ but has also many references to His deity. It is this title "Son of God" which expresses the deity of Christ as distinguished from His humanity. In contrast with "Son of Man" which is used by Jesus exclusively, the title "Son of God" is employed by others as well. Unger writes concerning this title:

In Scripture this designation is never applied to his miraculous birth, or exclusively to his Messiahship, which, however, is included, but invariably to his original relation to the Father as he was in his preexistence before he assumed humanity. Our Lord declares himself to be the Son of God, and includes his Messiahship as based upon his proper oneness and equality with God, either by direct expression or indirectly by

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁹⁴ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 353.

implication.⁹⁵

Luke's usage of this title coincides largely with that of Matthew and Mark. Its main implication is that Christ is equal with the Father without being subordinate to Him. Luke 10:22 proves this, and on the basis of this verse Stonehouse concludes the following:

The Son's knowledge of the Father and the Father's knowledge of the Son are set forth with such exact correspondence and reciprocity, and moreover made the foundations of their respective sovereign revelational activity, that all subordination is excluded, and the passage constitutes an unambiguous claim of deity on the part of the Son.⁹⁶

Christ had been divine from all eternity and so the title "Son of God" was no mere theological after-thought of the early church but was used of Christ as a confirmation of His deity from too beginning of His ministry. Already His birth announcement by Gabriel included references to His sonship (1:32, 35) and, as has been shown, at the age of twelve Christ Himself was conscious of His unique sonship (2:49).⁹⁷ God confirmed the sonship at Christ's baptism (3:22-23) and at the transfiguration (9:35), and Satan recognized His sonship at the temptation.⁹⁸ The demons called Him by this divine title (8:28). Christ taught by parable that He was the Son of God (20:13-14) and acknowledged it at His trial (22:67).

This title signifies unequivocally too equality of the Son with the Father. The importance of this fact for an understanding of Luke is underscored by Stonehouse:

Without it all the rest would remain inexplicable inasmuch as it is only on the background of a full acknowledgment of His deity that His supernatural entrance into the world and His appointment to perform transcendent religious functions become intelligible. All of these designations of Jesus as Son of God-agree in witnessing to Luke's pervasively supernatural view of Jesus' person and activity, and therefore also present an insuperable obstacle in the path of the construction that Luke is a witness to an

⁹⁵ Unger, *Dictionary*, p. 581.

⁹⁶ Stonehouse, *Witness*, p. 167.

⁹⁷ Charles A. Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894), p. 235. "Jesus here at twelve years of age makes it known to his parents that he is assured of his Messianic calling. They knew it according to the stories of the infancy of Jesus reported by Luke, through the testimonies they had received. At the legal age for his appearance in the temple according to the traditional Jewish custom, he likewise was conscious of his Messiahship. As the Messiah he had the Father's work to do, and what should his parents find him doing but that work." The R. V. renders "in my father's house." Cf. Robertson, *Word Pictures*, II, 34.

⁹⁸ "If thou be the son of God" is a first class condition, assuming the statement to be true.

exclusively future exercise of Christ's messiahship.⁹⁹

Lord

"Lord" is a title expressing dignity, honor, and majesty. Generally the title is employed with considerable reserve in the description of the public ministry of the Savior. Whereas in the other Synoptics it occurs only in direct addresses to the Savior, **in Luke it is repeatedly used as an alternative narration designation to "Jesus"** (7:13; 10:1; 11:39; 12:42; 13:15; 17:5-6; 18:6; 22:31, 61). This usage seems to point to Luke's high opinion that "Jesus was a supernatural person who acted with divine authority, and at least occasionally applied the designation to Himself."¹⁰⁰ The title was further used by persons not belonging to Christ's disciples. Some were sincere (5:8; 7:6) and others insincere (6:46), meaning at times no more than teacher but at other times much more (18:41).

Elisabeth hails Mary even before the Savior's birth as "the mother of my Lord" (1:43) and the angel announces the birth with the words that a Savior had been born who is "Christ the Lord"¹⁰¹ (2:11). Simeon's prophecy that he would live to see "the Anointed of the Lord" (2:26) substantiates that the title "Lord," rightly used, is a designation for God. As Peter calls Jesus "Lord" he falls in worship at His feet (5:8).

As an adjectival attribute "Lord" appears only in the sayings concerning lordship over the Sabbath (6: 5) and the Lord's need of a colt (19:31, 34).¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Stonehouse, *Witness*, pp. 169-70.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 170. Cf. B. B. Warfield, *The Lord of Glory* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), for Luke's high view of the Savior, as seen by the designations of the Lord in the Third Gospel. Warfield shows that Luke, by quoting Isaiah's promise of a voice crying in the wilderness, "Make ye ready the way of the Lord, make His paths straight" (Luke 3:4), directly identifies the coming of Jesus with the advent of Jehovah. For Luke, therefore, Jesus is the Jehovah of the Old Testament (p. 105).

¹⁰¹ Winter asserts that the anarthrous "Lord" here clearly refers to deity since according to Lucan usage **when "Lord" is used for God, it lacks the definite article**, when used for Christ as Master it invariably retains it. Cf. Paul Winter, "Lukanische Miszellen," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXXIX (1958), 70-71.

¹⁰² Geerhardus Vos, "The Name 'Lord' as Used of Jesus in the Gospels," *Biblical Review*, VII (October, 1922), 522: "But looked at closely, even the Sabbath saying, while not indicating a title, has a larger background of comprehensive sovereignty. For it will be noticed that ... it reads: 'The Son-of-Man is lord also [or even] of the Sabbath.' Jesus has a wide lordship over things in which many other (or less weighty) matters are included. On the other hand, since Jesus was not the ordinary owner of the colt, and an extraordinary ownership is suggested, it follows that the

In the argument about the Davidic sonship (20:42ff.), Christ indicates His own view of the Lord. Vos comments discerningly:

He is placed not only as a sovereign above David, but this relation is also definitely fixed through David's calling him "my Lord." Besides, too purport of the entire argument lies not in the genealogical sphere; it is to vindicate for the Messiah a position of transcendental sovereignty, in protest against the earth-bound idea of the scribes, expressing itself in the other title "Son of David." We shall not be wide of our Lord's intent when paraphrasing: "The Messiah, being Lord even of so high a person as David, must needs be regarded as Lord universal."¹⁰³

Messiah

The use of "Christ" ("the Anointed One") authenticates Christ's claim to be the Messiah. The angels announced the Messiah's birth (2:11). The Holy Spirit revealed the appearance of the Messiah to Simeon (2 :26). Christ Himself claimed to be the Messiah (22:67; 24:26, 46). His enemies recognized His Messianic claim (23:39), and His disciples confessed Him to be the Messiah (9:20).

When Christ appeared in Palestine there seemed to have been at least two strands of Messianic expectation, which had been spun out of sacred history and the prophetic and apocalyptic commentary on it. These expectations have been summarized by Hill:

There was, first, the expectation of a glorious Messiah, usually thought of in warlike terms as a conqueror. The O. T. foundation of this hope is to be seen, for example in such passages as Ps 2, and Ps 109 (110). Secondly, there was the expectation of a humble, peaceful Messiah, the figure of Zac 9, 9 and Isa 61.¹⁰⁴

According to Hill, four key episodes in Luke show Christ to be the Messiah. The first is the Lord's baptism (3:21-22) where a double testimony is given to His office and status, audible and visual. The second episode is the Lord's visit to Nazareth (4:16ff.) during which He applies to Himself the prophecy of Isaiah 61. The third episode is the question sent by John in prison to Jesus and the Lord's answer, with the discourse on John which He followed up with 7:18ff. The final episode is Simon Peter's confession and the transfiguration (9:20, 28-36) which Luke binds

latter cannot have been restricted to this one animal, but must have included many other things."

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 522.

¹⁰⁴ E. Hill, "Messianic Fulfillment in St. Luke," *Studia Evangelica*, ed. Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Harald Riesenfeld, H. C. van Unnik (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), p. 190. Cf. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 273-99, for Jewish conceptions of the Messiah.

together more closely than any of the other Synoptics.¹⁰⁵

Other Messianic Titles

Besides the titles already mentioned and the Messianic episodes which so clearly identify Jesus as the Messiah, there are several other Messianic titles which support Peter's confession that Jesus is "the Christ of God."

One of these titles is "King." Christ accepts this title (23:3), others assert that He made this claim (23:2), identify Him as king (23:38), scoff Him as King, while some worship Him as King (19:38).

Another title is "God's elect," used of Christ by the Father at the transfiguration (9:35 R. V.) and used by His enemies in ridicule (23:35).

The title "Son of David" is likewise distinctly Messianic and has special reference to Christ's future reign on the throne of David (1:32-33). The blind man at Jericho repeatedly called Him by that title (18:38-39), recognizing in Him the person of the King and displaying more spiritual sight than the whole multitude.

In relation to that title Stonehouse has written:

Although Luke, in distinction from Matthew, is patently not concerned especially to commend Christ to the Jew, his recognition of Jesus as the Son of David provides still another emphatic testimony of the indispensable place which the Old Testament and its formulation of the messianic hope occupied within the faith and life of early Christianity. . . . The firm place which the title occupies in the Christian tradition, including Luke, is proof that the acknowledgments of Him as both Lord and Son of David were considered entirely consistent with each other.¹⁰⁶

One other important Messianic title remains, that of "Prophet,"¹⁰⁷ Luke presents Christ as the great prophet who has "visited his people" (7:16). Although some doubted His prophetic ability (7:39), others recognized Christ as a prophet on the basis of His work (9:8, 19). Christ applies the proverb concerning the prophet to Himself (4:24) and asserts that He must die in Jerusalem as a prophet (13:33f.) which fact the Emmaus disciples acknowledge (24:19).

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 192-98.

¹⁰⁶ Stonehouse, *Witness*, p. 168.

¹⁰⁷ B. McKeating, "The Prophet Jesus – II," *The Expository Times*, LXXIII (October, 1961- September, 1962), 50-53.

While modern scholars question ¹⁰⁸ or deny ¹⁰⁹ that Jesus ever claimed to be a prophet, Luke's testimony convinces the believing heart that a prophet greater than Jonah was active in Palestine.

It has been shown that the names and titles for Jesus authenticate His person and ministry. Several conclusions can be drawn from the Lucan usage of Christ's titles.

(1) With Luke, as with the other Evangelists, the titles of Christ, even those specifically referring to His humanity, always point beyond that to a totally unique person with a divine ministry.

(2) Although Luke primarily stresses the humanity of Christ, he speaks of Christ as deity in the fullest sense of the term.

(3) The references to Christ's deity come from various sources: demons, Satan, angels, Mary, Elisabeth, Luke, Peter, Christ, the Father, and the Spirit. There is a wide range in personages (from Satan to God) as well as in time (from before Christ's birth until after His resurrection).

(4) Christ's awareness of His person and mission is present even in His childhood.

¹⁰⁸ Vincent Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (New York: St. Martin's Press Inc., 1953), p. 15: "Whether He thought of Himself as a prophet is more open to question."

¹⁰⁹ Barrett, *Holy Spirit*, p. 98: "A more obvious, and also more useful, suggestion is that Jesus did not think of himself as a prophet, and therefore did not speak of himself as such."

CHAPTER VI

THE LUCAN PICTURE OF THE WORK OF THE SON OF MAN

Luke's emphasis on the work of the Son of Man is one of his Gospel's primary themes, as well as that of the other Gospels. The unique person came to perform a unique task. What this task was is the subject of this chapter.

The Activities in His Ministry

The divine imperative of His activities

His coming by divine necessity. – In Acts 2:23 Luke records Peter's statement which in a very real sense gives his theology of the ministry of Christ as well: "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Luke views the ministry of Christ from baptism to ascension as the working of a divine drama of salvation in which, though the human characters are free to act according to their own will, the plot has been determined by God. Luke constantly portrays Christ as acting under the authority of divine necessity. As Morris comments:

Luke has many references to the things which Jesus must do. It is never said in so many words whence this necessity arises, but no one is left in any real doubt but that this is the divine will. If God has determined that a thing be done, then it remains only for Jesus to fulfill it.¹¹⁰

While in the Gospel of Mark Christ only speaks once of the necessity of His death (8:31). Luke uses this same Greek verb no less than ten times in connection with Jesus' ministry. Christ asserted that He had to be about His Father's business (2:49). He had to preach the gospel of the Kingdom to many cities (4:43) and saw it as a divine necessity that He suffer and die (9:22). He had to heal a woman who had been sick for eighteen years (13:16). His noble ministry must of necessity be concluded first before men could put Him to death (13:33). His suffering and rejection were necessary (17:25) in light of prophecy concerning Him (22:17). After His resurrection, the angels reminded the women of His words that He had to be crucified and raised again (24:7) and the resurrected Christ Himself pointed out to the Emmaus disciples (24:26) and His own group of disciples (24:44) the necessity that the Scriptures be fulfilled concerning Him.

Luke does not present Jesus as responding without choice to an inexorable divine fiat, as Caird points out:

¹¹⁰ Leon Morris, *The Cross in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), p. 84.

We are not meant to think that Jesus was a fatalist, but that at every period in his life he responded with willing obedience to the necessity that was laid upon him by his vocation. God could not be held responsible for the perfidy of Judas or for any of the other sins which contributed to bring about the crucifixion, yet not even this happened outside the control of his determined plan. *For the Son of Man goes as it has been determined; but woe to that man by whom he is betrayed (22:22).*¹¹¹

His coming to fulfill prophecy. – The passages above have already shown that Christ came not only to fulfill a divine plan or purpose but that this purpose, at least in part, was found in prophecy. One of the Lucan motifs is that Christ acted in accordance with Old Testament prophecy. He begins his Gospel by telling his readers that he is writing about the things which have been "fulfilled" (πεπληροφρημένων). As Geldenhuys suggests, the word

points to the fact that in Jesus the divine promises of the Old Dispensation have been fulfilled and that a new era has been inaugurated. The fulness of the saving purpose of God has been revealed and the glad tidings must be proclaimed.¹¹²

Luke points to Christ as too fulfillment of the purpose of God. He shows in a three-fold way that the divine plan was both foretold and prefigured in the Old Testament. First of all, Luke introduces the idea of fulfillment into contexts where it is not present in parallel passages of the Synoptics (18:11; cf. Mark 10:33). Also, he repeatedly shows that Christ Himself saw His entire ministry in light of Old Testament prophecy (4:21) and showed His disciples that He came to fulfill Old Testament prophecy (22:17; 24:26, 44). From the passages of Luke 24 it can be seen that Christ did not merely fulfill a few isolated prophecies but the whole tenor and pattern of the Old Testament point to Him. So Luke demonstrate a also that Christ fulfilled types and patterns of the Old Testament. Calrd lists two types fulfilled by Christ which are important to Lucan Theology:

In particular he fulfilled the Exodus and the Passover. The Exodus, in which God had brought his people through slavery to freedom, had made them a nation, had bound them to himself by a gracious covenant, and had provided the basic pattern for the interpretation of Israel's subsequent history. The Lord their God who had brought them out of Egypt would redeem them from every humiliation, deserved or undeserved, and bring them in the end through the cleansing fires of affliction to their destined glory. This faith was kept alive by the annual memorial service of the Passover, which looked back to the historic emancipation and forward to God's future reign of righteousness and peace. Thus when Luke calls Christ's death "his exodus which he was to fulfill in Jerusalem" (9:31) and later links that death with the fulfilling of the Passover in the Kingdom of God

¹¹¹ G. B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1963), p. 35.

¹¹² Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966), p. 56.

(22:16), he means us to understand that in Christ God has brought to completion the great plan of redemption of which the whole story of the Old Testament was a prophetic forecast.¹¹³

His coming to perform a Messianic ministry. – Luke mentions four times that Christ's ministry was nothing short of a divine visit. Christ's birth showed that God had visited and was about to redeem His people (1:68), that the dayspring from on high had visited men to illumine and to guide them (1:78), that God came to His people in the person of a prophet (7:16) and that the rejection of His visit would result in judgment (19:44).

To Luke the coming of the Savior was the coming of God Himself to perform a Messianic ministry. The Evangelist's viewpoint has well been summarized by Caird:

God is not merely the playwright who has devised the plot for the drama of redemption; he is an actor who makes a personal appearance on the stage and whose presence brings the whole action to its denouement. The same idea is conveyed by Luke's frequent use of the verb euangelize³ (to "bring good news"), which he uses in preference to the noun euangelion, because in his mind it carried definite associations from its use in the Old Testament. ... As to the prophet, so to Luke, "The gospel of the kingdom" meant, the news that God had arrived among his people to assume his sovereign power.¹¹⁴

The Messianic import of His activities

As the Messiah of God, Jesus saw the activities of His ministry in the divine perspective. The note which was struck early in His life, that He must be about His Father's business (2:49), is carried on throughout the Gospel. Christ repeatedly affirmed His entire dedication to the will of God (4:5ff.; 4:9ff.) and viewed His activities as the fulfillment of His Messianic calling. These activities involved the revealing of the Father, the relating of the good news, the salvation of men, and the setting up of the kingdom.

The revealing of the Father. – Christ said much about the person of the Father whom He came to reveal (10:21-22). Throughout His ministry Christ assumes the existence of the Father (22:42). His essence is only hinted at. God is seen basically as a God of life (20:36-38).

The excellencies or attributes of God are generally seen in relation to the sinner and are primarily taught in parabolic form. God is a God of love, mercy, and longsuffering (15:20-24). He possesses the qualities of justice (15:12), omniscience and holiness (16:15), goodness

¹¹³ Caird, *Gospel*, pp. 34-35.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

(18:19), and omnipotence, authority, and power (22:42, 69; 18:27).

The exaltation or worship of God is accomplished by praise offered by both angels (15:10) and men (13:13; 18:34; 19:37; 23:47). It is further accomplished by the offering of possession (20:25; 21:4), by giving God a place of priority (16:13; 20:25), and by living for Him (20:38).

Christ further reveals that the purpose of the world finds expression in the Kingdom of God (13:18, 20). While the doctrine of the kingdom in Luke will be the subject of a later chapter, it will be well to note here that Christ spoke of many salient features of the kingdom. It was a subject receiving detailed explanation (13:12ff.). Christ discussed the means of entrance (13:24; 18:16-25), reasons for exclusions from it (13:25ff.; 14:24), the expectation of it (16:15; 19:11; 21:7-31; 22:16-18; 23:51), and the execution of it. It is characterized by the eating of bread (13:29; 24:15), the giving of rewards (19:15-19), and communion (22:16-18).

Besides the expression of God's purpose in the establishment of the kingdom, Christ gives also an explanation of God's purpose for individuals. God's purpose for sinners is that they be forgiven (15:20); for saints that they are His children, partakers of the resurrection, and ultimately like the angels (20:36); for Christ that He may be King (19:38), a prophet and teacher (4:18-19; 20:21) and a Savior (22:42); and for Israel, to cut it off (1.4:24) but ultimately to save it (1:71).

Christ revealed the person, purpose, and, finally, the performance of the Father. In relation to the world God, who by implication is its creator (10:21), is active in providence (12:6, 24). In relation to sinners, the Father forgives (15:21), judges (13:25ff.), abases (18:1.4), and invites (1.4:16). In relation to saints, God hears prayer and avenges (18:7-8), justifies (18:14), raises from the dead (20:36), gives life (20:38), and sends the Spirit (23:46). And in relation to Christ Himself, the Father chooses Him for a task (23:35), sends Him (19:39), empowers Him (9:43), authenticates Him (3:22; 9:35), allows Him to die (2:42), and receives His spirit (23:46). Finally, Christ revealed God as His unique Father. As Martin remarks:

God was His Father in a sense which was true of no one else. He distinguished between His sonship and that of others. He spoke of "my Father" and "your Father" but never of "our Father" when He was including others with Himself (cf. 12.30, 32; 10.22).

Indeed the distinctive teaching of Christianity is not that God is the Father of everybody but that He is the Father of Jesus. It was because of His unique consciousness of sonship that He called men to learn the secret of sonship from Himself. The clearest expression of this is to be found in 10.21ff.: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." He claimed to stand in a unique relationship both to God and to man. He knew God as no other did and had

the power to convey that knowledge.¹¹⁵

Christ also speaks of believers as God's children (12:32; 20:36), "for as well as being the Father of the Messiah, Jesus, God was also the Father of the 'little flock' of faithful Christians who acknowledged that Messiahship."¹¹⁶ And yet the believers' relationship to God is but a pale reflection of the unique eternal sonship of the Messiah.

The relating of the good news. – Luke 4:16-30, which has been called "perhaps the most significant passage in Luke-Acts,"¹¹⁷ reveals another aspect of Christ's Messianic activity. Zahn remarks that Christ, using the words "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears,"

explains not only that this sermon is the essence of His vocation, but that He at this very point, by proclaiming God's Word, was carrying out His task and that thus the time of grace proclaimed by Him had started. This proclamation of the good news is no longer a prophesying of that which is yet future but a designation of the present as the time of fulfillment of prophecies.¹¹⁸

Luke uses the visit to Nazareth as a microcosm of the entire Gospel. Tolbert traces too form which the pattern takes:

(1) The Jewish people are offered the gospel. (2) Their initial response is enthusiastic. (3) Their hostility is triggered by references, based on their own Scriptures, to the place of Gentiles in God's redemptive purposes; and they reject the gospel. The Jewish reaction against the teaching of the Old Testament is really tantamount to a rejection of the recognized basis of their own religion. (4) Jesus and others, primarily Paul, understand the universalism inherent in the Old Testament and act in accord with it. In this manner Luke shows that Christianity **and not Judaism** maintains continuity with the Jewish past.¹¹⁹

Christ explains the content of this good news in verse eighteen: there is release for the captives, recovery of sight for the blind, and liberty for them that are bruised. The following

¹¹⁵ Hugh Martin, *Luke's Portrait of Jesus* (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1949), pp. 108-9.

¹¹⁶ H. F. D. Sparks, "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood in the Gospels," *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 250.

¹¹⁷ Malcolm Tolbert, "Leading Ideas of the Gospel of Luke," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (Fall, 1967), 442.

¹¹⁸ Theodor Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas* (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920), pp. 238-39.

¹¹⁹ Tolbert, "Leading Ideas," 442-43.

verse gives the climax of that which the Messiah is to herald: the acceptable year of the Lord, that is, "the whole of the period of salvation which God inaugurates with the appearance of too Messiah."¹²⁰

Various other expressions by Luke point to Christ's task of relating the good news, such as bringing light to those in darkness and guiding the way (1: 79). He came to preach the kingdom of God (4:34), to send fire on the earth (12:49),¹²¹ and to bring division (12:51).

The salvation of men. – Luke emphasized that the cross was part of the divine plan for the Messiah. Old Testament prophecies relating to this aspect of Christ's work come primarily from Isaiah 40-66. There are at least eight references to this passage in the Gospel: 2:25, 30-32; 3:4-6, 22; 4:18-19; 6:20-22; 7:22; 22:37. These prophecies describe the mission of the Servant of the Lord who will/bring salvation to the world in spite of scorn, injury, and death.

Christ Himself spoke repeatedly of His mission to save. His claim to have come not to destroy men's lives but to save them (9:56) refers to the salvation of men's souls, as Lenski notes:

ψυχαί is here not used in the sense of "lives," that which animates the body, but in the sense of "souls," the immaterial part which is often named when the person is to be indicated, cf., Acts 2:41: 3000 ψυχαί , "souls" or persons. The great mission for which Jesus "came" from heaven to earth was to save, σωσαι , constative aorist, to rescue men from sin and damnation and to place them into permanent safety.¹²²

In Luke 19:10 Christ states in unequivocal terms that He came for this very purpose: to seek and to save that which was lost.¹²³

The setting up of the kingdom. – The announcement of the Savior's birth to Mary included the fact that He would be the fulfiller of the Davidic covenant (1:31-33). This prophecy necessitates that He would reign on the throne of David over the house of Jacob in an everlasting

¹²⁰ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 171. It is interesting to note that Christ failed to complete the quotation from Isaiah 61:1-2 because "the day of vengeance of our God" is still future.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 367: for the meaning of this difficult passage. He sees the fire to be Christ's authoritative Word.

¹²² R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of Luke's Gospel* (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1946), p. 558.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 945: "The emphasis is one 'came' which is placed forward for this reason, which tells of his coming in its entirety; it is a Messianic term, for Jesus is the One coming and as such was now present."

kingdom. The expressions "the throne of David" and "the house of Jacob," if taken literally and naturally, the way Mary must have understood them, indicated that Christ would reign as a literal King in a literal earthly kingdom. Godet rightly declares: "It is, indeed, the theocratic royalty and the Israelitish people, neither more nor less, that are in question here; Mary could have understood these expressions in no other way. . . ."¹²⁴

Jesus Christ, both in His own ministry and in that ministry entrusted to the disciples, announced the fact that the kingdom was at hand (17:21; 10:9-10). When the kingdom was rejected (11:14-23), Christ prepared His disciples for a long delay in its establishment (19:11-27) but promised them participation in the kingdom despite its delay (22:28-30).

This, the last of Christ's Messianic activities emphasized by Luke, shall yet see its fulfillment. Providentially, the establishment of the kingdom depends on the fulfillment of the other three ministries. Their completion assures the coming of Christ as King to establish His Kingdom.

His Association with the Multitude

The multitude has an important place in the Work of the Son of Man. Luke's presentation of Christ and the multitude has several distinctive features, including the designations used, the description of the multitude, and the dealings of Christ with the multitude.

Designations for the multitude

The Synoptic Gospels use three words which in English have been rendered multitude, people, crowd or throng.

Plethos. – This general term is employed for anything that appears in large numbers. It is used of a multitude of the heavenly host (Luke 2:13), of a multitude of fish (Luke 5:8), and of a multitude of people (Luke 1:10; 19:37; 23:1).

Laos. – Luke shows a fondness for *laos* ("people") where the other Synoptics use *ochlos* ("multitude").¹²⁵ He uses the word *laos* indiscriminately, sometimes in the sense in which it is

¹²⁴ F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans. H. D. Cusin (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1870), I, 91.

¹²⁵ Bernhard Citron, "The Multitude in the Synoptic Gospels," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, VII (1954), 409-10, where four seeming exceptions are explained: Matthew 4:23; 16:5; 27:25; 27:64.

used in the Septuagint, as the nation of Israel ¹²⁶ (e.g. 1:68; 2:32) and sometimes in a general sense as a crowd (e.g. 6:17; 23:27).

Ochlos. – The word most commonly used in the Synoptics is ochlos. ¹²⁷

The fact that *ochlos* appears much less frequently by Luke than by the other Synoptics has found a reasonable explanation: "The third Evangelist is conscious of the derogatory meaning of the word in classical Greek where it denotes 'the mob.' His aloofness from the *ochlos* can be traced throughout the Gospel." ¹²⁸

With the words for "multitude," Luke describes a general, impersonal crowd of throng without any derogatory or complimentary intentions. Only when his description of the multitude is examined does there appear a special emphasis.

Description of the multitude

Unruly crowds. – Matthew's Gospel generally omits references to the pressing, jostling, moving throng while the other Synoptics, especially Luke, note the disturbance caused by the unruly multitude. For example, Matthew simply describes the healing of the man who was sick of the palsy (Matt. 9:1ff.), while Mark and Luke describe the traffic jam in front of the house (Mark 2:3f; Luke 5:18fr.). After the healing the *ochlos* glorified God (Matt. 9:8). Mark and Luke avoid the word *ochlos* and use *pantes* (Mark 2:12) and *hapantes* (Luke 5:26).

At the occasion of the visit of Jesus' mother and brothers, Luke alone blames the crowd for not making way for the visitors (8:19), while in Mark the people even intercede for them (3:32). In the passage of the woman with the issue of blood Luke alone notes that the multitude throng Him (8:45; cf. Matt. 9:22), and on the occasion when Jesus taught from a ship, only Luke shows anxiety because "the people pressed upon him" (Luke 5:1; cf. Matt. 13:1ff.; Mark 4:1ff.). Luke's aversion towards crowds is illustrated by his hyperbolic expression that "there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trode upon one another" (12:1). Luke pictures the *ochlos* on the road through Jericho as an amorphous crowd

¹²⁶ For Israel's place in Luke cf. J. van Goudoever, "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel," *Novum Testamentum*, VIII (April-October, 1966), 95-110.

¹²⁷ Scroggie compares the frequency of *laos* ("people") and *ochlos* ("multitude") in the Synoptics: "The figures are: 'people,' in Mark, 3 times; in Matt., 15 times; in Luke (Gospel), 36 times, and in Acts, 48 times: 'multitude,' in Mark, 38 times; in Matt., 50 times; in Luke (Gospel), 41 times, and in Acts, 22 times: i.e. 'people' occurs in Luke twice as often as in Matt. and Mark together; and 'multitude,' twice as often in Matt. and Mark together as in Luke." W. Graham Scroggie, *A Guide to the Gospels* (London: Pickering and Inglis, Ltd., 1965), p. 338.

¹²⁸ Citron, "Multitude," 410.

which blocked the view for the small-sized Zacchaeus (Luke 19:3; cf. Matt. 20:31).

Citron concludes that in Luke's eyes the *ochlos* becomes the very symbol of madness:

Those vexed with unclean spirits are *ochloumenoi hupo pneumaton aktharton* (Luke 6.18). The use of the verb *ochleo* as indicating the work of evil demons because they crowd out the mind of those who have fallen under their spell, is characteristic for Luke. It is used in the same sense in Acts 5.16. Thus the whole *ochlos* that sought to touch Jesus (Luke 6.19) is the demon-possessed crowd, whose outward appearance reflects an inward state of mind).¹²⁹

Unfriendly multitude. – The crowds are in Luke's Gospel not only unruly and embarrassing but often unfriendly and hostile. In Matthew the multitude is normally sympathetic but at times led astray by Jewish demagogues (cf. Matt. 14:5). The slanderous allegation that Christ "casteth out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of the devils" is ascribed by Luke to the multitude (11:15), while in Matthew the remark is made by the Pharisees (9 :34). At the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem Luke does not even suggest the presence of a friendly multitude. Christ is hailed by the *plethos* of the disciples (19 :37) while the opposing Pharisees stand "among the multitude" (19:39). Pilate's verdict, "I find in him no fault at all" is according to Luke strongly resented by priest and people and made them "the more fierce" (23:5).

Both Matthew and Luke note a change of popular opinion after the death of Christ. According to Matthew the change seems to have been genuine (27:54), while in Luke the only noticeable change is remorse: "they smote their breasts" (23:48).

Unrelieved Galileans. – After a close examination of Luke's record Citron comes to the interesting conclusion that Luke's "only sympathy is for the *Gallilean* [sic] *ochlos*"¹³⁰ and that for Luke the initiative comes from the helpless multitude which followed Christ always throughout His Galilean ministry (Luke 6:17; cf. Matt. 4:25; Mark 3:7). The primary motive for the approach of the multitude was the desire to be healed. Luke pictures the anxious multitude waiting for Jesus' return from the land of the Gadarenes (8:40). Jesus lets them come very close (8:42). Those who had received Him first are now received¹³¹ by Him (9:11). The *ochloi* had opened their hearts to Jesus and He gave them access to His, preaching to them and healing them. Luke records much earlier than the other Synoptics the desire to hear the Word of God: "And it came to pass that as the people pressed upon him, to hear the word of God, he stood by the lake of Gennesaret" (5:1). The Galilean *ochlos* saw their unrelieved need for the divine message and ministry and Jesus granted them their request. This is the most positive aspect of Luke's

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 412.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 414.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, "The verb *apodechomai* (to receive gladly) means to give access to one's heart."

presentation of the relationship between Jesus and the multitude.

Dealings of Christ with the multitude

Absence of compassion for the multitude. – Luke frequently records the response of the multitude to Jesus' ministry. He is fond of stating that Jesus was surrounded and followed by great crowds that were filled with amazement at His works (5:26; 7:16-17; 9:43; 11:14; 13:17; 14:25). Yet he does not speak of Jesus' compassion on the multitude. As Harrison points out: "This is reserved for individuals."¹³² Luke, who shows such great interest in individuals shows, at best, an attitude of indifference towards the crowds. Citron lists three examples of characteristic unfavorable references to the multitude:

In Luke 3.7 John the Baptist addresses the multitude as "generation or vipers" while in Matt. 3.7 this hard saying is applied to Pharisees and Sadducees only. In Luke 11.29 Jesus calls the whole multitude "an evil generation," while in Matt. 12:39 only the Scribes and Pharisees are addressed in this way. In Luke 12.56, the *ochloi* are hypocrites, in Matt. 16.3, the Pharisees and Sadducees alone are hypocrites. . . . It is . . . impossible to decide whether Matthew intentionally shielded the *ochlos* or Luke exposed it.¹³³

Absence of instruction for the multitude. – The passages of the other Synoptics in which Christ Himself summons the multitude for instruction are lacking in Luke (cf. Mark 7:14; 8:43; Matt. 15:10). Likewise, there is a marked contrast in the passages of Christ's teaching. In Matthew and Mark Christ primarily teaches the multitude. In Luke, even if the multitude is present, Christ usually teaches His disciples. The introductions to the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon in the Plain afford a choice illustration of this. In Matthew, Christ "seeing the multitudes . . . taught them, saying" (Matt. 5 :1-2); in Luke "he lifted up his eyes upon the disciples and said . . ." (Luke 6:20).

As Luke records no invitations for the instruction of the multitude nor emphasizes incidents of teaching of the multitude, He also has a strange inversion of audiences in Christ's teaching. At places the audience changes suddenly from the multitude to the disciples. Mosley has a list of these references:

ix. 43b: "But while all were marvelling at all the things which he did, he said unto his disciples . . ."

x. 23: After apparently speaking to the multitude, "And turning to his disciples he said privately . . ."

¹³² Everett F. Harrison, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), p. 196.

¹³³ Citron, "Multitude," 416.

xii. 1: "When the many thousands of the multitude were gathered together . . . he began to say to his disciples first of all . . ."

xii. 22: After a parable spoken to the multitude, "And he said unto his disciples ... First of all . . ."

xii. 54: After speaking to the disciples, "And he said to the multitudes also . . ."

xvii. 20-2: After speaking with the Pharisees, "And he said unto the disciples . . ."

xx, 45: "And in the hearing of all the people he said unto his disciples . . ." ¹³⁴

At other places, where Mark has single audiences, Luke introduces a distinction of audience (9:43b; cf. Mark 9:30 and Luke 20:45; cf. Mark 12:38). Luke apparently has an overall purpose in this distinctive presentation. The Third Gospel is addressed to an individual and it is filled with references to individuals whose need was met by Christ. Luke's individualism is the other side of his universalism. Christ came with His message and ministry to all groups and nations as well as to every individual. Only as individuals personally respond to Christ can He meet their needs.

Absence of explanations in private to the disciples. – There remains to be discussed one more Lucan peculiarity in the teaching ministry of Christ. Along with Matthew Luke says nothing about a private explanation of Christ to His disciples. Mosley, after a discussion of all the relevant passages, comes to the conclusion that in Luke Jesus gave no special teaching privately. ¹³⁵

One cannot agree with Mosley's form-critical conclusion that "Luke's treatment of the Markan audiences shows that he felt quite free to change the audience references in his source" ¹³⁶ or that "the references to audiences reveal other motives at work, motives strong enough to override any concern to present an accurate picture of what actually had happened." ¹³⁷ But his question is legitimate: Why does Luke make the audience so definite without in any way attempting to explain how the different groups were separated out by Jesus, or how he concentrated on one group and ignored the rest?" ¹³⁸

¹³⁴ A. W. Mosley, "Jesus' Audiences in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke," *New Testament Studies*, X (1963-1964), 146.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 143-144.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 148.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 149. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. S. M. Hooke (London: S.C.M. Press, 1954), pp. 23-31. Jeremias' solution for the differences in the Synoptica audiences is worse than no solution at all and must be rejected. He writes of Matthew 18:12-14; Mark 9:50; and Luke 15 :2, for example: "We are faced with a contradiction which can hardly be resolved by harmonizing methods The same Evangelist contradicts himself." (p. 30)

¹³⁸ Mosley, "Jesus' Audiences," 147.

The answer to this distinctive feature of Luke lies in his distinctive theological emphasis. Luke faithfully records what occurred while stressing the ministry of the Son of Man to individuals.

The Authority of His Person

The authority resident in His words

Christ came as a teacher and claimed absolute authority for His teaching (Luke 10:16). While He appears in the Synoptic parallels as διδάσκαλος and is called by this title, in Luke alone He is addressed six times as ἐπιστάτης, and that primarily by His disciples (5:5; 8:24, 45; 9:33, 49; 17:13).¹³⁹ The word means "chief," "commander," "master," and "superintendent," so that *epistates* points to the special authority which Christ had and which was recognized by His disciples. Whereas Luke avoids the word "rabbi," Christ appears in his Gospel as *didaskalos* and *epistates* and these titles speak of His divine authority.

Christ as *didaskalos*. – Luke's use of *didaskalos*, which appears in his Gospel sixteen times, has been outlined by Glombitza:

The title διδάσκαλος is used in the Gospel of Luke in an unusual manner: it appears only in the synoptic parallels, and is entirely lacking in Luke's special material and in his formulation of the tradition. In fact, this title is used for Jesus only in the mouth of strangers which do not belong to the group of the disciples. Luke 22:11 is no exception, Jesus allows Himself to be designated thus by a stranger in relation to the preparation of the Lord's Supper. The disciples never address their Lord in this fashion, while Mark employs this title very freely.¹⁴⁰

Glombitza continues:

Luke, then, has a unique usage and treatment of this title: Jesus is only in the eyes of strangers and for strangers a teacher, Rabbi, but He is not that for His own. All this is remarkable, since Luke does not at all use the verb διδάσκειν infrequently.¹⁴¹

As a teacher Christ's authority was recognized even by the unbelieving (Luke 1:32; cf.

¹³⁹ Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966), p. 28.

¹⁴⁰ Otto Glombitza, "Die Titel διδάσκαλος und ἐπιστάτης für Jesus bei Lukas," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, IL (1958), 275.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 276.

Matt. 7:29; Mark 1:27) and "all bare him witness and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth" (Luke 4:22). As the divine teacher, He alone had the right and authority to reveal the Father (10: 21-22). His authoritative teaching put His adversaries to shame (13:7) and left them speechless (11:6),¹⁴² while "all the people were very attentive to hear him" (19:48).

Christ as epistates. – The usage of *epistates*, instead of pointing to Christ's function as a teacher and to a teacher-student relationship, indicates rather that Luke considered it as a title for a man with a special office and position and thus with special authority. Luke "uses it when he pictures Jesus as the one who is challenged to a revelation of His ἐξουσία,"¹⁴³ whether by word or by deed. A brief discussion of some of the references will bear out this point.

In Luke 5:5, Peter addresses Christ as *epistata*, indicating that his obedience to Jesus' command to draw fish does not rest on the resignation of an expert fisherman to the wish of a layperson, but rather on a conscious subjection to a man possessing authority. The double appellative *epistata*, *epistata*, in 8:24 at the stilling of the storm again emphasizes that the man who possesses special authority is called upon to display it. The address by John in 9:49, in relation to the exorcists who also cast out demons is closely tied to the authority of Christ's name with which the demons were cast out. Because of the authority resident in Christ, His words likewise carried absolute authority.¹⁴⁴

The authority revealed by His Works

The recognition of authority. – In Luke's presentation of the work of the Son of Man the recurring theme is that of Christ's authority, centered in the terms *evxousi,a* (4:32, 36; 5:24;

¹⁴² For Christ's reasonable approach as a teacher and His teaching methods in Luke, cf. John Baker, "Luke, the Critical Evangelist," *The Expository Times*, LXVIII (October, 1956 - September, 1957), 123 - 125.

¹⁴³ Glombitza, "Die Tite1," 277.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 278. Glombitza offers a cogent reason for Luke's unique use of this title: "It seems to me tha Luke by usage of the titles, that is, in the way he excludes διδάσκαλος for Jesus, and emphatically uses ἐπιστάτης, acts very consciously and permits us to see in this his theological concepts. It is important for him to show that the church in this world is not a school of philosophers and that Jesus is not the head of such a school. As its Lord, the church has a very special relationship to the world. Because the word ἐπιστάτης is not employed as a title by the heads or the schools of philosophers it is so appealing to him."

7:8) and ἐξέσταιν (6:2; 4:9). The definition of authority has been given by Foerster¹⁴⁵ as (a) that an action is possible in the sense that there are no hindrances or that the opportunity for it occurs and (b) that an action is not prevented by a higher norm or court, that it may be done or is not forbidden. In Christ it consequently denotes His divinely given authority to act freely and sovereignly.

Christ's claim to be the Messiah was substantiated by a display of His authority in the performance of miracles. His teaching at Capernaum brought a recognition of Christ's authority and power (4:32), and His casting out of demons brought amazement because of Christ's supernatural authority (4:36). Before the assembled Jewish leaders Christ claimed the authority to forgive sins, which alone belongs to God. And to demonstrate this claim, Christ healed the sick of the palsy (5:24).¹⁴⁶ With uncommon faith the Gentile centurion acknowledged Christ's royal authority in the realm of sickness (7:8).

The reason for miracles. – The miracles are Christ's preeminent display of authority. A miracle may be defined as:

an extraordinary act in the physical realm, perceptible by the senses, caused by the intervention of a transcendent supernatural power, and generally acts outside the realm of natural causes and effects.¹⁴⁷

Luke reveals at least two reasons for the miracles. They displayed the power of God and they disclosed the truth of God, thus authenticating the claims of the person who performed them. As Dunamis the miracles displayed God's transcendent power in the world, for "the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty

¹⁴⁵ H. Foerster, "Ἐξέσταιν," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), II, 560-74.

¹⁴⁶ Hermann Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5 vols.; Munchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), I, 495: "In the earlier period, the freedom from sin of the saved community was usually taken for granted. According to some passages the Messiah contributes to the bringing in of this future ideal, in so far as he destroys the godless out of Israel through judgment, sets at nought the might of the demonic powers, and protects his righteous people from sin by his government.... The notion also appears that Israel will attain forgiveness of sins through the intercession and suffering of the Messiah.... But on the other hand no passage is known to us in which the Messiah in his own authority accords to anyone the forgiveness of sins. The forgiveness of sins remains everywhere the exclusive right of God."

¹⁴⁷ Charles C. Ryrie, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1959), pp. 51-52.

works that they had seen; saying, blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord" (19:37-38a).

C. S. Lewis writes concerning the miracles and nature:

They show invasion by a Power which is not alien. They are what might be expected to happen when she is invaded not simply by a god, but by the God of Nature: by a Power which is outside her jurisdiction not as a foreigner but as a sovereign. They proclaim that He who has come is not merely a king but the King, her King and ours.¹⁴⁸

The miraculous power of Christ showed that Jesus of Nazareth was indeed the Messiah-King and God Himself.

The miracles also disclosed divine truth which could be taught no other way, truth "that proved that He was a Saviour by doing the works of a Saviour, by healing men and women from their diseases of both body and soul."¹⁴⁹ And again:

The essential message of the miracles is that they exhibit Our Lord in this character – that of one who has alike the will and the power to save. Such is Our Lord's own application of them in His answer . . . to the disciples of John the Baptist.¹⁵⁰

Not only do the miracles reveal something about the Messiah but they themselves are a revelation. They bear sufficient and valid testimony that Jesus is the promised Messiah. As has just been noted, Christ used the proof of His miracles thus with John (7:18-23). To this very day the miracles proclaim that God has visited this planet.

The realm of miracles. – Christ's miracles proved His authority over disease, nature, death and the spirit-world.¹⁵¹ Luke mentions twenty different miracles but indicates that they are only typical, representative cases. Whole groups of miracles are hinted at in 4:40; 5:15; 6:19; 7:21 and 8:2.

First, Luke shows that Christ's miracles prove His authority over every area of disease and deformity. Burton suggests that the list of healing miracles

¹⁴⁸ C. S. Lewis, *Miracles* (London: Collins, 1966), p. 136.

¹⁴⁹ H. Wace, "Miracles," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. James Orr (5 vols.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960), III, 2064.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁵¹ For a detailed classification of Gospel miracles cf. Brooke Foss Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (New York: Macmillan and Company, 1887), pp. 466-69.

measures off the entire circumference of the world of suffering, beginning with the withered hand, and going on and down to that "sacrament of death," leprosy, and to that yet further deep, demonical possession. Some diseases were of more recent origin, as the case of fever; others were chronic, of twelve or eighteen years' standing, or lifelong, as in the case of the possessed boy. In some a solitary organ was affected, as when the hand had withered, or the tongue was tied by some power of evil, or the eyes had lost their gift of vision. In others the whole person was diseased, as when the fires of the fever shot through the heated veins, or the leprosy was covering the flesh with the white scales of death. But whatever its nature or its stage, the disease was acute, as far as human probabilities went, past all hope of healing.¹⁵²

Christ's authority in the realm of nature is demonstrated by Luke in three miracles: the miracle of the multiplication of the bread (9 :12-17) which was a miracle of creative power; the miracle of the miraculous draught of fishes (5:1-11) and the stilled storm (8: 22-25), both of which were miracles of providence. These miracles over nature "betray the energy of One who had power not only over men, but over the unintelligent forces of the universe."¹⁵³

Two miracles present Christ as Lord over death. By raising the widow's son (7:11-17) and the daughter of Jairus (8:41-42, 49-56), Christ gave a picture of the ultimate permanent resurrection of all the saints. One who could reverse death and had authority over His own life and death (23:46) must be stronger than death and its forces. The miracles demonstrated that One had arrived who could and would conquer death.

Finally, Luke records at least four occasions when Christ cast out demons (4:33-36; 8:26-39; 9:38-43; 11:14). The demonic powers of Luke 4:33ff. knew Christ's authority, as Oosterzee shows:

The mystery concealed from the human world of the origin of Jesus and the purpose of His incarnation, is already known to the world of spirits, which almost instinctively is compelled to tremble when it recognizes its future conqueror.¹⁵⁴

The demons and even Satan had to give way to the one who by the finger of God made them depart, underscoring the fact that the authority of the Son of Man extends over matters of

¹⁵² Henry Burton, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.), pp. 256-57.

¹⁵³ J. H. Bernard, "Miracles," *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings (5 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), III, 390.

¹⁵⁴ J. J. Van Oosterzee, *The Gospel According to Luke, Lange's Commentary on the Scriptures*, ed. John Peter Lange, trans. Philip Schaff and Charles Starbuck (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960), p. 78.

life and death, matters of nature and the supernatural. All things are subject to His sovereign power.

The characteristics of miracles. – It has already been noted how varied in character and, humanly speaking, hopeless in their nature the cases of healing were, which Luke the Physician records. The authority of Christ extends into every area of human misery.

The cases were further presented to Jesus in various ways. Burton emphasizes this fact when he writes of the cases:

They were nearly all of them impromptu, extemporary events, coming without His seeking, and coming often as interruptions to His own plans. . . . No times were inopportune to Him, and no places were foreign to the Son of man, where men suffered and pain abode, Jesus refused no request on the ground that the time was not well chosen, and though He did again and again refuse the request of selfish interest or vain ambition, He never once turned a deaf ear to the cry of sorrow or of pain, no matter when or whence it came.¹⁵⁵

Thirdly, the miraculous actions were performed without means. There was a singular absence of methods. There was no prescription of remedies. Burton again is much to the tint:

In the seeming exception, the clay with which He anointed the eyes of the blind, and the waters of Siloam which he prescribed, were not remedial in themselves; the washing was rather the test of the man's faith, while the anointing was a sort of "aside," spoken, not to the man himself, but to the group of onlookers, preparing them for a fresh manifestation of His power.¹⁵⁶

Finally, Christ's miracles affected an instant and complete cure. "Immediately" is Luke's frequent and favorite word Peter's mother-in-law, apparently at the point of death, immediately recovers from her great fever and, as if nothing had happened, ministered to her guests. The disciples were baffled and chagrined, attempting what they could not perform as with the possessed boy; but with Jesus failure was impossible.

The miracles indeed point to the power and authority of Jesus. While prophets and apostles have healed the sick, their power was delegated, intermittent and temporary. The power which Jesus wielded was inherent and absolute.

¹⁵⁵ Burton, *Gospel*, p. 258.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 259. Cf. Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 26), quoting Greydanus: "In his performing of miracles the Lord was not dependent upon too faith of man. Nevertheless, He often accomplished it in connection with faith. It is here that some modern 'faith healers' err, because, while professing to continue the healing ministry of the Saviour, they demand from the sick that they should first be 'purified' and believe before they can be healed."

The reaction to miracles. – Luke often obtains emphasis by recording the feelings of amazement and astonishment excited by the wonderful deeds of the Lord. Luke pictures a Jesus who impressed men as deity impresses them. In addition to the reaction of wonderment throughout the Gospel (those waiting for Zacharias, 1:21; those who heard the shepherds, 1:63; Christ's parents at the purification, 2:33; those who heard the twelve-year-old Jesus in the temple, 2:47-48; those who heard Jesus at Nazareth twenty years later, 4:22; and the disciples on Easter Sunday, 24:41),¹⁵⁷ Luke relates special comments of the onlookers at the miracles which show that Christ's dignity and authority were clearly recognized. Morris writes of the miracles in Luke:

These might conceivably have been displays of mighty power, but Luke does not leave us with this impression.... Fear came on men who saw the miracles as they realized that God had visited His people (Lk. 7:16). Those who saw them were 'astonished at the majesty of God' (Lk. 9:43). Before the miracles men glorified God (Lk. 17:15-18).¹⁵⁸

The effects of miracles upon those who saw them, as indicated by Luke, may be summarized as follows:

- (1) Astonishment. The disciples were astonished at Christ's authority over the storm (8:25; cf. 5:26; 9:43; 11:14).
- (2) Fear. There was fear on the part of those who had seen the sick of the palsy healed, (5:26) and the widow's son raised (7:16; cf. 8:25).
- (3) Glorification of God, rejoicing. The healed Samaritan leper glorified God with a loud voice (17:15; cf. 5:26; 7:16) and gave thanks (17:16), while the people rejoiced at the healing of a woman with an issue of blood (13:17).
- (4) Confession of the authority of Jesus. At the healing of the demoniac His authority was recognized by all (4:36). At the miraculous draught of fish Peter recognized the hand of God.¹⁵⁹ In 7:16 Jesus is recognized as a prophet, and the people realized that God has visited His people.
- (5) Accusation against Jesus. He is accused of casting out demons by Beelzebub (11:15). This too is a confession of the supernatural authority of Jesus.

The reaction to the miracles show, in the words of Barrett, that "there is more in miracles

¹⁵⁷ G. Mackinlay, *Recent Discoveries in St. Luke's Writings* (London: Marshall Brothers, Ltd., 1921), pp. 36-37.

¹⁵⁸ Morris, *Cross*, p. 87.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*: "The recognition brought no immediate sense of joy or exaltation, but the surprising ejaculation, 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord' (Lu. 5:8). Peter reacted as in the presence of the very holiness of God. His joy in the catch was swamped by the realization that he was a sinner." Likewise, Plummer comments with great insight: "This miracle has brought home to him a new sense, both of his own sinfulness and of Christ's holiness. . . . This was a miracle in Peter's own craft, and therefore was likely to make a special impression on him." Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 145.

than their outward appearance. They are, to use the Fourth Evangelist's word, σημεῖα of the power of God" ¹⁶⁰ (4:48).

The Accomplishments in Salvation

Luke presents a superior Savior. For him Jesus plainly occupied the highest place. The position of Jesus revealed by the appellations used of Him by Luke and the authority exhibited in Christ's ministry indicate somewhat the stupendous task involved in bringing salvation. Since a person cannot well be separated from his work, of what tremendous significance must Christ's work have been which necessitated that the eternal Son of God accomplish man's salvation!

The promise of salvation

Salvation was promised from of old. It is the theme of the Old Testament and the theme of the inspired songs which were uttered in view of the Savior's birth.

The promise of the Scriptures. – Luke announces in his opening sentence already that he is writing about those matters which have been fulfilled (1:1). Christ's presence and work were in fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. Zacharias viewed the coming of salvation as a fulfillment of what God "spake by the mouth of his holy prophets" (1:70). This salvation of which he sings (1:68) has been eagerly anticipated by pious people (2:38; c1. 24:21) who waited for the "consolation of Israel" (2:25). Luke stresses too fulfillment of Scripture by Christ in Nazareth (4:16, 21) and records the Lord's statements that in His passion "all the things that are written must be fulfilled" (18:31; cf. 21:22). Luke sees specific fulfillment of prophecy in the fact that "he was reckoned with transgressors" (22:37) and notes that Christ saw prophecies concerning Himself in the entire Old Testament canon (24:25, 27, 44, 45, 46).

The promise of the songs. – In the early chapters of his Gospel Luke features a series of beautiful hymns. Morris writes concerning them: "While they are not professedly songs about salvation, there is much about salvation in them. Indeed it could be said that basically they all deal in one way or another with salvation." ¹⁶¹ Mary begins her song by praising God whom she describes as "God my Savior" (1:47). Zacharias, instead of primarily expressing joy over the birth of his own little son, begins his song with "Blessed be the Lord the God of Israel; for he hath visited and wrought redemption for his people, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David" (1:68-69). When Zacharias speaks of his own son, he does so in relation to the God-given salvation. The angelic song deals with the birth of "a Saviour which is Christ the Lord" (2:11). And Simeon can declare that he is ready to depart after seeing Christ,

¹⁶⁰ C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947), p. 86. Cf. pp.185-86 for a complete list of reactions to miracles in the Synoptics.

¹⁶¹ Morris, *Cross*, p. 74.

"For mine eyes have seen thy salvation" (2: 30).

The prediction of suffering

In various ways Luke reveals his deep interest in Christ's passion and all that concerns it. His narrative of the transfiguration of Christ shows his predominant interest in Christ's death.

In the transfiguration. – The predictions of Christ's passion in Luke's Gospel start immediately after Peter's confession that He is the "Christ of God" (9 :20). Christ charges His disciples to tell no man who He was and continues to tell the disciples of His suffering and death (9:21-22). Luke thus links the Savior's passion with Peter's profession, The former arises out of the latter. This typically Lucan procedure can be observed in the transfiguration narrative later in the chapter, which is linked to the preceding prediction by the statement that it took place "about eight days after these sayings" (9:28).¹⁶² In this section where chronological details are so meager the connection is important.

Unlike the other Evangelists, Luke relates that the subject of the conversation between Christ and the heavenly visitors was "his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem" (9:31).¹⁶³ Instead of emphasizing the glory and majesty of the transfigured Christ, Luke reveals his predominant interest in His passion even at this event. Geldenhuys shows what this event meant in light of Christ's passion:

Because He knew how terrible the suffering would be, and because the choice to undergo it voluntarily as man demanded such boundless self-denial, He seeks communion with His Father in prayer. And the transfiguration which He passes through is the answer of His Father. By this it is unambiguously revealed that when Jesus chooses the way of suffering for the redemption of sinful mankind He does so quite voluntarily, as this event shows, for He is the beloved Son of God, who is without sin and is under no obligation to suffer or to die. In addition, the transfiguration is an assurance given by God of His approval of the Saviour's choice.¹⁶⁴

From the transfiguration on Luke lets the shadow of the cross fall on his Gospel narrative by ever keeping the coming events before the reader (9:51; 13:22, 33; 17:11; 18:31; 19:28). But, as Stagg notes, "Shadow is not quite the word for it, for what Luke sees is a triumph, not a defeat.

¹⁶² Mark and Matthew speak of six days. Luke's variation from them can hardly be explained by those who suppose that Luke had Mark's Gospel before him.

¹⁶³ Lenski, *Interpretation*, p. 531. "Decease," writes Lenski, "denotes the entire 'exodus' (Ausgang) by which Jesus left this earth, the sacrificial death plus the resurrection and the glorification."

¹⁶⁴ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 281.

It is an accomplishment (9:31), a fulfillment (9:51), and a completion (18:31)." ¹⁶⁵

In the teaching of Christ. – Christ frequently taught indirectly and directly concerning His death. Very early in His ministry He prophesied that "the bridegroom shall be taken away from them" (5:35), an obvious reference to His death. Likewise Christ's teaching that He would be delivered into the hands of men (9:44) and Luke's observation that "the days were well nigh come that he should be received up" (9:51) point to His crucifixion. The fact that Jesus would give the sign of Jonah to His generation (11:29-30) and that He clearly spoke of Himself in the parable of the vineyard as the heir who was killed and the stone which the builders rejected (20:13-18) indicate the fate which would befall Him.

Aside from these indirect references, there are many direct statements concerning His death. He plainly announced His rejection, death, and resurrection (9 :22) and repeatedly predicted His death at the hands of men (9:31, 44). The physical suffering at the hands of the Gentiles, His death, and resurrection are prophesied by Christ in graphic detail (18:31-33), but not until the Last Supper does Christ speak of the significance of His death (22:15, 19-20), that His body and blood are given for men.

The inevitability of Jesus' death shines throughout all these direct and indirect sayings but the disciples failed to understand the importance of His teaching. Luke relates that the disciples "knew not this saying, and it was hid from them that they should not perceive it, and they feared to ask him concerning this saying" (9:45). And again, "They understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, and they knew not the things which were said" (18 :34). Peter still misunderstood at the very end, in Gethsemane (22:38).

The prescription for salvation

The fact of sin. – More than any other Evangelist Luke speaks of the sinfulness of man. His Gospel contains frequent references to the depravity of man, descriptions of various sins, and warnings of the doom of sinners.

Luke clearly sees that man needs a radical transformation if he would be saved. Men are on the wrong track because "that which is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of God" (16:15). In their achievement men are no better than "unprofitable servants" (17:10). Even the best of men – Christ's disciples – are classified as evil (11:13). No one at all is good except God (18:19).

Luke notes early in the Gospel that it was to be the work of John the Baptist to make right

¹⁶⁵ Frank Stagg, "The Journey Toward Jerusalem in Luke's Gospel," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (Fall, 1967), 501.

the heart of the people (1:17a) ¹⁶⁶ and to make ready the people for the Lord (1:17b). The implication is that men's hearts were not right neither were they themselves ready to confront their God. When John finally appeared, his ministry underscored the depravity of all men and the universality of sin. He denounced the sins of the multitude (3:7-10) as well as that of the individual groups (3:12-14).

The three parables of Luke 15 show man's lost condition and Christ's encounter with the questioning lawyer reveals the sinfulness of the human heart (10:25-36). Christ did indeed recognize distinctions in degrees of sin (5:32) but taught that sin was universal (18:8; 14:18) and that all men are depraved, that is, unable to perform meritorious works in the sight of God.

Descriptions of specific sins abound in the Third Gospel. John the Baptist pronounced judgment on racial pride, hypocrisy (3:8), and conformity to the crowd (3:10-14). Christ's parables reflect many forms of sin, both as inward attitude and outward act. Pride (15:2, 11-32; 18:9-14), unfaithfulness (16:1-13; 19:12-27), love of money (16:14), lack of love (10:25-37), love of the world (18:14), prayerlessness (18:1-8), lying (16:24), fruitlessness (15:6-9), and covetousness (Luke 12).

Besides these forms of sin, Christ showed something of the seriousness of sin and the doom which awaits the sinner. Men are lost (Luke 15) and will perish in their sins (13:1-5). Although God's patience is great, ultimately those who fail to bear fruit will perish (15:6-9). The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19-31) speaks of the certainty of punishment for godless living and the parable of the Wicked Husbandman (20:9-18) forcefully teaches the truth at evil-doers cannot look for immunity. There will be "days of vengeance" for those who will not repent (21:22).

The forgiveness of sin. – According to Luke, forgiveness of sin involves repentance or forsaking of sin, and faith in the Savior. Like the other Evangelists, Luke has much to say concerning the necessity of repentance. Repentance means a change of mind. "It indicates a complete change of attitude, spiritual and moral, towards God." ¹⁶⁷ Thus, "repentance includes the decision of the whole man to change, which means that there is not merely an external change

¹⁶⁶ Morris, Cross, p. 65: John's ministry to "turn the hearts of the fathers to the children" implied that the hearts of Israel's forbearers were against the children. They "could not but condemn children whose ways were so far removed from the right paths that were dear to the fathers. The children must be radically renewed. They must learn to walk in right paths. Then the hearts of the fathers will react differently."

¹⁶⁷ Paul S. Haick, "The Argument of the Gospel of Luke" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1965), p.123.

involved nor solely a change of inward attitude."¹⁶⁸ It involves an acknowledgment of their sinfulness, an acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah, and an accompaniment of good works.

Luke records the Baptist's clarion call to repentance (3:3-4) and notes that Jesus came to call sinners to repentance (5:32). Because men are evil they must repent (3:7) and show it in their lives (3:10-14). Luke alone reveals this detailed advice of the Baptist to the people, publicans, and soldiers. Especially in Luke men are presented as responsible beings:

God expects them to take their responsibility seriously and to turn from every evil thing. Luke sees the importance of this, and he will not let us miss the demands made on men by repentance. He spells them out in full. In the same vein he tells us that Jesus demanded that the forgiven practice the virtue of forgiveness (Lk. 11:4, 17:3f.). There must be changed lives.¹⁶⁹

With Luke there is no neutrality. A deed is either good or evil (6:9). The man who is not with Christ is against Him (11:23). Therefore he includes the Savior's charge that "repentance and remission of sins" should be preached throughout the whole world (14:47).

More than the other Synoptic writers Luke dwells on the forgiveness of sins. Although he nowhere clearly states it, the ability to perform the fruits of repentance which are demanded of every individual is dependent upon the fact that the sins are forgiven. In the other Gospels, injunctions to forsake sin follow forgiveness (John 5:14; 8:11). Faith in Christ as the Messiah-Redeemer is based on hearing and receiving the Word (8:15), and brings forgiveness (5:20, 24) and enablement and willingness for a new walk (7:41-42, 47-48).

The authority to forgive sins belongs to God alone (5:21), but Christ, as God incarnate, claims this power and exercises it (5:24).

Luke never suggests that salvation is by human merit. He records that Christ said to the woman whose sins had just been forgiven, "Thy faith hath saved thee" (7:50).¹⁷⁰ The faith of the centurion is commended (7:9), while the faithlessness of the disciples is castigated (8:25; 9:41). Luke also speaks of the saving faith in those who came to he healed (8:48; 17:19; 18:42). Their faith brought spiritual as well as temporal deliverance, as all genuine faith eventually will. For

¹⁶⁸ Jürgen Goetzmann, "Bekehrung," *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament* (3 vols.; Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1965), I, 73.

¹⁶⁹ Morris, *Cross*, p. 67.

¹⁷⁰ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 237: "Her faith in Him and in the grace of God is meant. Again we see that Jesus does not say "thy love hath saved thee," but "thy faith" – not because "faith" is a merit, but because it is her faith that appropriates the forgiveness which grace has bestowed.

Luke, faith in the Savior is not optional. He makes it clear that the coming of Christ forces men to a decision which has everlasting consequences. Morris refers to this need for a decision in response to Christ's ministry:

There is an ineluctable element of decision involved in His whole mission. His coming divides men. And the implication is that those who reject Him will eventually rue their decision. For Jerusalem the day of reckoning is near "because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation" (Lk. 19:44). It is a solemn matter to be visited by Christ. His offer of salvation is to be taken seriously. A day will come when many "shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able" (Lk. 13:24). Clearly Luke wants us to see that important issues are posed. There is a judgment hanging over all men. Jesus presents them with the possibility of escape. Let the not neglect their day of opportunity. ¹⁷¹

Luke's prescription for salvation is therefore **the forgiveness of sins, based on faith in the Savior, resulting in a complete change of life.**

The provision of salvation

The announcements of Christ's passion. – Certain peculiarities mark Luke's passion account, and they give a clue to Luke's distinctive emphasis on the death of Christ. For one thing, Luke fails to record the key passage of Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45, where the Lord Himself gives the theological interpretation of His death. Milligan asks the question:

Would it not be natural to expect that in a Gospel where Christ is distinctively held up before us as the Son of man, who "came to seek and to save that which was lost" (xix. 10), special stress would be laid upon the atoning significance of the death by which this was accomplished? Would we not, in fact, be justified in looking confidently to St. Luke to supplement too admittedly very scanty records of the other Evangelists in this respect? ¹⁷²

At first glance, at least, the very opposite seems to be the case.

There are also alterations in the Passion narrative. Luke has no reference to the anointing at Bethany which casts the shadow of His approaching death. In the account of the Last Supper the warning about Judas is postponed and the menace of the betrayal and the sorrow of the disciples do not overshadow the meal as in Mark's account. The prophecy of Peter's denial has been transformed from a tragedy to a confident assertion of the ultimate victory which would be

¹⁷¹ Morris, *Cross*, p. 73.

¹⁷² G. Milligan, "On the Lucan Interpretation of Christ's Death," *The Expositor*, II (1900), 71.

his (12:32).¹⁷³ Jesus is confident concerning His own destiny: "The Son of Man goeth as it has been determined" (22:22). There is no suggestion that the disciples would eventually forsake Him and in the recount of the scene in Gethsemane "there is almost no tension and very little agony."¹⁷⁴ The procedure before the council is much less solemn in Luke than it is in Matthew and Mark and gives the impression of an informal examination rather than a set trial. The high priest does not rend his clothes, neither do the members of too council definitely pronounce Christ guilty of death.

In the narrative of Christ's death there is, in contrast to the other Synoptics, a marked confidence and diversion of attention from Jesus to others. "Luke sees no tragedy in the good news about which he writes."¹⁷⁵ Kiddle writes concerning Christ's confidence:

He bids the women "weep not for Him, but for themselves (xxiii 28-31 Luke only). He gives the message of comfort to the malefactor – both would be together that day in Paradise (xxiii. 40-43 Luke only). And He dies with a cry of confident trust, "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit" (xxiii 46 Luke only) – a cry which is in complete contrast with and contradiction to the cry of despair recorded by St. Mark and St. Matthew, a cry which itself transforms the Crucifixion from tragedy to a victory, even before the Resurrection.¹⁷⁶

The same writer concludes in light of the emphasis of the Lucan passion account:

For St. Luke, the death on the Cross was certainly important, but only as the necessary condition of the Resurrection (xxlv 26-48); and the Resurrection, too, was extremely important, but chiefly because it led to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Luke xxiv 49, Acts i 4, ii 32-33 &c.).¹⁷⁷

Luke minimizes the tragedy to emphasize the glory:

¹⁷³ M. Kiddle, "The Passion Narrative in St. Luke's Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVI (July, 1935), 274. Kiddle calls this "an excellent example of St. Luke's constant tendency to regard past failures in the light of subsequent success. In fact, confidence has been substituted for anxiety, and joy for sorrow, throughout the proceedings."

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 275. Kiddle and others remove 22:43-44 as non-Lucan. Even with the verses retained, there is less revelation of suffering and grief here than in the other Synoptics. For the genuineness of the verses, cf. Baton J. Gloag, *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895), p. 241.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 269.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 275.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 270.

He wrote in the spirit of Easter and Whitsun, rather than that of Good Friday. He regarded the latter as necessary, but only as the short path to the unending glory which lay beyond – a glory which illuminated even the way to the Cross.¹⁷⁸

It is not that Luke denies the sacrificial or vicarious character of the Savior's sufferings but that "he passes beyond the offering of death to that of life, and thinks principally of the restored communion with God which Christ by His one offering Himself has affected."¹⁷⁹

Although Luke's passion account contains only one explicit statement concerning the theological Significance of Christ's death (22 :19-20), the fact that Luke highlights the innocence of the Savior is at least an implicit acknowledgment, that the innocent Son of Man died for guilty mankind. Laymon summarizes the evidence from the passion narrative:

Most dramatically when Jesus, accused of advocating treasonable acts, stood before Pilate, the Roman procurator, this ruler upon examining him distinctly declared: "I find no crime in this man" (23 :4). Later, when Jesus was arraigned before King Herod, he was returned to Pilate without judgment being passed upon him (vs. 6-12). Again Pilate said: "You (the Jewish authorities) brought me this man as one who was perverting the people; and after examining him before you, behold, I did not find this man guilty of any of your charges against him" (vs. 14). And yet once more Pilate asserted that he found no crime in him deserving death (vs. 22). Finally, in Jesus' hour of demise the Roman centurion in charge of the Crucifixion declared, "Certainly this man was innocent!" (vs. 47). The recording of these repeated announcements of innocence on the part of officials of state could hardly be accidental.¹⁸⁰

The accomplishments of Christ's passion. – What Christ accomplished in His death can be gathered from His own words and from Luke's description of His works in salvation. At the Last Supper, Christ Himself interpreted the significance of His death (22:19-20). While scholars differ whether verses 19b-20 should be in the original text,¹⁸¹ and critics are all too ready to dismiss them as interpolations and too eager to see a consequent contradiction between Luke and

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 273.

¹⁷⁹ Milligan, "Interpretation," 75.

¹⁸⁰ Charles M. Laymon, *Christ in the New Testament* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1968), p. 115.

¹⁸¹ Caird, *Gospel*, p. 237. Caird writes that "the Lucan account of the Last Supper is a scholar's paradise and a beginner's nightmare; for it raises problems in almost every department of New Testament study and has provided a basis for a welter of conflicting theories."

Paul,¹⁸² conservative scholars have demonstrated the genuineness of the text.¹⁸³

In this debated passage Christ shows three things concerning His death. First, He "freely surrendered His body unto death and . . . this gift of Himself in death constituted a sacrifice on behalf of His disciples."¹⁸⁴ Second, the breaking of bread and the pouring of the cup point to the violent sacrificial death which awaited Christ. And finally, Christ's death inaugurated a new covenant for the church which is in effect now (I Cor. 11:25; II Cor. 3:6; Gal. 4:21-31), and which includes regeneration and forgiveness of sins.

In Christ's own words, then, His death is a sacrifice for others and introduces a new covenant between God and man, including the possibility of forgiveness and regeneration.

Luke's description of the death of Christ furnishes another proof for the vicarious nature of Christ's death. While Conzelmann claims that Luke does not connect forgiveness with Jesus' death and can say, evidently with a straight face, that in Luke there is no "direct soteriological significance drawn from Jesus' suffering or death. There is no suggestion of a connection with the forgiveness of sins,"¹⁸⁵ evidence to the contrary abounds. While Luke is not as specific in these matters as his fellow Evangelists, yet he does greatly emphasize the passion of Christ. He introduces it into contexts where the other Synoptics do not; he constantly pictures it as taking place in accordance to God's predetermined plan; he thinks of Jesus as a Savior who came to deliver sinful men; he speaks of the physical sufferings and labors the point that Christ really

¹⁸² Kiddle, "Passion," 279: "There is not a single passage throughout St. Luke's gospel and Acts to correspond with St. Paul's emphasis on the death of Jesus on the Cross as the sole means of salvation, and its absolute price – nothing like his declaration that redemption was by His blood (Rom. iii 24-25)." Stonehouse's comment furnishes an able reply to this (p, 134); "In particular, considering the association of Luke with the apostle Paul and his opportunities of information regarding the life of the church of his day, it is incredible that he would have been unacquainted with the practice of the church as Paul reports it in I Cor. xi. 23ff, and would have published a contradictory version of it."

¹⁸³ Ned B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Luke to Christ* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951), p. 133. Stonehouse closes his incisive discussion with these words: "In brief, my impression is that Luke's account, on the supposition that the longer text is Lucan, although containing some distinctive features, is characterized by intrinsic intelligibility and consistency. Such difficulties as appear are comparatively superficial and largely vanished in the light of exegetical and archaeological investigation ... the shorter text is beset by insuperable exegetical and historical obstacles."

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p, 139. This is true even with the shorter reading.

¹⁸⁵ Hanz Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 201.

died.¹⁸⁶ It is true that Luke connects salvation with the person who is present (1:68-69, 76-77; 2:11, 30, 38) and with the Messiah who would return (21:28), but the conclusion is inescapable that Christ can only be a Savior because of His death. Morris rightly sums up his discussion of the Lucan view of Christ's passion:

In the light of all this, it is very difficult indeed to deny that Luke sees soteriological significance in Christ's death. And if he does not see soteriological significance, the question arises, What significance does he see? That he sees some significance is manifest, for he devotes much space to it. And if he does not expressly speak of the death as soteriological, it is also true that he does not expressly describe it any other way. He does not refer to it as the death of a martyr, for example. We are left to draw our conclusions from the kind of thing I have just noted. And at the very least such statement is more consonant with an atoning death than with any other kind of death. There is no essential difference here between Luke on the one hand and Matthew and Mark on the other.¹⁸⁷

God's provision for salvation is the vicarious death of Christ. It is the distinctive feature of the Third Gospel that sin and the Savior from sin are emphasized. Gardner summarizes this emphasis of the Gospel of Luke:

It shows peculiarly Christ's feeling toward sin and his efforts for man's rescue. In none of the other Gospels do we see so fully the pollution of the human heart, and Christ's patience and his power to save. More frequently than in any other Gospel does Christ call men sinners, and he himself is called the Saviour and his work salvation. His love is no weak sentimentalism ignoring the evil in the characters of those he loved; while he pities, he condemns, and he sees that only as they are rescued from the sin itself can there be any real salvation.¹⁸⁸

The Assumption of Former Glory

¹⁸⁶ For an important study of the physical sufferings of Christ cf. Don Falkenberg, "He Was Wounded ...," *Campus Fellowship*, III (1969), pp. 5, 14. Falkenberg shows that Christ suffered all types of flesh wounds known to medical science and that the Old Testament foretold each one of these types: *Bruising* (Isa. 53:5, 10; 52:14; Matt. 26:67; Mark 14:65; Luke 22:62; John 18:22; 19:3), *Laceration* (Ps. 129:1-3; Matt. 27:26; Mark 15:15; Luke 23:16, 22; John 19:1). *Penetration* (Isa. 55:13; Gen. 3:17, 18; Matt. 27:29-30; Mark 15:17, 19; John 19:2). *Perforation* (Ps. 22:16; Matt. 27:35; Mark 15:24; Luke 23:33; John 19:18). *Incision* (Zech. 12:10; John 19:33, 34). *Bursting* (Ps. 69:20; John 19:33, 34).

¹⁸⁷ Morris, *Cross*, p. 106.

¹⁸⁸ Edward P. Gardner, "Christ in the Four Gospels," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXV (April, 1912), 233.

Several striking expressions in Luke's Gospel make it clear that Luke regarded Christ's death primarily as the necessary prelude for Christ's resurrection and ascension.

In the transfiguration account, Luke represents Moses and Elijah as speaking with Jesus of His "decease" which He was to accomplish at Jerusalem (9:31). It has already been indicated that the term ἐξοδος seems specially chosen to embrace not only Christ's death, but His consequent resurrection and ascension. A little later in the same chapter Luke notes that Jesus steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem "that he should be received up" (9:5). The word ἀναλήψεως "is the substantive form of the regular biblical expression for ascending to Heaven."¹⁸⁹ Christ's own words, that He would be perfected the third day (13:32; τελειοῦμαι), undoubtedly speak of the goal of His whole mission when He would return to the glory of the Father. These passages demonstrate that for Luke the climax of Christ's earthly ministry came in His resurrection and ascension.

The resurrection

As with Paul so with Luke the resurrection of Christ is not merely the attestation of His saving work but itself an integral part of it.

The triumph of the resurrection. – Christ's resurrection was, first of all, a vindication of His righteous authority. The earthly Jesus displayed His divine authority, and the miracle of the resurrection vindicated this authority. Westcott describes the stupendous miracle of the resurrection:

It will be seen that in the fundamental and crowning miracle of the Gospel – the Resurrection – all these forms of miraculous working are included. The course of nature was controlled, for there was a great earthquake; the laws of material existence were overruled, for when the doors were shut Jesus came into the midst of His disciples, and when their eyes were opened He vanished out of their sight. The reign of death was overthrown, for many of the saints came out of their graves and went into the Holy City. The powers of the spiritual world were called forth, for angels watched at the sepulchre and ministered to believers. Thus full and harmonious is the whole strain of Scripture: **All things are double, one against another, and God hath made nothing imperfect.**
¹⁹⁰

In Luke's theology, the resurrection vindicated not only the claim of Christ (24:6-7) but

¹⁸⁹ Milligan, "Interpretation," 74.

¹⁹⁰ Westcott, *Introduction*, p. 469.

also the prophecy concerning Him (24:25-27, 44-46).¹⁹¹ Christ, who had committed every decision of life to the word of God, was proved to be righteous and true.

The resurrection of Christ was further a vindication of Christ's royal authority. Johnson has given expression to this fact:

The resurrection, in Jesus' own perspective, was the climax of His career in the first advent. It is significant to note that the Lord now changes His name which He uses to describe Himself in relation to Scriptural fulfillment. Previously, He had, used Son of Man (9:22, 44; 17:25; 18:32), but now He uses Χριστός (24:26, 46). It seems that the resurrection was the conclusive vindication of His claim and declaration of His Messiahship. This perspective was maintained in the book of Acts.¹⁹²

The teaching of the resurrection. – Unlike Matthew and Mark who focus their attention on Christ's resurrection appearances in Galilee, Luke confines Himself to the events at Jerusalem and its immediate vicinity. This does not mean that Luke considers the Galilean appearances as untrue or that he knew nothing of them. Luke's careful composition concentrates on Jerusalem as the city of salvation and the center of world evangelism. He selects those events which serve this purpose best and with which he is most familiar. Stonehouse writes:

It is quite possible that Luke, without doctrinal and historical bias, chose to select, from the many appearances of the risen Christ known to the Christian church, certain manifestations of which he personally could testify on the basis of his contacts with Christians in Judea.¹⁹³

Luke is not only unique in the nature of the resurrection appearances which he records but also in what his narrative reveals about the body of Christ. Luke's explicit references to the resurrection body of the Lord, which to liberal theologians smack of crass literalism and

¹⁹¹ These passages of Luke 24 make Christ's high view of the Scriptures apparent. He saw His ministry as the main theme of Old Testament prophecy; He acknowledged the certainty of the fulfillment of prophecy; He included the entire Old Testament canon in His view of Scripture; and He expressed concern over a neglect of the Scriptures.

¹⁹² Elliott E. Johnson, "A Study of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ in the Gospel of Luke" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1968), p. 244.

¹⁹³ Stonehouse, *Witness*, p. 148. Instead of adopting such a solution, even recent scholars still prefer to refer to the Lucan resurrection narratives as concoctions of myths and legends. Cf. Eduard Lohse, *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi im Zeugnis des Lukasevangeliums* (Neukirchen: Verlag, 1961), p. 32. For a refutation of this form-critical approach cf. Zane C. Hodges, "Form Criticism and the Resurrection Accounts," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXIV (October-December, 1967), 339-348.

"anti-docetic tendencies,"¹⁹⁴ are to believers a blessed pattern for their own resurrection bodies (Phil. 3:21; I John 3:2).

Christ's body can appear and disappear at will (24:30, 36), is very similar in appearance to His former body (24:16, 31, 39-40), consists of flesh and bones (24:39), although nothing is said of blood, can eat various kinds of food (24:30, 41-43), even though it is not needed any longer for sustenance, and is unhindered by obstacles (24:36; cf. John 20:19, "the doors were shut").

Christ appeared only to His disciples. He dispelled their doubts, demonstrated the necessity of His death, and discussed the future ministry of the disciples.

The ascension

Luke is the only Evangelist who brings his Gospel to a close with a reference to Christ's ascension and the adoration with which this incident was attended. That Luke had in mind more than a casual departure is seen by the response of the disciples who returned to Jerusalem with great joy to await the fulfillment of Jesus' promise (24:52-53).

In Luke the importance of the cross and resurrection lies in the fact that the way through suffering and death leads to glory, the way through humiliation leads to exaltation. Christ, who appeared at His transfiguration in His glory for a little season while yet in His humiliation (9:31), explains that only through His suffering could He "enter into His glory" (24: 26). The transfiguration seems to have been the beginning or the end, the beginning or the process by which Christ would assume His former glory, climaxing in the ascension. Lampe expresses this in the following words:

The exaltation is consummated at the Ascension when the prophecy of Ps. cx. 1 is fulfilled and Jesus is seated at the right hand of God, as he had himself predicted in his reply to the high priest. Through death to the heavenly throne. This is the picture which Luke is most concerned to show us.¹⁹⁵

The close position of the ascension in relation to the resurrection in the Third Gospel without a reference to the intervening forty days has led some to suppose that Luke followed two strands of tradition, one in the Gospel and one in Acts,¹⁹⁶ and that the two accounts stand in an

¹⁹⁴ Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 446.

¹⁹⁵ G. W. H. Lampe, "The Lucan Portrait of Christ," *New Testament Studies*, II (1955-1956), 167.

¹⁹⁶ For this view cf. H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. William P. Dickson and Frederick Crombie (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884), pp. 585-86.

"unbridgeable tension."¹⁹⁷ How untenable such a position is has been ably demonstrated in the past¹⁹⁸ and yet scholars continue to document their unbelief by pointing to non-existing contradictions. Luke's compressed account of Christ's post-resurrection ministry points rather to his theological emphasis, namely, that the immediate goal of the earthly ministry and passion of the Lord was His ascension into heaven "to enter into his glory."

¹⁹⁷ Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 450.

¹⁹⁸ Theodore D. Woolsey, "The End of Luke's Gospel and the Beginning of the Acts," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXIX (1882), 593-602.

CHAPTER VII

THE LUCAN PRIMACY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The Third Gospel has been called the Gospel of the Holy Spirit because it emphasizes the role of the Spirit in the life of Christ more than any other Gospel. There are at least seventeen references to too Holy Spirit in Luke. The expression "Holy Spirit" occurs thirteen times in Luke's Gospel and forty-one times in Acts, while it appears in Matthew only five times and in Mark four times.

A consensus of scholarly opinion sees the Holy Spirit as Luke's main motif in His Gospel and in Acts. Tatum speaks of the "centrality of the Spirit in the thought of St. Luke,"¹⁹⁹ and Lampe says that "the connecting thread which runs through both parts of Luke's work is the theme of the Spirit of God."²⁰⁰ Oliver sees the Spirit-motif especially in the Lucan birth stories.²⁰¹ A study of Luke-Acts will bear out Luke's intended emphasis on the Holy Spirit. Six out of eight major teachings of Christ on the Holy Spirit are recorded in Luke's Gospel, where christology and pneumatology are the main doctrines. Acts emphasizes pneumatology, ecclesiology, and christology, in that order.

The Personal Reality of the Holy Spirit in Luke's Gospel

Despite Luke's distinctive emphasis on the Spirit, he has little new revelation concerning Him. Lampe comments on this fact:

Although the activity of the divine Spirit is the essential theme of his writings, St. Luke has little to say concerning the nature of that Spirit (apart from its vitally important relationship to the person and work of Jesus) that is not already found in the Old Testament. In the literature of Israel the Spirit of God is generally conceived of as an impersonal [???] but divine force, deriving from its primary significance of "breath" or "wind" its two principal connotations of life-force and power. As the creative power of word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his

¹⁹⁹ W. Barnes Tatum, "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," *New Testament Studies*, XIII (1966-1967), 185.

²⁰⁰ G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 159.

²⁰¹ H. H. Oliver, "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke- Acts," *New Testament Studies*, X (1963- 1964), 224-225.

mouth.²⁰²

One would have to disagree with the observation that the Holy Spirit is primarily an impersonal force in the Old Testament, but even if this were the case, Luke, as well as the other Gospels, picture the Holy Spirit as a person. Were it not for the current denial of the personality of the Holy Spirit among Lucan scholars, a discussion of the personal reality of the Spirit could properly take a subservient place in Lucan theology, but the contemporary confusion in this area necessitates a refutation from Luke's Gospel itself.²⁰³

The opening chapters of Luke show a marked emphasis on the prophetic ministry of the Spirit. It is interesting to note that after the inception of Christ's ministry (4:18) there are only four more references to the Holy Spirit, and none refer to His activity during the Savior's ministry. The Holy Spirit prepared for the Messiah by prophetic utterances which He inspired. He prepared the body and person of the Messiah for His unique ministry. Not until Pentecost would the Spirit perform a universal ministry.²⁰⁴

The Holy Spirit as a person

Although the Spirit's personality is not distinctively emphasized in Luke's Gospel, there are several indications that He is more than merely an impersonal force.

²⁰² Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 160.

²⁰³ For assertions by contemporary Lucan scholars see the following works. C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), p. 17, where Barrett maintains that in the Gospels πνεῦμα stands "for impersonal, divine force, not a divine being." Tatum, pp. 184-94, only speaks of the prophetic, creative, and messianic Spirit, "while cautiously avoiding any reference to the Spirit as a person. Oliver, p. 22, identifies the power of the Highest with the Holy Spirit. Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966), p. 58. For Grundmann the Holy Spirit is merely "the creative power of God" ("erschaffende Gotteskraft"). Helmut Flender, *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*, trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 136: "The Holy Spirit acts '*comme le principe de sa vie physique*.'" Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960). Conzelmann fails to give the Holy Spirit sufficient consideration, and where he does discuss Him, he identifies Him with the power of God (cf. pp. 180-184).

²⁰⁴ Herbert Lockyer, *All the Doctrines of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1964), p. 89. Lockyer is correct with his general statement concerning the Spirit in the New Testament: "Concerning the work of the Spirit as revealed in the New Testament, we can classify the truth thus, Who the Spirit is and what He does is unfolded – *Historically* in the *gospels*, *Experimentally* in the *Acts*, *Doctrinally* in the *epistles*, *Governmentally* in the *Revelation*."

He has the attributes of personality. – Personality contains the essential elements of intellect, emotion or sensibility, and will. These elements or intimations of them can be found in the Lucan presentation of the Spirit, sketchy though His treatment might be.

The intellect of the Spirit is seen in the fact that He revealed matters concerning the Savior to Simeon (2:26) and that He is able to teach men what to say (12:12).

The Spirit's sensibility is only intimated in the Third Gospel. Luke records that Jesus rejoiced because of the Holy Spirit (10:21). Plummer explains that "this holy joy is a Divine inspiration"²⁰⁵ by the Holy Spirit. It is unthinkable that an impersonal force without emotions could elicit this startling emotional response of the Savior, only recorded by Luke. The Spirit's joyful revelation appears to be the cause of the Savior's jubilant ejaculation.

The will of the Spirit is seen in His ministry to Christ. He led Christ into the wilderness with the definite purpose of temptation, which implies an action as a result of the will on part of the Holy Spirit (4:1). Again, the Spirit's will is seen in the fact that He sent Christ to perform His ministry of teaching and healing (4:18). Christ's ministry shows the Spirit's purpose and purpose implies will.

He performs the actions of personality. – The very character of the Spirit's works makes it impossible to attribute these works to a mere power or influence.

The Spirit leads Simeon: "And he came by the Spirit into the temple" (2:27). And He directs Christ "who was led by the Spirit into the wilderness" (4:1).

Further, the Spirit sends Christ: "He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted" (4:18).

Likewise, the Spirit teaches: "For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say" (12:12).

Most importantly, the Spirit performs miracles:

And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. [Luke 1:35]

He receives the ascriptions of personality. – The Holy Spirit can be blasphemed: "Unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven" (12:10). This may possibly argue for the fact that He is a person.

²⁰⁵ Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), p. 281.

He is seen in association with other persons. – The Holy Spirit is associated in such a manner with other persons, and is yet separate from them, that the passages would have little meaning if He were not a person. If a sin against the Son of Man can be forgiven and yet blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is unforgivable (12:10), this argues for an equal if not superior personal being in relation to the Holy Spirit. Since the Son of Man is a person, it follows that the Holy Spirit can be no less.

The appearance of the Spirit at Christ's baptism (3:22), together with the Father, and the subsequent and immediate filling of Christ by the Spirit, and being led by the Spirit is inexplicable and totally confusing if the Spirit is an impersonal force or emanation.

There are also two passages in which Luke relates the Holy Spirit to His own power and yet distinguishes him from it, so that it is impossible to conclude that the Spirit is a mere power. The first passage reads: "And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" (4:14). Luke views the Holy Spirit as a person who has power, not simply as a powerful force or thing. The same distinction between the person of the Spirit and the power of the Spirit is found in Luke 1:35: "The Holy Ghost shall come, upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." If the Spirit and power were synonymous, these words would be a useless repetition.

The Holy Spirit as deity

He has the appellations of deity. – The appellations of the Holy Spirit bear witness to His deity. The Spirit is called by Jesus Himself "the Spirit of the Lord" (4:18). The word here used for "Lord" is "Jehovah," the covenant-keeping One. The Spirit is thus named because His origin is from God, He functions for God, and He is one with God in His nature.

The title "Holy Spirit" or "Holy Ghost" (11:13) is the most formal title of the Spirit and the most frequently used. It emphasizes the Spirit's essential, moral character. Only God possesses true, absolute holiness, and since the holiness of the Spirit is consistently predicated in His name, this is evidence of His deity.

He has the attributes of deity. – The attributes of the Holy Spirit also point to His deity. As has just been mentioned, the Spirit is called the Holy Spirit because He possesses that innate, absolute holiness which only God possesses. The Holy Spirit is further seen to possess omnipotence. This is indicated in Luke 1:35. The angel tells Mary that the Holy Spirit shall come upon her and the power of the Most High shall overshadow her. The Holy Spirit is seen in the exercise of His divine power as He creates the sinless human Savior. This same supernatural power is attributed to the Spirit by Christ, who acknowledges that His own power to perform miracles was that of the Spirit (4:14-15, 18; cf. 11:20).

Luke also implies that the Spirit possesses omniscience. He writes: "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, being forty days tempted of the devil" (LI-2). It is very apparent that the Spirit arranged the temptation,

knowing in advance the time, place, and outcome. The Spirit in His omniscience led Jesus on this predetermined course to the predestined conclusion of His triumph over Satan. A further indication of the Spirit's omniscience may be found in Luke 12:12. Luke records the Lord's saying that the Spirit will enable the disciples to defend themselves. They may not know what to answer but the omniscient Holy Spirit will give them the right word at the right time. The obvious teaching of this passage is that the Holy Spirit knows all of man's circumstances. He knows when they need help and He knows how to help them.

He performs the acts of deity. – Luke relates acts of the Holy Spirit which only God can perform and which therefore further demonstrate the deity of the Spirit. It has already been shown that the Holy Spirit is able to create. He is the *Creator Spiritus* in Mary. Tatum speaks of this creation:

The Spirit acts as the *divine creative power* – acting upon matter and producing the life of this unique child. Through the "overshadowing" of the Spirit, the virgin Mary conceives a son. Indeed, Jesus can justifiably be called "Son of the Most High" (1.31) and "Son of God" (1.35) because he is conceived through the agency of God's Spirit.²⁰⁶

Navone has included under the Spirit's creative power the whole new creation:

Just as the Spirit of God was active at the foundation of the world, so that same Spirit was also to be expected at its renewal. The Spirit of God spoken of as the recreating, revivifying power of the days of the Messiah. The entry of the redeemer upon the stage of history would therefore be the work of the Spirit; its significance would be grasped in terms of the messianic and eschatological prophecies concerning the new creation.²⁰⁷

Perhaps separate from the Spirit's act of creation of the human Savior and yet related to it is the act of begetting Christ. Although the process of the incarnation will forever remain an inscrutable mystery, the Spirit's work was more than the creating of a mere human life. The begetting of Christ involved the joining of the eternal God to man and the protecting of this God-man from the taint of sin. Only a divine person would be capable of accomplishing such an unparalleled act of power and wisdom.

Luke also mentions one incident of revelation by the Spirit: "It was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ" (2:26). If revelation is God's communicating to man that which he could otherwise not know, then this act of the Holy Spirit marks Him as divine.

²⁰⁶ Tatum, "Epoch," 187.

²⁰⁷ John Navone, "The Holy Spirit," *Scripture*, XX (July, 1968), 80.

One further act of the Holy Spirit worth noting, which receives repeated emphasis by Luke, is the Spirit's inspiration of persons which enables them to prophesy (1:11; 1:67; 2:25) and to speak things which they must say to make the defense that God wants them to make (12:12). Lenski writes of this latter divine act of the Spirit:

This is direct, miraculous aid; and when the Spirit gives a man what he is to say, the proper name for this act is inspiration, verbal inspiration, than which no other exists. And the argument is quite invincible that, if God's Spirit inspired the disciples when they were subjected to court trials, he was certainly able to inspire those whom he desired when it came to the far greater interest of supplying God's Word to all ages.²⁰⁸

He is seen in association with the Father and the Son. – Finally, there appears to be at least one passage in which Luke, by pointing to the Spirit's associations with the other members of the trinity, indirectly argues for His deity. He alone records Christ's words from Isaiah 61:1-2 in Luke 4: 18: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me." Rienecker asks, "What does it mean that here there is no mention of the Holy Spirit but rather of the **Spirit of the Lord**?" His answer is as follows:

Undoubtedly the divine Trinity is meant to be given expression here. It is comprised of the Spirit (Holy Spirit), the Lord, that is, God the Father (in the Old Testament God is constantly called Lord), then Jesus, the Son of God, of whom the Spirit is; three persons and yet one! The one person Jesus is so filled with the Spirit and with God, that the expression "the Spirit of the Lord is upon me" sets forth the unity of essence in the divine Trinity. A mystery worthy of worship.²⁰⁹

Besides this association of the members of the trinity, Luke mentions the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the other members of the trinity. When Christ said in His parting words, "And behold I send the promise of my Father upon you" (24:49), He referred to the Holy Spirit's descent on the day of Pentecost. Alford comments on this passage:

The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son is here clearly declared, as well as that from the Father. And consequently we find St. Peter, in Acts ii. 33, referring back to *these very words*, in ascribing the outpouring of the Spirit to the now exalted Saviour.²¹⁰

²⁰⁸ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of Luke's Gospel* (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1946), p. 683.

²⁰⁹ Fritz Rienecker, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1966), p. 123.

²¹⁰ Henry Alford, *The Gospel According to Luke, The New Testament for English Readers* (Boston: Lee and Shephard, 1872), I, 450.

Barrett remarks that Luke's conception of the Trinity is one in which "the Father sends the Son and the Son sends the Spirit," however, "the operations of the Spirit never bear any valuation lower than the operation of God."²¹¹ Although Luke has no clear statement concerning the procession of the Spirit, the Spirit's functions during the life of Christ (e.g. 3:22; 4:18) seem to point to the fact that the Spirit issues forth from the Father as well, Barrett's statement notwithstanding. During the ministry of Christ God sends the Spirit to empower Christ. At Pentecost, the Spirit is sent as a gift and His source is "from on high" (24:29), from the Father²¹² and from the exalted Lord.

It has become clear that the various appellations, attributes, acts, and associations of the Spirit cannot help but underscore the conclusion that the Spirit is God and in thus demonstrating the Spirit's deity, these considerations are a further proof for the personality of the Spirit as well.

The Holy Spirit in types

"A type is a divinely purposed illustration which prefigures its corresponding reality."²¹³ Types enrich and illustrate Bible doctrine. The Scriptures record various types or emblems of the Holy Spirit and the Gospel of Luke names three of them.

Clothing. – Luke 24:49 in the ASV reads as follows: "And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high." Clearly Christ was predicting the experience at Pentecost when the disciples were filled with the Spirit. As Ryrie suggests, this may be a pictorial emblem of our relationship as belonging to God and representing Him (cf. Luke 15:22; e.g., the commencement gown and hood represent the university from which the wearer received the honor of which the regalia is an emblem).²¹⁴

Dove. – While all four Gospels mention that at Christ's baptism the Holy Spirit descended upon Him as a dove, only Luke stresses that it was "in a bodily shape like a dove" (3:22). Obviously something visible occurred. The picture of a dove in Luke's Gospel served to make Christ known to John the Baptist (it appeared in bodily shape); it showed the heavenly origin of the Spirit (it descended from the opened heavens); and it spoke of the peaceful nature of the Spirit (it rested on Christ).

²¹¹ C. K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (London: The Epworth Press, 1961), p. 67.

²¹² Luke 11:13 for the brachyology or abbreviation of thought where the gift of the Spirit is said to be given ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ("out of heaven").

²¹³ Charles C. Ryrie, *The Holy Spirit* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1965), p. 23.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

Oil. – Jesus referred to His own anointing (4:18), which probably took place at His baptism. Anointing speaks of the application of oil which plays such an important part in both the Old and the New Testament and which is an obvious type of the Holy Spirit. As oil was used in the inductions of kings to their office (I Sam. 10:1; 16:13; I Kings 1:39; Ps. 23:5), so Christ's anointing by the Spirit appears to mark Him off as the true Messiah.

When Luke's teachings concerning the personality, the deity, and the types of the Spirit are given sufficient consideration, they present an irrefutable argument against modern Lucan scholars who identify the Spirit with the impersonal power of God and give Him only scanty treatment in their study.

The Vital Relationships of the Holy Spirit to the Ministry of the Son of Man

Luke's primary contribution to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is in the area of the Spirit's vital relationship to the person and work of the Son of Man.

The Relationship to the Preparation of the Son of Man

The relationship to the persons introducing Christ. – To the men and women introducing the birth of Christ the Holy Spirit is primarily a Spirit of Prophecy. Lampe comments on this distinctive feature of Lucan theology:

A most striking feature of the opening chapters of St. Luke's work is the outburst of the prophetic Spirit which forms the setting of the Forerunner's birth and mission and of the birth and infancy of Jesus. Prophetic inspiration had disappeared from the Hebrew scene since the days of the great canonical prophets, and Spirit-possession had apparently ceased in Israel. It suddenly reappears in full vigour at the beginning of the gospel story.

²¹⁵

Luke's initial reference to the Spirit appears on the lips of the angel Gabriel in the annunciation to Zechariah that his wife Elisabeth will bear a son, John.²¹⁶ It is John who "will be filled with the

²¹⁵ Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 163.

²¹⁶ Lenski, *Interpretation*, pp. 46-47, remarks: "Not enough attention is paid to the striking fact that the person of the Holy Spirit and his divine work are mentioned to Jews as being perfectly known to them. There is never a word of explanation that God exists in three persons, and there is never even a question, to say nothing of a word of objection, in the Unitarian sense."

Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb" (1:3).²¹⁷ Literally, that means "while still in the womb" instead of "from birth" (cf. 1:41, 44). By his outward features, John is to be a very exceptional prophet (1:35a). The filling makes him a well-equipped prophet, prepared ~or the ministry of prophecy concerning the Son of Man. He will bring joy and gladness, "those characteristic features of the Spirit's activity as St. Luke conceives of it."²¹⁸ Important for Lucan theology is the fact that here the Spirit comes upon John as the Spirit of Prophecy. The immediate context of Gabriel's speech makes this quite clear. John goes forth "in the spirit and in the power of Elijah" (1:17). Indeed, John can properly be called "the prophet of the Highest" (1:76) only because he is filled with the Spirit.

The second mention of the prophetic ministry of the Spirit occurs when the two pregnant cousins, Mary and Elisabeth, met, and the babe in the womb of the latter leaps in honorific salutation. Thereupon "Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost" (1:41). Inspired by the Spirit, she hails Mary's unborn son as her Lord and pronounces benedictions on Mary. Again, this filling by the Spirit was "charismatic, enabling her to speak prophecy through a revelatory enlightenment."²¹⁹

Not only did Elisabeth utter prophecy, but it is specifically said of Zacharias that he prophesied. After the circumcision and naming of John, "his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost" (1:67). Immediately "he prophesied" (1:67). The so-called *Benedictus* follows. Luke again shows that the dominant role of the Spirit in preparation for the Messiah lies in the realm of prophecy.

Likewise, Simeon, a devout Israelite, experienced the ministry of the Holy Spirit. Three comments refer to the relation of the Spirit to Simeon. "The Holy Ghost was upon him" (2:25). Geldenhuys rightly takes this to mean that "he was constantly under the influence of the prophetic working of the Holy Ghost."²²⁰ Further, "it had been revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost" (2:26) that he would live to see the Messiah. And under the guidance of the Spirit he came into the temple (2:27) just before Christ was brought there by Joseph and Mary. It is

²¹⁷ Werner H. K. Soames, *Old Theology* (London: James Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1910), p. 71: "There seems to be only one way in which to account for this phenomenon, the *special circumstances* of the case. John the Baptist was to be the Lord's 'forerunner,' and therefore he required to be specially equipped for his great and unique work. Exceptional circumstances called for an exceptional agent or instrument, and for an exceptional equipment."

²¹⁸ Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 165. Cf. Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 51: "He is intoxicated, but not from wine or strong drink, but from the Spirit of God He is 'more than a prophet,' the greatest among those born of women (Lk. 7 :26, 28)."

²¹⁹ Lenski, *Interpretation*, p. 78.

²²⁰ Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), p. 118.

certainly the prophetic power of the Spirit which prompts Simeon's excited hymn of praise.

Finally, one is inclined to agree with Kann²²¹ that the prophetess Anna was enlightened by the Spirit as well concerning the official capacity of the child before her, although Luke does not specifically mention this. Yet there can be no other explanation for her conduct (2:38). The Spirit enlightened her, for, says Rengstorf, "according to Luke only the Holy Spirit is able to effect the recognition of Jesus as the Son of God (cf. 2:25; Acts)." ²²²

It is not surprising that Luke highlights the Spirit's prophetic ministry at the inception of the Messianic age. In Judaism the Spirit was known primarily as the Spirit of prophecy²²³ and it was expected that the coming of the Messiah would be proclaimed by men on whom the revelatory and inspiratory influence of the Spirit rested. ²²⁴

Luke shows that the Spirit of prophecy, the Holy Spirit, came according to Jewish expectation for the purpose of the nation's preparation for and proclamation of their Messiah.

The relationship to His birth. – While Matthew speaks of the Spirit's role in the birth of Christ (Matt. 1:18, 20-21), Luke is much more specific. The angelic message announcing the conception of Jesus embraces three Lucan themes: the Holy Spirit, the power of God, and the divine sonship. Mary is told that "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (1:35). Both Matthew and Luke name the Holy Spirit as the agent of the virgin birth but Luke contributes the means: "the power of the Highest," that is, the power of God, shall overshadow Mary. ²²⁵

²²¹ Herbert E. Kann, "The Holy Spirit and His Relation to Christ as Found in the Four Gospels." (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1940), p. 58.

²²² Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962), p. 30.

²²³ Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5 vols.; München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), II, 127-28: "How self-evident to Rabbinic Judaism was the equivalence of the Holy Spirit with the divine Spirit of prophecy or prediction is especially clear from the fact that the Targums have simply translated the OT 'Spirit of God,' or 'Spirit of Yahweh,' or 'Holy Spirit' by 'Spirit of Prophecy.' For this reason, without further proof, it should be assumed that the Rabbinic scholars everywhere (except where the context makes it necessary to think of the Spirit inspiring Scripture) understood by the Holy Spirit the Spirit of prophecy, or of prophetic endowment."

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 129.

²²⁵ Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 24: "It is the idea of the Shechinah which is suggested here (Exod. xl.38). The cloud of glory signified the Divine presence and power, and it is under such

The relationship between the Spirit and the power of God is a peculiar Lucan *leitmotiv*, as Navone notes.²²⁶ The power of the Highest is the omnipotence of God and show. that the entire conception was wrought by the omnipotent operation of the Holy Spirit. While modern Lucan scholars make the Spirit synonymous with this power,²²⁷ Luke does not confound the person of the Spirit with His power. The Holy Spirit begets the Son, but He is never called the Father of the Son. Pearson suggests a reason for this:

No more is here to be attributed to the Spirit, than what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a mother.... As Christ was made of the substance of the Virgin, so He was not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, Whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget Him by any communication of His essence, therefore He is not the Father of Him, though He were conceived by Him.²²⁸

The Holy Spirit as the agent of the virgin birth is also responsible for the result of the miraculous birth. The relation between the Spirit and His omnipotence, on the one hand, and the divine sonship, on the other hand, is one of cause and effect. It is because of (διό και)

influence that Mary is to become a mother."

²²⁶ Navone, "Holy Spirit," 83: "The two themes appear 3 times together in his Gospel (1.17 and 35; 4.14), and 3 times together in Acts (1.8; 6.8; 10.38). In every case except Luke 1.17, the two themes appear together in important contexts where they dominate the development of the plan of salvation."

²²⁷ Ibid.: "The relationship between the Holy Spirit and the power of God is one of parallelism in which the terms are practically synonymous."
Also, Tatum, "Epoch," 187: "The 'Power of the Host High' is synonymous with the preceding 'Holy Spirit,'" and
Oliver, I "Lucan," 224: "It is clear that for Luke δύναμις υ ψίστου is equal to πνεῦμα ἅγιον ; as well as Barrett, Holy Spirit, p , 76, where he takes the two clauses of Luke 1:35 "as members of a synonymous parallelism, and there is probably no difference between them."
Neither can one agree with Nigel Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1965), p. 19: "This residuum of anarthrous references to a holy spirit repays scrutiny. It was not the third person of the Trinity that overshadowed St. Mary and empowered her to conceive the Messiah; it was this indefinable and holy power of God."
But the absence of the definite article, which causes such confusion for Turner, simply stresses the qualitative aspect of the Holy Spirit. Cf. H. E. Dana and Julius Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 149.

²²⁸ Cited by Henry Alford, *The New Testament for English Readers* (Boston: Lee and Shephard, 1872), I, 296-297.

the activity of the Spirit that the child shall be called the Son of God.²²⁹ Literally, the angel promised, "That which shall be born of thee shall be called holy, the Son of God."²³⁰ The unborn child, because of the Spirit's activity, is called ἄγιον, as being free from the taint of all sin. The birth through Mary guaranteed the Savior's humanity; the conception by the Holy Spirit guarded His humanity against imperfection and sin.

The relationship to His baptism. – In his account of the baptism of Christ, Luke lays a greater emphasis on the operation of the Spirit than do the other Evangelists. He does so through his insertion of the phrase "in bodily form" and through mentioning that the Spirit came while Jesus prayed.²³¹ While in the Lucan perspective Jesus' baptism is the historical recognition by God and the Holy Spirit of what He had been from His birth, yet something more seems to be implied. Although Luke nowhere mentions the fact expressly, yet the prime function of the Spirit at Christ's baptism, although different from it, seems to have been that of anointing the Messiah. Christ refers to His anointing in Luke 4:18. Luke's references to it in Acts (4:27; 11:38) brings Navone to the convincing conclusion that "the anointing took place at his baptism and implies that he is unique."²³² The anointing seems to have had at least a three-fold importance for the life and ministry of Christ:

- (1) The anointing endorsed Jesus as the true Messiah, distinguishing Him from all the false Messiahs (3:22, cf. Acts 4:27).
- (2) The act of anointing endued Jesus with power for His prophetic ministry (4:18).
- (3) It enabled Jesus to perform the ministry of the Messiah (4:18; cf. Acts 10:38). It marked the

²²⁹ Tatum, "Epoch," 188-89: "Of importance is this: *the status of John or Jesus is determined by his own peculiar relationship with God's spirit....* On the one hand, the Spirit relates itself to John as the dynamic *Spirit of prophecy*. On the other hand, the Spirit relates itself to Jesus as the *divine creative power* which forms him in the womb of his mother Mary.... These differences in the role of the Spirit in the early lives of John and Jesus underline ... the subordination of John to Jesus. Filled with the Holy Spirit, John is simply the 'prophet of the Host High' (1.67). Created by the Holy Spirit, Jesus is the one 'Son of the Host High' (1.35). As a prophet John can become strong in the Spirit (I. 80). But as the Son of God Jesus does *not* grow in the spirit (ii.40, 52).

²³⁰ Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 25.

²³¹ Francis Joseph Crump, *Pneuma in the Gospels* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954). Crump holds (p. 37) that the only clear reference in Luke's Gospel to the personality of the Holy Spirit is at Christ's baptism. The references to "Spirit" in the New Testament prior to the baptism of Christ are vague and obscure and therefore cannot be used as direct proofs for the existence of a distinct third personality in the Trinity. At the time of baptism, however, the distinctive personality of the Spirit is made manifest under the form of a dove.

²³² Navone, "Holy Spirit," 86.

beginning of His public display of power through miracles.

The relationship to His temptation. – Luke describes Jesus as being "full of the Spirit" (4:1), when He returns from His baptism in the Jordan. While it is not possible to come to a dogmatic conclusion, it is reasonable to suppose that Christ was filled from the very moment of conception. Several reasons suggest themselves why this would be so. Since the persons of the Trinity are inseparable, it would follow that Jesus was filled by the Spirit and the Father from the womb. Further, the revelation that John was filled with the Spirit from his mother's womb argues strongly for the view that Jesus was filled at the same time.²³³ Moreover, since no sin separated Jesus from His father, to whom He was ever submissive, it is evident that the Spirit always filled or controlled His whole being. Old Testament passages concerning the Messiah (Isa. 11:1-3; 42:1-4; 61:1-2; cf. Luke 4:18) imply that the Messiah is always filled with the Spirit.

It was under this control of the Spirit that "Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness" (4:1)²³⁴ to be tempted. This guidance of the Spirit was apparently constant in His life, as was His obedience to that guidance. Luke's distinctive presentation of the Spirit's ministry to the tempted Savior has been well set forth by Lampe:

It is St. Luke alone who emphasizes the completeness of our Lord's Spirit-possession in connection with this event, and so brings the struggle with too devil within the scope of the Spirit's operation. To overcome the forces of evil, as well as to exercise wisdom and judgment, was part of the work of Spirit-possessed messianic leader prophesied by Isaiah, and the activity of the Spirit is often associated by St. Luke with the conflict against the adversary (Cf. Lk. 10:21 in its context in this Gospel).²³⁵

The relationship to the preaching of the Son of Man

According to Luke, Christ's journey from the Jordan is directly related to the ministry of the Spirit. The Spirit is active at its beginning at the baptism (3 :22), during the interruption by the temptation (4:1-13), as well as at its conclusion" in Galilee, as "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit" (4:14).

In the synagogue at Nazareth Jesus relates His prophetic ministry to the anointing of the Holy Spirit. He sees Himself as that prophet foretold in Isaiah 61:1-2a, whose mission it is to bring in the age of salvation. Luke links this proclamation at Nazareth with the preceding

²³³ John F. Walvoord, *The Holy Spirit* (Findlay: Dunham Publishing Company, 1958), p. 92.

²³⁴ Like Matthew, Luke avoids the more violent Marcan word ἐκβάλλειν .

²³⁵ Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 170.

accounts of the temptation and the baptism by stressing the Spirit- unction of Jesus. His purpose is to show that Christ is united with the Spirit in a far closer bond than any prophet before Him. The prophets of Israel were possessed by the Spirit in a temporary and spasmodic fashion, whereas, so far as the Savior's words and works are concerned, they are virtually identical with those of the Spirit Himself.

Not merely does Jesus recognize His preaching to be the result of the ministry of the Spirit, but Jesus also rejoices during His prophetic ministry in the Spirit:

In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father; for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight [10:21, ASV].

Schlatter has well stated the Spirit's role in this uniquely Lucan revelation of the Savior's ecstasy:

Jesus' joy was based on the Holy Spirit; for it was not the result of a natural well-being but originated from a look at God, as a gift from God above. Only because Jesus was moved by the Spirit could it be a joy for Him, that it was those poor in spirit and knowledge, whom the Father brought to Him, not the wise and understanding. And only because of the Spirit stood the Father so near and great before Him, that in recognizing Him He found His full satisfaction. Only because of the Spirit did He bear it with joy that He remained a mystery for all others, so that nobody understood Him and He solely had the Father as a friend and witness who knew what was in His heart. Only because of the Spirit did Jesus know Himself to be exalted above all of humanity with this supreme and royal certainty; that is, His kingdom and possession, because the Father has given over to Him, who is on the way to the cross, all things.²³⁶

Christ rejoices in the sovereignty of God's salvation. The message of the kingdom was withheld from some while revealed to others. Christ also rejoices in the simplicity of God's salvation. Even those untrained in the Rabbinical schools, the untaught, can understand the way of salvation.

This is the only text in the Gospel where we read of Jesus' rejoicing. His joy is analogous to that of Mary and Elisabeth who rejoice because of their insight into and participation in God's plan of salvation (1:14,47). In both cases Luke emphasizes that the joy is associated with the Holy Spirit.²³⁷

²³⁶ Adolf Schlatter, *Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1961), p. 266.

²³⁷ The rabbis held, in contrast to this, that the Holy Spirit rests only upon a happy person. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 176.

The relationship to His performing of miracles

The power of the Spirit. – According to Luke, the Spirit's empowering of Christ, which was visibly and historically manifested at His baptism, appears to characterize His entire ministry (4:14). As Navone observes: "The entire impact of his mission is achieved in virtue of the Spirit."²³⁸ This is especially borne out by Luke 4:18 where Christ emphatically asserts that He is sent by the Spirit to preach and to heal. The word ἀποστέλλω used by Luke "adds the idea of a delegated authority making the person sent to be the envoy or representative of too sender."²³⁹ Christ's authority is derived from the Spirit and His power "is the translation into action, as it were, of the authority which he possesses."²⁴⁰

It is clear that the display of divine power in the ministry of Jesus resulted from the work of the Holy Spirit on His behalf (4:1a). Luke records Jesus' answer to the accusation of complicity with Beelzebub: "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you" (11:20). For this enigmatic phrase "by the finger of God" Matthew has as counterpart "by the Spirit of God" (Matt. 12: 28). At first glance the absence of the term "Holy Spirit" in Luke's account is surprising, especially since it is he among the synoptic Evangelists with the distinctive emphasis on the Spirit. However, the expression "finger of God" in the Old Testament denotes the power of God (Exod. 8:19; Ps. 8:3). Jesus cast out demons by the power of God, that is, by His spirit. Crane writes in relation to this:

The Spirit of God was God active for the redemption of men – God working. Luke simply gives us an equivalent for the term "Spirit of God" – one which brings out more plainly the activity of God. The Spirit of God and the finger of God might well be equivalent terms in this case.⁴²

What is not so clear, however, is whether Christ performed all His miracles in the power of the Spirit or whether some of His miracles were performed in the power of His own- nature. While the latter proposition is denied by some,²⁴¹ and a solution cannot be conclusive, there appear to be at least some instances where Christ acted in His own power. So, for example, Luke attributes the healing of those who came from Galilee, Judea, and Jerusalem to the "power of the Lord" (5 :17). Again, the healing of the multitude after the choosing of the disciples was the

²³⁸ Navone, "Holy Spirit," 88.

²³⁹ Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 121.

²⁴⁰ Louis B. Crane, *The Teaching of Jesus concerning the Holy Spirit* (New York: American Tract Society, 1905), p. 43.

²⁴¹ Elliott E. Johnson, "A Study of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ in the Gospel of Luke," (unpublished Th. D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1968), pp. 206-7.

result of His own power (6:19) and the power is said to have proceeded from Christ as too woman with the issue of blood touched Him (6:19). Luke records one other instance of an apparently miraculous display of Christ's own power. At a time when the enraged multitude endeavored to kill Him, He escaped through their midst (4:29-30). From these passages it is best to conclude that while Christ generally performed miracles in the power of the Spirit, He was not bound to do so and could exercise His own power as well.

The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. – Luke records the warning concerning the sin against the Holy Spirit in its shortest form: "And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven" (Luke 12:10).

According to Matthew (12 :22-32) and Mark (3:22-30), the warning is directed against the Pharisees who accused Jesus of casting out demons by the power of Satan. Mark particularizes the sin of the accusers by recording that they said of Jesus: "He hath an unclean spirit" (3 :30). It was too sin of ascribing the works of divine mercy and power which Christ wrought in the power of the Spirit to a diabolical source.

The fact that Luke introduces the word about the blasphemy here in this context where Christ speaks to His disciples, shows that in Luke's Gospel the saying is not so much a warning to the disciples against this, the most extreme sin, but in the context of verse eight and nine and eleven and twelve, it appears that Christ gives an indication to what extreme men go in their opposition to Him and the denial of His word and works as being clearly divine.²⁴² The disciples had already heard earlier the blasphemous charges directed against Christ by the Scribes and Pharisees (5:24) who charged that Jesus worked in league with Beelzebub (11:14).

In the context of Luke 12:10, Luke does not explain why remission is impossible for those who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, for Jesus is here not warning against this sin. But even so, the fact that blasphemy against the Son of Man would be forgiven while blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is unpardonable, indicates the awesome prominence of the person and power of the Spirit in the ministry of Jesus. The Spirit's work in the miracles of Christ was so evident that to deny it and to confuse it with the power of Satan meant to be guilty of the most heinous sin.

The relationship to the prayers of the Son of Man

A number of the Third Gospel's references to the Holy Spirit are linked with the prayers of Jesus. Navone relates several instances:

²⁴² Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 190-91, who thinks that because of the context, "Luke understands the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit to be rejection of the Spirit's inspiration when one is required to testify before persecutors."

The theme of the Holy Spirit and prayer enters into the account of Jesus' baptism. Luke alone notes that Jesus was praying when the Holy Spirit anointed him (3.21-22). Jesus' joyful prayer of gratitude at his Father's self-revelation to the little ones (10.21) is inspired by the Holy Spirit. The Christian community's prayer is also accompanied by the Holy Spirit (Acts 4.23-31); and it carries on the constant prayer of Jesus, according to his command (Luke 21.36).²⁴³

It is therefore not surprising that Christ urged His disciples to pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit. The Son of Man in His humiliation, as well as all men, needs the ministry of the Holy Spirit. As Lampe remarks, it is

one of the most characteristic features of St. Luke's teaching, namely, his insistence upon prayer as the means by which the dynamic energy of the Spirit is apprehended. Prayer is, in fact, complementary to the Spirit's activity since it is the point at which the communication of divine influence becomes effective for its recipients.²⁴⁴

The Promised Reception of the Holy Spirit as a Gift

After Luke 4:18 the Spirit's presence and action in and through Jesus are assumed. Yet from time to time there are references to the Holy Spirit, especially to a future ministry which He would have to the disciples at some point in the future.

The realization of the promise

As a result of the expectant prayers of the disciples. – Luke 11:13 relates to the future gift of the Spirit: "If ye too, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?"

While some have supposed that this promise has reference to the disciples while Christ was still on earth, there is no record that the disciples ever prayed for this gift of the Spirit while they were with Christ. To the contrary, Christ explicitly promised them that He would send them the power of the Spirit after His departure (24:49). But if the receiving of the Holy Spirit was so certain, why were the disciples urged to pray for this, the best of all gifts?²⁴⁵ Zahn gives a lucid

²⁴³ Navone, "Holy Spirit," 90.

²⁴⁴ Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 169.

²⁴⁵ The parallel passage in Matthew 7:11 reads: "How much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" In rabbinical writings the term "good things" signifies the gifts of the messianic age to come. According to Luke, then the Holy Spirit is the *summum donum*. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (London: S.G.H. Press, 1945), p. 119.

answer to this question:

The Holy Spirit shall come from heaven when the hour has come. But simply because the disciples have to wait for a season for the coming of the Spirit and cannot hasten this event through zealous prayers, it does not follow that the promised Holy Spirit should not be an object of their prayers from the very beginning. This is rather equally as understandable as that they should pray for the coming of the reign of God and the hallowing of the name of God.²⁴⁶

Their prayers for and certainty of the descent of the Holy Spirit were not incompatible with each other.

As a result of the exalted position of Christ. – In the concluding verses of Luke's Gospel, Luke prepares his readers for Pentecost, which Lampe calls "the great turning point in the story, the hinge, as it were, of the two-volume narrative."²⁴⁷ The disciples, who are to be the witnesses of Christ to all nations (24:47-48), have only to await the ascended Lord's sending of the Spirit to be empowered then for their mission: "And behold, I send the promises or my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high" (24:49).²⁴⁸ Luke's repetition of the promise in Acts 1:5, 8, like Luke 24:49, links the sending of the Spirit to the ascension of Christ. As Luke alone records, Jesus possesses the Spirit, therefore, when His earthly ministry is completed, He is also able to send it.

As a result of the explicit promise of the Father. – Christ expressly calls the Holy Spirit the "promise of the Father," that is, that which the Father promised. Centuries ago God had already promised a universal outpouring of the Holy Spirit (cf. Isa. 44:3; Ezek. 36:27; Joel 2:28; Zech. 12:10). The Spirit was to equip them for special service. Just as Jesus had received the Spirit at the start of His ministry, the disciples will receive this promised gift at the beginning of their ministry.

The results of the reception of the Spirit

The Spirit equips the disciples for service. – When Christ announced the future

²⁴⁶ Theodor Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas* (Leipzig: A Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920), p. 454.

²⁴⁷ Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 192.

²⁴⁸ Rienecker, *Lukas*, p. 554. "The utterance of the sending of the Holy Spirit is in the present tense to express that the promise is not only certain, but can also be expected in the immediate future. The Lord sends the Spirit promised by the Father in His own fulness of power."

ministry of the disciples, He implied that the effectiveness of their witnessing would depend on the coming of the Spirit and the gifts which resulted from it. Without them they would be unable to perform their proper function. Included in this enablement for service is the teaching ministry of the Spirit to enable the disciples to bear witness even before the religious leaders and political courts (12:12). The Holy Spirit transformed the disciples from local messengers to universal missionaries.

The Spirit enlightens the disciples. – Luke lays great stress on the disciples' inability to comprehend Christ's teachings concerning His passion. After His death and resurrection Jesus opened the Scriptures to men's minds (24:12) and He opened their minds to the Scriptures (24:45). But it is apparent that the disciples could not yet understand the implications of Christ's sayings about their own future (Acts 1:6). In the words of Lampe, "Not until his death, resurrection and exaltation had brought about the coming of the Spirit could they enter, with understanding, on the work for which they had been trained."²⁴⁹

The Spirit empowers the disciples. – The Third Gospel records Christ's last words as being a promise for an enduement or a clothing upon with power.²⁵⁰ This power, through the filling of the Holy Spirit, would be fully and completely adequate for their task in Jerusalem and among the nations.

The Holy Spirit is also promised as the best of all gifts (11:13). Concerning this inclusive promise Crane writes:

Here is not simply the Old Testament idea that the Spirit of God is the necessary equipment for God's service. It is an advance upon that idea. The Spirit is not here the uniform of the messenger; it is the very means of his life. How this is to be is not yet explained. The full doctrine of sanctification is not yet revealed. It would therefore not be fitting to detail the Spirit's agency in that spiritual process. But we have certainly a hint of what Jesus was afterward to teach in the Fourth Gospel and which the apostle Paul was still further to develop in his epistles.²⁵¹

While the Holy Spirit would equip them for service and enlighten them for their task, the Holy Spirit's power would be available to them in an unprecedented fashion and would revolutionize every area of their lives.

²⁴⁹ Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 191.

²⁵⁰ A. B. Bruce, *The Gospel According to Luke*, The Expositor's Greek New Testament, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1961), p. 651. Bruce thinks the enduement may be a reference to warlike armor.

²⁵¹ Crane, *Teaching*, pp. 68-69.

Luke sees the vital importance of the Holy Spirit in the Spirit's relationships: His relation to the Son of Man, to the disciples, and to the whole world. His Gospel opens with prophecies through the Spirit; it closes with promises of power to result from the Spirit. The Spirit prepared for the ministry of the Son of Man, worked in the life of the Son of Man, and, after Christ's ascension, He took the place of the Son of Man.

CHAPTER VIII

THE LUCAN PREEMINENCE OF SPIRIT BEINGS

The Emphasis on Angels

Luke's special interest in angels has been noted by Scroggie:

Our most complete revelations, whether of the functions of the holy angels towards the Saviour during His life on earth, or of their relation to us, are to be found in Luke. The word *angel*, or *angels*, of celestial beings, occurs 23 times in this Gospel.¹

There are more glimpses of the unseen world of spirit beings in this than in any other Gospel. The word $\alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omicron \varsigma$ appears 175 times in the New Testament and fifty-one times in the Synoptic Gospels. Both in the Hebrew text and in the Greek New Testament the word translated "angel" means primarily "messenger."² Only in four places is the word $\alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omicron \varsigma$ clearly used in reference to human messengers, three of which are found in Luke.³ Luke agrees with the other biblical writers in stressing the fact that angels are messengers sent by God. But more than the other Gospel writers, he sees the angels in their ministry as servants to the Son of Man and the sons of men. Ramm has succinctly contrasted the specific service rendered by Christ, men and the angels:

Man is the earthly servant of God; Jesus Christ is the theanthropic servant of God; and the angels are the heavenly servants of God, for they are always represented as coming from heaven and returning to heaven.⁴

The ministry of angels

As "representatives of the heavenly world and messengers of God"⁵ the angels perform

¹ W. Graham Scroggie, *A Guide to the Gospels* (London: Pickering and Inglis, Ltd., 1965), p. 380.

² H. Bietenhard, "Engel," *Theologisches Begriffslexicon zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther and Hans Bietenhard (10 vols.; Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, n.d.), I, 227.

³ Luke 7 :24 (John's messengers); 7 :27 (John); 9 :52 (Jesus' messengers); James 2:25 (Israel's messengers to Jericho).

⁴ Bernard Ramm, "Angels," *Basic Christian Doctrines*, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962), p. 67.

⁵ Bietenhard, "Engel," 227.

important ministries in behalf of the Son of Man.

Their ministry to Christ. – As Luke showed the activity of the Holy Spirit at many major events of Christ's life, so he notes how the angels accompany the Savior in various steps of His earthly career. First, an angel is sent with the prediction of Christ's birth. The angel Gabriel announced the birth of the Savior to Mary (1:26-33), as he had predicted that of His forerunner, John the Baptist (1:11-20).

Further, angels play an important role in the proclamation of Christ's birth. An angel appeared to the shepherds near Bethlehem, and a multitude of the heavenly host sounded too praises of God, and then returned to heaven (2:9-15). No such announcement is made at John's birth and it is clear that Luke, who alone records this incident, wishes to distinguish the two births, as van Oosterzee observes:

It is made evident from the very first, how much the King surpasses the forerunner. But, for this angelic manifestation, how could the glad tidings have been communicated with infallible certainty, and who could have been more worthy of so august a proclamation than the Word made flesh? Yet the angel appears not in the manger, but visits the shepherds in the silent night-watches, in the open field; a circumstance which powerfully testifies, that the greatness which is to distinguish the Lord's coming is a silent and hidden greatness. He appears to shepherds: God has chosen the mean things of the world to confound the things which are mighty.⁶

Apparently Luke also wishes to show the preparedness of angels to help Christ at every step of His way. Luke records Satan's quotation from Psalm 91:11-12: "He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone (Luke 4:10-11). Although the passage is misapplied in this case, the a fortiori reasoning on which it is based is correct: "If God is prepared to aid an ordinary righteous man through His angels, how much more would these angels help you, His Son!" But the time for angelic aid was not ripe. Soon afterward, however, as Matthew relates, the angels strengthened Christ (4:11).

As at the temptation in the wilderness, so at the temptation in Gethsemane, an angel appeared and strengthened Christ (Luke 22:4.3).⁷ The angels were prepared to minister to

⁶ J. J. van Oosterzee, "The Gospel According to Luke," *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, ed. John Peter Lange, trans. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960), VIII, 37.

⁷ While some consider Luke 22:43-44 as ungenueine, Geldenhuys asserts: "There exists no conclusive proof that verses 43 and 44 do not belong to the original text of Luke. On the contrary, even Harnack, Streeter, Loisy, Creed and others defend their authenticity. Most probably the verses were omitted by later copyists because they had no clear idea of the Saviour's

Christ's physical and spiritual needs.⁸ Rengstorf sees a clearly Lucan theological emphasis in appearance of the angel at Gethsemane:

And when in this condition an angel comes to him, to strengthen him, this evidences – and that especially in view of Jesus' messianic proclamation through the angel of God 2,9 ff. – that God's witness is over and before him, that even in the rejection by his people he is the Messiah of God and as such shall remain the king of his people.⁹

Finally, Luke relates that on Easter Sunday two angels appeared to the women with the joyous proclamation of Christ's resurrection (24:4-7, cf. v. 23).

The angels, individually and in groups, have a specific ministry to the Son of Man. Pache concludes that since "the angels exert such a ministry in regard to Christ, it is because they are particularly subordinated to Him."¹⁰

Their ministry to men. – As servants of God, the angelic ministers are seen active in behalf of believers and unbelievers.

First of all, the angels show a compassion for sinners. The announcement by the angels to the shepherds or the newborn Savior was more than a dispassionate proclamation of a noteworthy event, as Ryle emphasizes. The fact that unfallen angels rather than fallen men praised the Savior shows

us what good servants the angels are. All that their heavenly Master does pleases and interests them. – It shows us what clear knowledge they have. They know what misery sin has brought into creation. They know the blessedness of heaven, and the privilege of an open door into it. – Above all, it shows us the deep love and compassion which the angels reel towards poor lost man. They rejoice in the glorious prospect of many souls being

real humanity and could therefore not understand why an angel had to strengthen Him and why He had to experience such a conflict." Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), p. 577.

⁸ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of Luke's Gospel* (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1946), p. 1076. Lenski, writes that although "there is a tendency to make this strengthening spiritual and not physical" it was a "strengthening of his exhausted body by means of new vitality. The body of Jesus was about to give way and expire in death under the terrific strain."

⁹ Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962), p. 251.

¹⁰ Rene Pache, *The Future Life*, trans. Helen I. Needham (Chicago: Moody Press, 1962), p. 106.

saved, and many brands plucked from the burning. ¹¹

The angels further seem to co-operate with God in answering prayer. Zacharias, who probably was one of those who prayed for the redemption of Jerusalem (2;38) and who earnestly prayed for a son, received the promise of God's answer through the angel Gabriel (1:13).

Angels also show concern for man's salvation. Only Luke records Christ's words in 15:10: "Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." The concern of God for and rejoicing of God over that lost sheep and lost coin, that is, the lost sinner experiencing salvation, appears to be shared by the angels.

Finally, angels are seen to take care of the believer at death. In His parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, unique to Luke, Christ speaks of the angels who carried Lazarus upon his death to Abraham's bosom (16 :22). While it is true that this is may be only a parable ¹² and that it was a common Jewish concept the godly angels would summon the souls of the just and evil angels the souls of the ungodly, ¹³ yet, as Lenski confesses: "All the interpretations of learned exegetes who try to disturb the honest faith which humbly accepts these words as they read has never succeeded in shaking it in the least." ¹⁴

The angels' concern for the unsaved sinner as well as the dead saint shows how encompassing their ministry is. Luke sees their service in behalf of men as related primarily to their spiritual well-being, both in this life and in the life which is to come.

The manifestation of angels

Although Luke stresses primarily the ministry of angels, indirectly he reveals much about the nature of angelic beings by illuminating details in his description of their manifestation.

¹¹ John Charles Ryle, *Expository Thoughts on the Gospels* (London: Charles J. Thyme, 1897), I, 57-58.

¹² Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1869), p. 393. Because of the parabolic nature of the narrative Plummer excludes the possibility of any definite teaching on the condition of the soul after death. Cf. James H. Gray, "The Rich Man and Lazarus; or, What the Lord Taught About Future Punishment," *Our Hope*, XLIV, 698. Gray takes the position that this was an actual story, not merely a parable.

¹³ Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (6 vols.; München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), II, 223.

¹⁴ Lenski, *Interpretation*, p. 849.

They are personal beings. – The angels are described as persons. The special Lucan emphasis on joy and rejoicing is especially discernable in his description of the angels. The heavenly multitude rejoiced and praised God at the Savior's birth (2:13-14) and the angels rejoice at the salvation of sinners (15:10). Concerning this latter manifestation of joy and its bearing on the personality of angels van Oosterzee has well written:

What the Saviour declares of the joy in heaven over that which is found again on earth, deserves to be named one of the most striking revelations of the mysteries of the life to come. To the Saviour the angel-world is more than a poetic dream – more than an aesthetical form; it is to Him a community of self-conscious, rational, and holy beings. These are acquainted with that which goes on in the moral world on earth; they take lively interest in the saving of the sinner; they rejoice as often as in this respect the work of love succeeds: this joy springs from their knowing how, even through the conversion of one sinner, the honor of God is exalted, the kingdom of Christ is advanced, the blessedness of mankind is increased, the future reunion of heaven and earth is brought nearer.¹⁵

The two passages above at least imply that the angels have an intelligent knowledge of salvation and all that is involved, otherwise their joy would be meaningless. Also, the fact that angels seem to have individual names, of which Luke records the name Gabriel ("God is strength;" 1 :19, 26) has led Pache to conclude that this must mean that each angel has a distinct personality.¹⁶

A personal being, angels are dispatched on personal ministries. On each of their missions, Schick notes, the angels are not concerned with "the interpretation of the divine messages or the communication of general edicts of God, but rather they bring specific, personally relevant messages to a person or to a small group of persons."¹⁷ Their interest is in individuals.

They are powerful beings. – The angels are able to give supernatural protection. Through Luke's indirect reference, it is apparent that even Satan acknowledges the ability of angels to protect the righteous man in every situation of life (4:10-11; cf. Ps , 91:11-12). Angels also bring supernatural strengthening. Luke does not explain in what way the angel strengthened Christ in Gethsemane (22:43). Heubner asks with awe: "A wonder it is how an angel – a creature, could strengthen the God-man."¹⁸ But Luke is clear that angels rendered supernatural

¹⁵ Van Oosterzee, "Gospel," 236.

¹⁶ Pache, *Life*, p. 102.

¹⁷ Erich Schick, *Die Botschaft der Engel im Neuen Testament* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1963), pp. 11-12.

¹⁸ Cited by van Oosterzee, "Gospel," 349.

aid.

They are peaceable beings. – Angels dispel fear. While Luke indicates that the sudden appearance of angels always resulted in fear in the persons addressed (Zacharias, 1:12; Mary, 1:29; shepherds 2:9; women at the tomb, 24:5), he is equally emphatic that the first aspect of the angelic message was always related to the dispelling of fear (1:13; 1:30; 2:10; 24:5b-7).

The angels disseminate peace and joy. In beautiful harmony with the theme of Luke's Gospel, the messages of the angels are words of peace and joy. The angels appear invariably in Luke's Gospel as peaceful messengers.¹⁹ They not merely free the persons from the fear with which they responded, but their presence as well as their message serve to create a condition of peace and joy in the believers' life. As Schick so well states:

It is thus an intrinsic mark of the message of the angel and a presupposition for all else, that it imparts to the person, to whom it is directed, in the depth of his being a new and a divine power, an ability to see things differently than before, namely, in the light of eternity, in a great connection with the divine plan.²⁰

They are preeminent beings. – The position of prominence which the angels hold in God's economy can be seen from Luke's description of their appearance, their abode, their activity, and their authority.

Luke says little concerning the appearance of angels, but where he makes reference to it, he writes that they appeared in the form of men (24:5). But their shining or dazzling garments²¹ at once reveal their heavenly character and they are recognized as more than mere men (24:2).²²

That the angels have a preeminent position is also seen in their abode. Luke records

¹⁹ That this applies also to their ministry at the death of the believer needs hardly be mentioned. Angels transport the spirit of the person to the place of ultimate peace and enjoyment. Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 224, show how the Jews anticipated this ministry of peace: "When a just person departs from this world three groups of serving angels (Dienstengel) go to meet him. The first say to him: 'May he come to his peace!' The others: 'He who has walked straight before him'; and the third: 'May he come to his peace, may they rest on their places (Lagern)' Isa. 57 :2."

²⁰ Schick, *Botschaft*, p. 13.

²¹ The same word, "dazzling," is used of Christ's garment at His transfiguration, 9:29.

²² Pache, *Life*, p. 120: "We believe that in general the angels remain invisible (especially to us down here) for this reason particularly: that they may not attract the attention of believers to themselves."

Gabriel's illuminating words that reveal that he stands in the presence of God, or the third heaven (1:19). Luke calls the angels a "heavenly host" (2:1) and notes that they returned back to heaven (2:15). The angel which strengthened Christ came also "out of heaven" (22:43).

While the believers who have died are also seen as being in God's presence, they are clearly distinguished from the angels (22:36). They are said to be ἰσάγγελος, "equal to the angels," a word which only Luke employs.

The activity of angels indicates their place of prominence as well. They are personal messengers of God, the Lord of the universe. These sinless creatures ("holy angels," 9:26) are said to belong to the lord ("the angel of the Lord," 2:9; "his angels," 4:10) and carry on an exemplary, extensive, and eternal ministry. It is exemplary because they set before men an example of joyous and perfect fulfillment of God's will (11:2, "thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth"). It is extensive because God has a great multitude of angels at His disposal (2:1). And it is eternal because the angels cannot die (20:36).

Although Luke relates nothing specific concerning the future activity of the angels, he does indicate that the last judgment will be held by Christ in the presence of the angels and that those who have denied Christ will then be denied before the angels of God (12:9; 9:26).

The angels, as messengers of God, are invested with His authority. They substantiated this authority by giving signs to confirm too veracity of their message (1:18-20; 1:36; 2:12) and by demanding explicit faith in their own words (1:20).

While critics deny the reality of angels and assert that "man is not to place his faith and hope in angels which are, taken for themselves, messengers without authorization,"²³ Luke makes much of angelic authority. Balzac's maxim can be applied to those critics who leave no room for angels in their theology: "It is a part of human nature to destroy that which one cannot possess, to deny that which one does not understand, and to insult that for which one is envious."²⁴

Luke's distinctive emphasis on angels is apparent. His Gospel begins with the angelic announcement in the temple and closes with the angelic announcement at the tomb. A pious priest, a blessed virgin, humble shepherds, and distressed women, they all bear witness to the existence of angels; Satan acknowledges their existence, the Lord teaches concerning them, and experiences their aid, and Luke, who claimed to write all things accurately, records the many ministries of God's joyful messengers.

The Encounter with Demons

²³ Bietenhard, "Engel," 229.

²⁴ Cited by Schick, *Botschaft*, p. 54.

A second group of spirit beings to which Luke makes repeated reference and which, like the angels, take a distinctive place in his Gospel are the demons. or the approximately eighty references to demons in the New Testament,²⁵ all but one²⁶ have reference to evil spirits, whereas among pagan Greeks a demon signified an inferior deity, whether good or bad.²⁷ A significant part of Christ's ministry involved ministering to those who were demon possessed. It is the distinctive contribution of Luke the physician to record more encounters of Christ with demons than any of the other Gospel writers. Likewise, the types of demonic activity recorded by Luke are more varied than those mentioned in the other Gospels. Luke is far more interested in the activity of the demons than in their identity and destiny. However, he firmly believed in their existence.

The identity of demons

Luke does not give a detailed discussion concerning the origin of demons, whether they are the spirits of evil men, the spirits of a pre-Adamic race, the disembodied spirits of the "nephilim" of Genesis 6 or of fallen angels,²⁸ but he stresses certain facts concerning them.

Their reality. – Nothing is more firmly set forth in Luke's Gospel than the existence of demons. Their reality is attested to by Luke, acknowledged by Christ, and accepted by the people. Luke attests to the reality of Christ in at least thirteen separate instances (4:33; 4:41; 6:18; 7:21; 8:26; 9:38; 9:49; 10:17; 11:14; 11:24; 13:16; 13:32). In four of these passages reference is made to an extensive ministry or Christ to demoniacs. The individual cases of cures of demon possession which Luke describes must be understood as simply select and typical cases of that which Christ performed constantly.

Further, Christ acknowledged the reality of demons. He is not only described as "charging," "rebuking," "commanding," and "casting out" the unclean spirits, but Luke records Christ's direct addresses to them (4:35, 41; 8:30). The Third Gospel also notes instances in which Christ made reference to His own ministry to the demon possessed (11:20; 13 :32).

²⁵ Louis M. Sweet, "Demon," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. James Orr (5 vols.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960), II, 829.

²⁶ In Acts 17:18 δαίμόνιον denotes an inferior pagan deity.

²⁷ W. E. Vine, *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* (Westwood: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1966), p. 291. While in the Authorized Version the word "demon" itself does not occur, designations such as "devils," "spirits," "unclean spirits," "foul Spirit," and "evil spirits" all refer to these personal beings called "demons."

²⁸ For a detailed discussion of these views cf. Charles R. Smith, "The New Testament Doctrine of Demons," *Grace Journal*, X (Spring, 1969), 28-35.

In light of these facts the only alternatives to the reality of demons have to be that either Christ accommodated Himself to the superstitious beliefs of His age, that He was deceived, or that He or the Evangelists were deceivers. The fact that each of these views has found ready exponents in this rationalistic age does not weaken the case for the existence of demons in the least. Even the enemies of Christ accepted the reality of demons and no one denied that He cast them out. All His enemies charged Him with was His collusion with Beelzebub in driving them out (11:14). Christ then showed that the charge involved a monstrous impossibility.

Their personality. – The suggestion is made frequently that there are no personal beings who may be designated as "demons." The term is simply an ancient, common, and prescientific designation for certain mental and physical ailments. Luke thought otherwise. Luke alone suggests that the demons, whenever they left their victims, bore witness in a despairing cry to the divine Sonship of Jesus (4:41). According to Luke, they recognized the humanity of Christ (4:34; 8:28), His deity (4:34, 41; 8:28), His sinlessness (4:34), and His Messiahship (4:41). This suggests the superior intellect of demons. That they have emotions is attested by their impassionate pleas (8:28, 32) to escape premature torment (8:28). Demonic volition is expressed in their choice of the alternative of entering the swine (8:32). Demons are personal beings. As Smith so succinctly remarks: "Diseases do not speak as did the demon who cried out, 'What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou son of the most high God?'" (Mk. 5:7)." ²⁹ (Cf. Luke 4:34).

Their nature. – They are spirit beings. In the first case of a demon which Luke records, he calls him "a spirit of an unclean demon" (4:23). Luke's phrase is unique and is a genitive of apposition: "a spirit, namely an unclean demon." ³⁰ Luke repeatedly uses the terms "spirit" and "demon" interchangeably (9:39, 42; 10:17, 20) and gives Christ's definition of a spirit as a personal being without flesh and bones (24:39), therefore without a physical body. As spirits, demons seem to crave embodiment (11:23-26; 8:23). While Luke nowhere gives a reason for this, Smith suggests that they "either seek the gratification of their sensual desires by embodiment, or ... can best further their Satanic program by embodiment." ³¹

It has already been suggested that demons are intelligent beings. Luke indicates the demons' perspicacity both to the person of Christ and to their own doom (8:28).

That demons are powerful beings is evident from the description of the kind of diseases and physical deformities they are able to inflict, as well as from the supernatural strength they can impart to the human body (8:29).

²⁹ Smith, "Demons," 38. Certain passages indicate that demons were able to speak (Luke 4:41, cf. Mark 1:24, 26, 34) but generally there is no distinction drawn between the cries of the tormented and the cries attributed to the demons themselves.

³⁰ Lenski, *Interpretation*, p. 262.

³¹ Smith, "Demons," 35.

Above all, Luke views demons as moral beings. He refers to them consistently as unclean spirits (4:33, 36; 6:18; 8:29; 11:24) and twice as evil spirits (7:21; 8:2).³² Concerning their immorality Unger writes:

The actions of the demonized seem to indicate that the unclean spirit takes possession in some instances for the purposes of sensual gratification, and uses every type of uncleanness. This may explain the desire of the possessed to live in a state of nudity, to have licentious thoughts (Luke 8:27), and to frequent such impure places as tombs.³³

Although the fact that demons are unclean spirits probably predicates that every trace of moral purity is absent, demons are represented as being of various degrees of wickedness (11:26). Their great number makes them seem ubiquitous, and they are organized under one leader with whom they are one in purpose (11:18).

The activity of demons

While Luke says much about the identity of demons, his primary attention is focused on their activity. Pache comments on the unusual demon activity which Christ encountered:

The first coming of Christ to the earth was the signal for a general counter-offensive on the part of the forces of hell. The Gospels give the impression that a multitude of evil spirits had gotten together in Palestine to oppose the Savior's ministry and to turn men's attention to themselves. There was indeed much at stake. After having unsuccessfully tempted Jesus in the wilderness, Satan, by mobilizing all his allies, tried to set up an obstacle before Him. This diabolical frenzy "rent on right up to the pages in the book of the Acts . . . and far beyond."³⁴

Their activity in relation to Christ. – The Son of Man came for the purpose of destroying the works of the devil (I John 3:8). This was fully realized by the members of the kingdom of the evil one. Accordingly they attempted to thwart Christ's purpose or at any rate hamper Him as much as possible. Demon possession was one of the means used by the evil forces to oppose the setting up of His kingdom. As Geldenhuys writes:

³² Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 133: "Mt. uses δαιμόνιον ten times and has ἀκάθαρτον twice as an epithet of πνεῦμα. Mk. has δαιμόνιον thirteen times, and ἀκάθαρτον eleven times as an epithet of πνεῦμα. Lk. in the Gospel has δαιμόνιον twenty-two times, with ἀκάθαρτον as an epithet, once of δαιμόνιον, and once of πνεῦμα; and with πονηρόν twice as an epithet of πνεῦμα." Plummer, while criticizing everyone else, errs himself: "unclean demon" appears three times in Luke (4:33, 36; 6:18) and "unclean spirit" twice (8:28; 11:24).

³³ Unger, *Demonology*, p. 67.

³⁴ Pache, *Life*, p. 143.

In order to be truly the Redeemer, Jesus had also to engage in strife with demon-possession and to prove that He had indeed overcome the power of the evil one. This is the reason why in the Gospels numerous instances are described where Jesus delivered demon-possessed person.³⁵

Luke realized the importance of this matter and therefore relates early in his Gospel the striking example of how Jesus triumphed over the demonic forces (4:33-37). Luke makes at least thirteen references to demons and in each instance records that they were conquered by the power of Christ. Apparently there was never a time in Christ's life when satanic forces did not oppose Him. Luke is especially emphatic about this (22:18), Lucan scholars notwithstanding, who say that between Christ's temptation and passion "temptation is finished decisively. . . and the devil departs,"³⁶ and claim that Luke himself "thinks of the ministry of Jesus as a time free of Satan."³⁷

While it is true that the fury of the underworld of evil was concentrated against the Messiah and that the purpose of His ministry was to destroy the forces of evil, it cannot be denied that the singular manifestation of demonic power was also the result of the encounter of the light of the Son with the darkness of Satan, which resulted, of necessity, in the exposure of the darkness. In the words of Unger:

It was but the critical and inevitable clash of the white light of perfect holiness and truth against the gross darkness of error and deceit. It was the unavoidable collision of the unhindered power of the Holy Spirit, manifested through a sinless, life, with the opposing power of Satan. It was impossible for the Son of God to be in the vicinity of evil power, and not expose it, and challenge it. Shadows of twilight and the curtain of night only temporarily hide what the brilliance of the noonday sun reveals.³⁸

Luke and the other Evangelists thus show by their emphasis on demons that it was the plan of the satanic forces to oppose Christ, it was the purpose of Christ to defeat them, and it was the presence of Christ which revealed them.

Their activity in relation to men. – Luke mentions various ways in which demons afflict men. The demons are seen to cause mental disorder. The father, describing his demon-possessed son, says "And lo, a spirit taketh him, and he suddenly crieth out; and it teareth

³⁵ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 172.

³⁶ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 28. Cf. pp. 156-58.

³⁷ Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966), p. 403.

³⁸ Unger, *Demonology*, p. 79.

him that he foameth" (9:39; cf. Mark 5:15). The same passage also seems to teach that demons cause fits of epilepsy. That demons inflict physical infirmities is further seen in Luke's record of Christ "casting out a devil and it was dumb" (11:14), and healing a person who had been "bowed together" for eighteen years and had a "spirit of infirmity" due to the activity of Satan (13:11-16). In a general way, demons seem to delight in inflicting personal harm or injury (9:39, "and bruising him hardly departeth from him," cf., Mark 9:22; Luke 4:35, "the devil had thrown him into the midst"³⁹; 8:29, he "was driven of the devil into the wilderness"). Further, being unclean spirits, demons tempt human beings with unclean thoughts and actions (8:27).

The demonic oppressions in the mental, physical and moral realms are evidences of demonic possession. The actual expression "demon possession" does not occur in the New Testament, but Luke, together with the other Evangelists, uses the word διαμονίζομαι (8:36), which "signifies to be possessed of a demon, to act under the control of a demon."⁴⁰ A close study of the Lucan narratives of demon possession will yield several important conclusions.

- (1) Demon possession involves the residing of a demon or demons in the person (4:36, 41 etc.).
- (2) Those who are thus afflicted express the mind and consciousness of the demon or demons indwelling them.
- (3) Demon possession evidences itself in a certain derangement of mind and body or both.
- (4) Especially in Luke's Gospel demon possession is clearly and repeatedly distinguished from disease (4:40-41; 6:17-18; 7:21; 8:2; 9:1; 13:32).
- (5) It is possible to be possessed by more than one demon (seven, 8:2; eight, 11:26; a legion,⁴¹ 8:30).
- (6) Demons possess children as well as adults (9:42) and this makes it scarcely possible to ascribe demon possession in every instance as originating in immoral and irresponsible conduct.
- (7) Some demons seem to leave the person for a time, only to return again (9:38; 11:24).
- (8) Demon possession can be overcome permanently and instantly only by faith (9:41), in the power of Christ (9:49; 10:17).

It can thus be seen that demon possession means the residing of a demon in a person, periodically or permanently, controlling and influencing the person's thought, feeling and action.

³⁹ Luke alone adds here, however, that the demon hurt him not. Luke evidently wishes his readers to understand that except for the authority of the Savior, the demon would have injured the man.

⁴⁰ Vine, *Dictionary*, p. 291.

⁴¹ Fritz Rienecker, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1966), p. 221: "The Latin word 'legion' is a Roman term of war which included a supposedly unconquerable group of 4000 to 6000 soldiers." It is not unlikely that at least two thousand demons possessed the Gadarene (Mark 5: 13).

Like the other two synoptic Evangelists, Luke records "That may well be called the classic case of demon possession, that of the Gadarene demoniac (Luke 8:26-39; Matt. 8:28-34; Mark 5:1-20). The accounts reveal all the characteristics of demon possession. Koch, a German pastor and psychiatrist, has listed these marks in terms of modern psychiatry. He discusses the Marcan account:

- vs. 2, possessed with an unclean spirit.
- vs. 3, accelerated motoric – no one can bind him.
- vs. 4, paroxysm – he breaks shackles and strikes himself with stones.
- vs. 6, disintegration – desire of help and fear of help.
- vs. 7, resistance – defense against Jesus.
- vs. 7, hyperesthesia – he recognized the deity of Jesus and His plenipotency.
- vs. 9, psychic variations – change of voice.
- vs. 12, occult transference – entrance into swine.⁴²

The judgment of demons

Their temporary overthrow. – The encounter with and victory over demons took place, first of all, through the divine authority of Christ. The casting out of demons proved that He was the Messiah, for in answer to John's inquiry, He pointed at His Messianic works which involved the curing of many "of evil spirits" (7:21-22). This Messianic authority is recognized by the demons themselves (4:33, 41; 8:28), fills the people with amazement and fear (4:36; 8:28; 9:43; 11:14), and is highlighted by Luke as he records the attending circumstances. For instance, in the case of the demoniac at Capernaum, Luke demonstrates that Jesus is obeyed instantly: "The demon went out from him" (4:35). It was a display of the omnipotent power of God over Satan's own domain. Luke alone adds that the demon, although he hurled the man into the midst of the worshippers, in no way injured the man. The fact that he adds this point shows not only his medical interest but it indicates that for Luke once Christ has spoken, the demon did not dare harm his victim anymore.

While Jesus' overthrow of demonic powers proved that He was the Messiah who had both the right and power to break into Satan's domain (11:22), the casting out of demons itself was performed in the power of the Spirit. Luke gives Jesus' own explanation of the method and power used in His expulsions: "But if I with the finger of God cast out demons, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you" (11:20). It has already been shown from the Old Testament and the parallel passage in Matthew (12:28) that reference here is to the Spirit of God. Unger concludes:

⁴² Kurt Koch, *Christian Counseling, and Occultism*, trans. Andrew Peter (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1965), p. 226. Koch gives a detailed exposition of this passage in the extraordinary booklet, *Bessessenheit* (Bergausen: Evangelisationsverlag, n.d.), 16 pp. He lists various documented cases from his counseling experience which substantiate not only the biblical narrative but indicate that while demon possession occurred during the ministry of Christ on a noticeable and devastating scale, it is by no means solely a thing of the past.

It was, accordingly, by the power of the Holy Spirit, operating in untrammelled fullness in His sinless humanity, that Jesus effectuated His cures, rather than by reliance upon His intrinsic power of deity as the second Person of the Godhead.⁴³

The way Jesus set the demonized free was in clear-cut contrast to Jewish and ethnic exorcism,⁴⁴ although contemporary Lucan scholarship attempts to prove otherwise.⁴⁵

Not only did Jesus cast out demons as one of the functions of His ministry of mercy to the oppressed, but He delegated the same power and authority to His disciples. Luke relates that while seven of the disciples failed earlier in Christ's ministry to cast out a demon because of their unbelief (9:41), nevertheless, before Christ sent out the twelve disciples He "gave them power and authority over devils" (9:1). Even those who did not belong to the immediate group of the disciples were able to expel demons in the name of Christ (9:49-50). In commenting on this case Lenski writes:

This is an instance in which a man so grasped "the name" of Jesus by faith that he expelled demons by its power. We are not told that he wrought other miracles in the same way. Jesus had not directly empowered this man as he had the Twelve (v. 1); the man attained this power by his own faith in Jesus.⁴⁶

⁴³ Unger, *Demonology*, p. 103.

⁴⁴ W. W. Everts, "Jesus Christ, No Exorcist," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXXI (1924), 357: "A greater contrast cannot be conceived than that between the foolish notions, and the superstitious practices, of the Jewish exorcists and the simple, direct command of our Lord as he cast them out. There are only two points in which he agrees with the Jews, once in adopting the Septuagint designation of demons dwelling in desert places, and again in finding large numbers of them, a legion at Gadara. Otherwise his position is absolutely opposed to theirs. The question was once asked, whence hath this man wisdom? He certainly did not derive his knowledge of demons from the synagogue. The Jews met demons generally by night, Jesus always by day. They gave them bodies. He said, 'a spirit hath not flesh and bones.' They adjured them, he never used the word. They used them as servants. He treated them as criminals. They claimed that they propagated their kind. He declared that, 'Angels neither marry nor are given in marriage,' and he spoke of 'the devil and his angels.' They identified demons and diseases. He treated possession as a distinct affliction. Sometimes it is mentioned alone, at other times with other ailments. Possession is mentioned in the gospels more frequently than any other affliction. Forty-four verses in Matthew, 49 in Luke, and 61 in Mark are devoted especially to these cases."

⁴⁵ C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), pp. 46-68, the chapter "Temptation and Exorcism." Barrett can say with a blatant disregard of the Gospel record: "The visions of Jesus and his power to cast out demons did not differentiate him from other men" (p. 68).

⁴⁶ Lenski, *Interpretation*, p. 549.

The seventy disciples who went out as Jesus' envoys rejoiced because the evil spirits submitted to them in the name of Christ (10:17). Unger explains that the driving out of demons in Jesus' name was vastly different from Jewish exorcism:

The phrase, "in the name of Jesus," (Mark 16:17; Luke 10:17) did not signify that the sacred appellation, formally pronounced, possessed any magical power to accomplish a cure. The "name" was tantamount to the infinite Person behind the name. The expression "in His name" was thus equivalent to "in His power," "in all that He is and does."⁴⁷

On the one hand Luke shows that the casting out of evil spirits was accomplished through the divine authority of Christ and through the delegated authority of the disciples, but on the other hand, Luke is intensely interested to show the divine acceptance of the victim of demon possession. The words underscore Luke's basic burden:

The interest centered not in the demon but in the demoniac, in the transfer of possession of the victim from the demon to the Savior, for in every case the issue was moral and spiritual. The demoniacs were never rebuked, were never warned to sin no more lest some greater evil should befall them. They appear as innocent victims of the demons. One boy was seized when a child. Mary Magdalene, out of whom seven devils were cast, became a Christian leader. The demoniac of Gadara, when clothed and in his right mind, was sent at once as an evangelist throughout Decapolis. These afflicted ones may have suffered with no responsibility of their own or of their parents, and it might have been said of them as of the man born blind, "neither hath this man sinned nor his parents but that the works of God should be made manifest in him."⁴⁸

The Lucan theme of the compassion of the Son of Man for sinners and the suffering is accented very forcefully in Luke's references to the dark world of evil spirits. Luke shows how high Christ's view of a demon-possessed man really was:

One gets the impression as if it is the most natural thing for Jesus that 2000 animals should be sacrificed for one man. We stand here before an unparalleled high evaluation of man. In the eyes of Jesus no sacrifice is too great for the liberation of man. The Gadarenes, however, did not share his opinion. In this they are like modern man who

⁴⁷ Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, IV, 501-35, "Zur altjüdischen Dämonologie" ("Concerning Ancient Jewish Demonology"). The loftiness of Christ's demonological conceptions stands in arresting antithesis to ancient Jewish ideas and practices, best illustrated, perhaps by Jewish rules on how to ward off demons: "Do not go into a ruine. . . . Behave decently at the toilet. . . . Do not sleep alone in your house. . . . Avoid even numbers. . . . Do not go out alone at night" (p. 533).

⁴⁸ Everts, "Jesus Christ," 358.

places the worth of things above the value of the hearts of men. ⁴⁹

Their ultimate doom. – The Lucan narrative clearly shows the demons' awareness of their own doom. It is of no small significance that Luke's first recorded utterance of demons is the interjection (4:34), which, in the words of Robertson, here "amounts to a diabolical screech."⁵⁰ The world of spirits is instinctively compelled to tremble when it recognizes its future conqueror. The demonic words which immediately follow this ejaculation of horror, "thou didst come to destroy us" (4:33) are not a question but an assertion. ⁵¹ The plural signifies that the demon speaks for the whole spirit world who are aware that Jesus, because of His vocation, does sustain a relationship to the whole kingdom of evil spirits.

Moreover, Luke shows that the demons realize their ultimate destiny in the pit (8 :31). The demons plead with Christ not to send them down into the α β υσσο ς "the deep" or "abyss," evidently a temporary place (cf. Matt. 25:41) of torment and confinement (8:28) where some demons are now confined. ⁵²

Christ's actions in relation to demons also anticipate their ultimate doom. In describing the Savior's encounter with demons, Luke portrays Christ as victor, as "the stronger" (11:22). The battle between Christ and the forces of Satan is never that of a struggle between equals. Demons plead with Him, obey Him instantly and completely, and are filled with consternation in His presence. Christ's earthly victory over the evil spirits pictured and guaranteed His ultimate victory over Satan and his realm (10:18). The final and abject defeat of Satan and his host is manifest in every demoniac's deliverance.

The Enigma of Satan

Theophilus and the other Gentile readers of the Third Gospel, unless they had intensive prior instruction concerning Satan, must have been nothing short of perplexed as they perused Luke's account of the Son of Man. Already in the first pages of the narrative there appears a diabolical person, a person whose origin is passed over, whose doom is predicted with enigmatic

⁴⁹ Koch, *Bessessenheit*, p. 15.

⁵⁰ A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (6 vols.; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930), II, 63.

⁵¹ Theodor Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas* (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920), p. 245.

⁵² Smith, "Demons," 38. Smith thinks that the "dry places" of Luke 11:24 which the expelled demons traverse are, on the basis of passages like Isaiah 13:21 and Revelation 18:2 the emblem of the demonic dwelling-place in another world, a world not known or inhabited by humans.

words, a being who is locked in mortal combat with the Son of Man.

As he does with the other spirit beings and even the Holy Spirit Himself, Luke presents Satan only in relation to Christ. He mentions him only seven distinct times, but in such a way that his importance in Luke's theology can hardly be exaggerated. Every reference to Satan is in the context of the struggle between the infernal person and the eternal Son of God, and the latter's victory over the former. Although Luke nowhere clearly states it, he views the purpose of Christ's presence on earth and His passion as having a close relationship to the power of this adversary.

Three relationships between Satan and Christ appear to be central in Luke's thinking: Satan's relationship to the person of Christ Himself, or a Christological relationship; his relationship to the program of Christ, or a political relationship, and, finally, a relationship to the persons for whom Christ died, or a spiritual relationship.

Satan the Tempter and Christ's triumph

The tempter's program. – A clue to the true nature of Satan's person and plan is already found in the name Satan. It is from the Hebrew שָׂטָן , "adversary," from the verb שָׂטַן , "to lie in wait as an adversary." The word has grown from a general term to an appellation and later to a proper name.⁵³ Luke mentions this name five times (10:18; 11:18; 13:16; 22:3, 31) and in all but one passage Christ Himself refers thus to His opponent. It is the common appellation for Christ for His adversary.

A further indication of Satan's program in relation to Christ is given by the nature of the temptation in the wilderness (4:1-13). In Luke's concept this was the beginning of a mighty conflict. Satan tempts Christ to make Him unfit for His work. The temptations were not merely to tempt Jesus as man but to attack Him as Savior, Messiah, and King. This is evident from the fact that they came immediately after His baptism, when He had finally entered into His public ministry and received divine approval. Christ, as the head of the new humanity, the second Adam – a fact especially underscored by Luke (3 : 38) – was tested as to His obedience to the Father. Had He failed the first temptation, He would have forfeited the right to be the Savior. The second temptation is more related to the kingship of Christ. He was asked to achieve legitimate ends – the acquisition of the kingdom – by illegitimate means – glory without suffering. The adversary finally took Him to the temple⁵⁴ where, according to traditional belief,

⁵³ Sweet, "Satan," IV, 2693.

⁵⁴ Even Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, pp. 160, 162, takes the temptations to be purely temptations in thought. Christ views all the kingdoms "in thought" and is taken to the temple "in thought." This stretches the credibility of the reader. Did Satan merely propose a mental jump off the pinnacle?

the Messiah would manifest Himself.⁵⁵ Here Christ is to test the faithfulness of God and by God's spectacular intervention be recognized as the Messiah by the multitude. The Savior rejects all three demands of Satan which would have involved self-will, self-seeking, and self-display. But Luke is careful to indicate that Satan, having exhausted every kind of temptation at his disposal at the time (πάντα πειρασμὸν) departs from Him "until a time," that is, until a suitable time (4 :13).

Of the four Evangelists alone Luke links the temptation with Christ's continuous struggle with Satan and with the passion account, where he notes that Satan entered Judas (22:3), an unquestionable reference to 4:13, showing that Satan returned personally to confront Christ. Having failed to make Christ deviate from His mission, he now seeks to destroy His work.

The tempter's personality. – The underlying meaning of the temptation account is a personal conflict. Without the presence of a personal devil the whole narrative loses its import. Van Oosterzee writes of Satan: "He knows Christ and hates Him. He uses the Scripture and perverts it; to lead astray is his joy, and lying is his power; God's word the only weapon that vanquishes him."⁵⁶

The personality of Satan is further attested to in Luke 11:21- 22. Godet well, comments on this passage:

It was necessary that **the strong man**, Satan, the prince of this world, should be vanquished by his adversary, **the stronger than he**, in a personal conflict, for the latter to be able to set about spoiling the world, which is Satan's stronghold.⁵⁷

And in a passage directed to Peter, Christ exposes the personal volition and moral motivation of Satan! "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat" (22 :31).

The Savior's perfection. – Satan's temptation involved an attempt both to subvert Christ's proper role and to attack His allegiance to God. Thus, basically, the temptations were directed against the Savior's person. Edersheim discerningly remarks:

All the assaults of Satan were really directed against Christ's absolute submission

⁵⁵ Alfred Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (2 vols.; New York: Longman's, Green, and Co., 1904), I, 293: "In the hour when King Heshiah cometh, He standeth upon the roof of the Sanctuary."

⁵⁶ Van Oosterzee, "Gospel," 69.

⁵⁷ F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans. M. C. Cusin (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1870), I, 210.

to the will of God, which was His Perfectness. Hence, by every one of these temptations, as **Weiss** says in regard to the first, "rüttelt er an Seiner Vollkommenheit." ⁵⁸

Although Satan tested the perfections of Christ, it was impossible that he would succeed. Was not the Holy Spirit the agent who had led Christ there? Was not the fulness of the Spirit the means that protected Him there? Christ not only would not fail but He could not fail. As "Adam fell in Paradise and made it a wilderness; Christ conquered in a wilderness and made it a paradise." ⁵⁹

Satan the Prince and Christ's power

The prince's sovereignty. – Luke leaves no doubt that he regards Satan as a sovereign with many subjects. He records the healing of the demon possessed man and the response of the multitude who ascribed Christ's power to Beelzebub, ⁶⁰ chief of the demons (11:15). In His reply Christ indirectly acknowledged that there was such a prince, a "strong man" (11:21). That this ruler of the demons possesses suzerainty in his own right is clearly indicated in Christ's second temptation: "And the devil said unto him, all this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine" (4:6-7).

Luke's narrative of the temptation is noteworthy for the addition of the word ἐξουσία . The devil claims authority over the world. This authority, he insists has been committed to him, and he can apparently hand it over to whomsoever he wishes. Concerning the nature of this authority Navone makes this observation:

The word *exousia* often occurs in Luke in the context of political power, (7:8; 12:11; 19:17; 20:20; 23: 7). Political authority is offered to Jesus. Luke alone, of all the Synoptics, speaks of the "power" of the devil. It is a power which "has been given" to him, the "power of darkness" mentioned in the Passion account (22:53), and described in Acts 26:18 as "the power of Satan." It is the apocalyptic and eschatological concept of the opposition of two kingdoms which was common in Judaism and the primitive

⁵⁸ Edersheim, *Life and Times*, I, 302.

⁵⁹ Olshausen, cited by van Oosterzee, "Gospel," 68.

⁶⁰ "Beelzebub" appears three times in the Third Gospel (11:15, 18, 19). In the Old Testament Baal-zebub ("lord of flies") was the god of Ekron, whom Ahaziah wished to consult, but was prevented by Elijah's intervention (II Kings 1:1-6, 16). In the New Testament the word always appears as "Beelzeboul," ("lord of the high place"), probably the original form of the word, and refers consistently to Satan.

church.⁶¹

The genuineness of Satan's offer has been rejected by some, but Chafer maintains that it was real:

It has sometimes been held that the claim of possession of the kingdoms of the world was a lie, this being asserted on the ground that Satan is exposed in the Scriptures as a liar. Such a conclusion is impossible for at least two reasons. The offer would have had no value had he not possessed the kingdoms he offered; and any such false claim would have been immediately branded as a lie by the Son of God.⁶²

According to Luke, then, Satan is the sovereign of the world system.

The prince's subjects. – Luke shows first that the subjects are organized. Christ completely divorces Himself from Satan's system, rejects charges that He performs cures by black magic,⁶³ and makes much of the unity which of necessity exists in Satan's ranks among the demons. This same unity and organization is seen in the fact that several demons may indwell the same person (8:2; 9:38; 11:26), and frequently one demon speaks for the whole group (4:34; 8:30, 32).

Satan's subjects, no less than their leader, are also evil. To this repeated reference has been made. At one place demon activity is equated with the activity of Satan (13:18). The woman with the spirit of infirmity was said to have been bound by Satan for eighteen years.

Luke also reports the fact that Satan's subjects may be men: "Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve" (22:3). Judas apparently was a man of great talent, for, as van Oosterzee writes, "Only he can become a devil, who has possessed the possibility of becoming an angel."⁶⁴ But he became Satan's tool. Either Satan or one of his demons took possession of him.⁶⁵ In either case, whether Satan's subjects are demons or men, they are never relieved of personal responsibility and guilt (22:22).

⁶¹ John Navone, "The Temptation in St. Luke (4:1-13)," *Scripture*, XX (July, 1968), 70.

⁶² Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Satan* (Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Co., 1922), p. 53. For the opposite view see Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, pp. 160-61.

⁶³ For an excellent summary of Christ's three-fold answer cf. G. B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1963), p. 154.

⁶⁴ Van Oosterzee, "Gospel," 331.

⁶⁵ On the basis that σατανᾶς is anarthrous here and nowhere else by Luke, Zahn, *Evangelium*, p. 665, concludes that a demon is here in view.

The Savior's superiority. – Satan's sovereignty is limited in extent and time. Caird has well stated Luke's emphasis in the important eleventh chapter:

Thus we are bidden to think of the world as enemy-occupied territory: it belongs by right to God, but through the sin of man it has fallen under the tyranny of Satan, who keeps it in a grip that no power of man can break; and the good news of the gospel is that into this embattled fortress has broken the first champion and representative of an invading and liberating power, the kingdom of God. The two kingdoms confront one another in a war that knows neither truce nor neutrality; he who does not side with Jesus sides with Satan, and he who does not fight for the forces of unity fights for the forces of disruption.⁶⁶

The ultimate doom of Satan and the unquestioned superiority of Christ is contained in Christ's words: "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven" (10:18). Like some other Lucan passages, this verse has been the expositor's delight as well as the novice's despair. While some relate this passage to Christ's victory over Satan in the wilderness, or to the ministry of the seventy⁶⁷ or to Satan's future expulsion from the heavenlies (Rev. 12:7-9),⁶⁸ it is best to see it with Zahn⁶⁹ as a reference to Jesus' victory over Satan in the temptation as well as to His suffering, death, and resurrection and, proleptically, of the final expulsion of Satan from heaven. The point at issue here seems to be the concept of having fallen, not the time when it took place. Satan had been cast down from his exalted position. That the disciples were able to cast out demons is a certain proof of Christ's complete victory. They had been given the ἐξουσία to oppose the δύναμις of Satan (10:19). As a result of Christ's victory, even their authority is greater than that given to Satan (4:6).

Christ's superiority over Satan's subjects is also a matter of special emphasis in Luke's Gospel. Luke uses the emphatic word δεῖ "it is necessary" to show why Christ healed the woman with the spirit of infirmity (13:16).⁷⁰ Caird comments incisively on Luke's account of this divine victory:

⁶⁶ Caird, *Gospel*, pp. 144-45.

⁶⁷ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 305 and Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 278.

⁶⁸ Unger, *Demonology*, p. 24 and Chafer, *Satan*, p. 11. But cf. Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 278: "In any case there is no analogy between this passage and Rev. xii. 12: the point is not that the devil has come down to work mischief on the earth, but that his power to work mischief is broken."

⁶⁹ Zahn, *Evangelium*, pp. 420-21.

⁷⁰ This favorite Lucan word is also used to express the divine necessity of the cross (9:22).

Jesus is acting in obedience to a necessity which takes precedence over all other obligations, including the sabbath law. The kingdom of God has broken in upon the kingdom of Satan, and the work of liberating the victims of Satan's tyranny must go on seven days a week. So far from being the wrong day, the sabbath was actually the best day for such works of mercy. For the sabbath . . . was also a weekly foretaste of the rest which awaited the people of God in the kingdom, a final release from all bondage.⁷¹

It is Luke's teaching that God has left Satan a certain use of his sovereignty and power, but that Christ's superiority over the prince of the demons guarantees His ultimate victory over Satan and his subjects.

Satan the Deceiver and Christ's deliverance

Another name for the prince of darkness, showing his nature as a deceiver, is διάβολος, the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew שָׂטָן. It comes from the verb διαβάλλω "to spread reports," "to slander" and means "slanderer," referring to the fact that Satan tries to calumniate the devout before God (Job 1, 2), but also that he deceives men and calumniates God before men. According to Godet, the name Satan is taken from his relations with God and "devil" is taken from the relation to men.⁷²

Luke himself speaks of the evil one four times with this name (4:2, 3, 6, 13) and once the name is used by Christ (8:12).

The deceiver's imitation. – In the parable of the sower Luke has διάβολος (8:12) while Mark has σατανᾶς and Matthew ο πονηρὸς. This is significant. Jesus refers here to the deceptive nature of Satan when He warns: "Then cometh the devil and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved." By snatching the Word, Satan is evidently deluding the unsaved into thinking that his substitute plan for salvation is better. The concluding words of the verse are peculiar to Luke and seem to point in that direction: "in order that they may not by believing the word be saved."

The deceiver's imitation is also seen in the temptation account where in Christ's final temptation Satan himself turns to Scripture as Christ had done before (4:9), but he twists it by omitting the words "in all thy ways" from Psalm 91:11-12 and misapplies it.

The devil of the Third Gospel is a dangerous opponent, one who takes away the word where he can and twists it whenever he uses it.

⁷¹ Caird, *Gospel*, p. 171.

⁷² Godet, *Commentary*, I, 210.

The deceiver's influence. – Satan's activity is not limited to Christ or to the unbelievers but extends to the believers as well. Christ's words to Peter are most revealing: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat" (22:31). Satan has desired *υ μᾶς*, that is, all the disciples, and not merely desired them but *ἐξητήσατο* means "to obtain by asking." The aorist implies success in the demand.⁷³ Satan desires to sift and accuse the disciples as he did Job. Morgan remarks:

In this general statement we have a remarkable revelation of Satan. His purpose is revealed. It is a tremendous word that "sift you as wheat." It describes a winnowing process, Satan desired to take that group of men and sift them. An old Puritan commentator, Trapp, said, Jesus uses a fan, and sifts to get rid of the chaff; but the devil uses a fan and sifts to get rid of the wheat.⁷⁴

The Savior's invincibility. – Satan aimed at the ruin of the disciples but they cannot be permanently deceived nor would his accusation be successful. Jesus shows that His prayer to God is worth more than the request of Satan (22:32). Neither Peter's faith would permanently falter nor that of the disciples. Moreover, Christ had already indicated to them that instead of rejoicing over their authority over demons, they should rather rejoice that their names are already written in heaven (10:20). They were safe because of the prayers of Christ and safe because of their position in heaven. Although they would never be free of Satan's influence (11:4), they were safe because of the Savior's invincibility.

⁷³ A. B. Bruce, "The Gospel of St. Luke," *The Expositor's Greek New Testament*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (5 vols.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1961), I, 628.

⁷⁴ G. Campbell Morgan, "The Gospel According to Luke," *Studies in the Four Gospels* (Fincastle: Scripture Truth Book Co., n.d.), p. 247.

CHAPTER IX

THE LUCAN PERSPECTIVE ON ETHICS

Among the distinctive features of Luke's theology are his emphases on various aspects of the believer's personal life in relation to duty and conduct. Luke brings before his readers the concepts of prayer, pride, and possessions, and far more than any other Evangelist highlights the believer's responsibility in these areas.

The Lucan Perspective on Prayer

Luke emphasizes prayer more than any other synoptic.⁷⁵ He does so by relating unique examples of the Savior's prayers. He records nine prayers of Jesus of which only two are found in other Gospels.⁷⁶ Luke further emphasizes prayer by preserving Christ's exhortations to prayer: the special parables of the Friend at Midnight (11:5) and the Unjust Judge (18:1-8), the story of the Pharisee and the Publican at prayer in the temple (18:9-14), and Christ's personal admonition to His disciples on the Mount of Olives (22:30, 40). And Luke also stresses prayer in narrative peculiar to him. It is almost as if by presenting Jesus as the Son of Man, Luke emphasizes the examples of Christ's prayers. Presenting Jesus as the Great Teacher, he stresses the exhortations of Christ concerning prayer. And presenting Jesus as the Great Physician, he emphasizes in his narratives the efficacy of prayer.

Its importance as seen in the Savior's examples of prayer

By recording the prayers of Christ Luke wished to emphasize the humanity of the Son of Man, for prayer is a human necessity and natural function of man. But more importantly for men, in the words of Wordsworth, the examples are for us "needed instruction in the duty and benefits of prayer. Accordingly this subject occupies a prominent place in his Gospel. It is eminently the Gospel of prayer."⁷⁷

⁷⁵ The Greek verb "to pray" (προσεύχομαι) occurs in the following texts which are found in the Lucan Gospel alone: 1:10; 3:23; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18; 11:1; 18:1, 10, 11. Cf. The good discussion by Lindell O. Harris, "Prayer in the Gospel of Luke," *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, X (Fall, 1967), 59-69.

⁷⁶ Luke's unique contribution are the baptism (3:21); the selection of the Twelve (6: 12); Peter's confession of faith (9:18); the transfiguration (9:28); the teaching of the Lord's prayer (11:1); the crucifixion. Instances when the parallel texts mention prayer are the filial prayer (10:17) and Gethsemane (22:39).

⁷⁷ Cited by J. C. Ryle, *Expository Thoughts on the Gospels* (London: Charles J. Thyme, 1897), p. 141. For an excellent discussion of Jesus as the praying Son of Man cf. Karl Heinrich

Luke views Christ's prayers as a daily custom as well as a spiritual exercise in times of crises.

Prayer as a custom in Christ's life. – In the life of Jesus there was a regular rhythm of work and prayer. He made a practice of withdrawing to some remote and quiet country spot to pray (4:42; cf. Mark 1:35). After days when healing and teaching had made great demands on the physical and spiritual strength of the Son of Man, He would retire by Himself as evening fell (5:15-16). Besides these periods of regular private prayers Christ spoke also of the value of corporate prayer (cf. Matt. 18:19-20) and Luke notes that it was His custom to join, Sabbath by Sabbath, in worship of the synagogue (4:16, 31, 44; 6:6; 13:10).

In addition to these regular practices of private and corporate prayer, Luke shows how Jesus gave Himself specially to prayer as He confronted the great crises of His life.⁷⁸ Luke is not so much interested how often Jesus prays but when He prays.

Prayer at the crises of Christ's life. – Jesus prayed at His baptism (3:21). In his narrative of the baptism Luke inserts one fact that the other Synoptics omit – that Jesus was in the act of prayer when the heavens opened and the Spirit descended with the accompanying voice of God's approval. It is only natural to suppose that these divine manifestations were specifically in answer to Christ's prayer.

Jesus further prayed before His first conflict with the Jewish leaders (5:16). While Pharisees and scribes from every village of Galilee, Judea, and Jerusalem came in hostility to find charges against Christ (5: 17-21), He spent the night in prayer so that "the power of the Lord was present" the following day (5: 17).

Only Luke tells us that the choosing of the Twelve followed a night of prayer on the mountain side (6:12). Hastings writes concerning this prayer of crisis:

This . . . was a moment of great solemnity; our Lord's long prayer must have concerned his future apostles, still so weak but needing to be so strong, men to whom everything that Jesus stood for was to be committed. Was it to this occasion that he was referring when later, on the night of the last supper, he declared "Simon, Simon, . . . I

Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 251-53.

⁷⁸ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 180. Conzelmann states that the baptism, the transfiguration, and the agony in the garden are three scenes which mark the main stages of Jesus' ministry and that they are assimilated to one another. On each of these three occasions a divine revelation is depicted as the answer to prayer.

have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail" (22:31-2)." ⁷⁹

The Son of Man is further seen in prayer before the first prediction of His suffering and Peter's confession of faith (9:16). ⁸⁰ The irreconcilable enmity of His adversaries made the time ripe for a revelation of His approaching suffering and death. Foreseeing the impression which this communication would make upon His disciples, He prepares Himself in prayer.

Again only Luke mentions that it was in the act of prayer that Jesus was transfigured and His face became radiant with an inner light (9:28-29). The transfiguration was an answer, or at least a corollary, to the prayer. It brought Him the needed solace and strength. ⁸¹

Christ also prayed when the seventy disciples returned victoriously from their mission (10:21-22) and before He taught His disciples to pray (11:1). While all the Synoptics mention that Christ prayed in Gethsemane (Matt. 26:39; Mark 14:35; Luke 22:41), Luke alone adds that Jesus exhorted His disciples to pray during His agony (22:40). The prayer of Christ in Gethsemane was the prelude to victory. Burton's words are much to the point when he writes:

As the first Adam fell by the assertion of self, the clashing of his will with God's, the second Adam conquers by the total surrender of His will to the will of the Father. The agony was lost in the acquiescence. ⁸²

Finally, Jesus uttered two prayers at His crucifixion which are unique to the Lucan account. The first is the prayer of intercession for those who brought about His death: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do" (23 :34). The prayer of the Son exposes His

⁷⁹ Adrian Hastings, *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem* (Baltimore: Helicon Press Inc., 1958), p. 90.

⁸⁰ Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), p. 275. On Luke's comment that Jesus prayed "apart," Geldenhuys writes: "In an actual sense Jesus always prayed alone, for prayer in His case was in this respect quite different from prayer in case of others, in that with Him it was direct exercise of fellowship with His Father, but with His people it is offered through a Mediator, on the strength of His grace."

⁸¹ John Navone, "Prayer," *Scripture*, XX (October, 1968), 118: "The glory of the Mount of the Transfiguration and the agony of the Mount of Olives bracket the redemptive work of Jesus with two mysterious moments of intense prayer in which Luke presents Jesus as fully human and fully divine. As human, Jesus could be a prophet, could be filled with the Spirit, could be encouraged by an angel and could feel the need of prayer; as the Son of God, Jesus could send the Spirit, could be transfigured, and could speak as an equal of the Father."

⁸² Henry Burton, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.), p. 192.

infinite mercy. The second prayer is a citation of Psalm 31:15: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (23:46) and was the traditional evening prayer of Judaism. This prayer expresses the confidence of the Jews that Christ would guard their life against peril.⁸³ Christ, on the other hand, expressed with this prayer the profound awareness that the Father's presence and union remained unimpaired.⁸⁴ Thus, Luke has Jesus speak of His Father in both His first (2:49) and last words (23:46).

This brief survey has shown Luke's emphasis of picturing the Son of Man in prayer at times of crisis in His life. But Luke further indicates that Christ prayed at regular times as well. Sometimes His prayers were in public but generally in private. At times He prayed all night, at other times apparently only briefly. All the prayers of Jesus began with "Father" in Luke's Gospel⁸⁵ and these prayers contribute to an understanding of Jesus' sonship. Hastings writes concerning Christ's prayers:

His are not primarily prayers of petition, but simply union, of that mutual exchange of love which he does not find with men. Among men he teaches, he cures, he is the master, but he is alone; only when solitary in prayer does he cease to be a solitary in entering into the society of his equals. From this point of view, far from being the most human, his prayer is rather the most divine of all Jesus' activities; it is in it that he most truly shows himself the equal of the Father, the Beloved Son.⁸⁶

However, the human aspect of Christ's prayers cannot be ignored and as He, the Son of Man prayed to His Father, so He has taught His disciples to pray. In this respect they are patterns for believers everywhere.

Its characteristics as seen in the Savior's exhortations concerning prayer

The sight of Jesus at prayer made His disciples ask Him to teach them to pray (11:1).

⁸³ Navone, "Prayer," 120.

⁸⁴ John Navone, "Prayer," *Scripture*, XX (October, 1968), 118: "The glory of the Mount of the Transfiguration and the agony of the Mount of Olives bracket the redemptive work of Jesus with two mysterious moments of intense prayer in which Luke presents Jesus as fully human and fully divine. As human, Jesus could be a prophet, could be filled with the Spirit, could be encouraged by an angel and could feel the need of prayer; as the Son of God, Jesus could send the Spirit, could be transfigured, and could speak as an equal of the Father."

⁸⁵ In fact all the prayers of Jesus in all the Gospels begin with "Father," except that starting with the Psalm text in Mark 15:34 (Matt. 27:46).

⁸⁶ Hastings, *Prophet*, p. 88.

John had taught His disciples to pray (11:1) and they prayed frequently (5:33). No doubt Christ's disciples had prayed before but they found that His prayers were different. In Luke's presentation of Christ's teaching concerning prayer, three areas of prayer life seem to be emphasized: the necessity of a personal relationship to the Father, the proper response and attitude of prayer, and the variety of particular requests for which prayer can and should be made.

The personal relationship in prayer. – Only Luke makes the prayer life of the disciples a prolongation of one of Jesus' own prayers. The prayer which He taught His disciples begins with the word "Father." The term "Father" implies, first of all, a spiritual relationship. Adoption into the family of God sprang from the atoning death of Christ but was implied in Christ's message of reconciliation. On the basis of the prayer in Luke 10:21-22, Luke not only reveals Jesus' filial relationship with God but also His capacity for extending that relationship to His disciples.

The term "Father" further implies an intimate relationship. Geldenhuys writes:

The single word "Father" in Luke represents Aramaic *Abba*, the word which Jesus used Himself. . . . The Jews in addressing God used the slightly formal *Abi* ("my Father") or *Abinu* ("our Father"), but Jesus used the ordinary intimate form which Children used ... in addressing their father, *Abba*.⁸⁷

By teaching His disciples to address their prayers to the Father, Christ also made reference to an analogous relationship (11:11-13). It is not a fictitious Fatherhood. If men can approach their earthly father for things they need, the heavenly Father is no less kind to grant their requests.

Prayer involves a personal relationship to the Father who has been revealed only by the Son.

The proper response in prayer. – Jesus teaches that character and attitude are important conditions of prayer. Words alone do not constitute prayers. The attitude of the heart must be right. Luke alone records two parables and one story which underscore too necessity of a proper response in prayer. Prayer must be offered in humility, with persistency, certainty, importunity, and in a spirit of thanksgiving.

The story of the Pharisee and Publican (18:9-14) puts a counterfeit and genuine prayer side by side. The prayer of the Pharisee is, in the words of Burton, "the prayerless prayer, that had

⁸⁷ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 319. Cf. Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1869), p. 295. Plummer rightly observes concerning the Lord's Prayer: "We must notice how entirely free from Jewish elements the prayer is. It is not addressed to the 'Lord God of Israel' nor does it ask for blessings upon Israel."

no need and which was simply an incense burned before the clayey image of himself." ⁸⁸ The Publican only sees himself as a sinner. The story was told, Luke notes (18:8), because of the pride of some who thought they were better than others. The humility of the Publican is accented as the proper approach to God in prayer, in distinction to the pride of the Pharisees who loved to make long prayers (20:47).

The parable of the Unjust Judge teaches persistency in prayer on the basis of faith that God will ultimately answer (18:8). If an unrighteous judge will heed the persistence of a widow's plea, how much more will the righteous and merciful God heed the cries of His servants who cry to Him continually, day and night!

In commenting on this parable, the Lord teaches His followers to approach God with certainty that their prayers will be answered. The answer might tarry for a while, but ultimately it will come. The same point is made earlier in the amplifications of the Lord's Prayer (11:9-10). Christ shows the answer to be as certain as the request is real.

In the parable of the Friend at Midnight Jesus suggests that importunity gets results in prayer. Here repetition and much speaking are not enough (cf. Matt. 6:7), but continual coming in faith (18:5) is a different thing. As the friend's request was answered "because of his importunity" (11:8), so persevering prayers will bring results. Van Oosterzee writes of the term "importunity" that it is "here in direct reference to prayer as unweariedness, perseverance in its highest energy. God wishes a faith which is not ashamed of endurance, and which therewith entertains the highest expectations." ⁸⁹

A final attitude of prayer, one which is especially peculiar to Luke's Gospel, is that of thanksgiving, issuing forth in prayers of praise and blessing. ⁹⁰ Especially the opening chapters of Luke contain examples of prayers of praise. Both angels and men praised God (2:13, 20; cf. 19:37), men glorified Him (2:20; 5:25-26; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15; 18:34) and blessed Him (1:64; 2:28; 24:53). Likewise Christ's filial prayer (10:21-22) breathes the spirit of thanksgiving, coupled with the peculiarly Lucan theme of joy. The idea of thanksgiving is found also in Christ's blessing of the cup at the last Supper (22:17) and His blessing of the bread before the disciples at Emmaus (24:30). Thanksgiving is an integral part of prayer.

The particular requests in prayer. – According to Luke, prayer encompasses many

⁸⁸ Burton, *Gospel*, p. 181.

⁸⁹ J. J. van Oosterzee, "The Gospel According to Luke," *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, ed. John Peter Lange, trans. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960), VIII, 180.

⁹⁰ For a detailed discussion of the prayers of praise in Lucan writings cf. Navone, "Prayer," 121-124.

requests. Schönweiss writes:

As far as the content is concerned, the New Testament prayer can include the smallest things as well as the largest, the matters of the day and those of eternity. The best example for this is the Lord's Prayer.⁹¹

The Lord's model prayer teaches something of the content of proper prayer. The prayer reads thus in the best manuscripts:

When ye pray, say, Father, Hallowed by thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive everyone that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation (Luke 11:2-4).⁹²

Ebeling correctly observes: "Jesus did not seek to teach us a prayer, but to teach us to pray – and that of course means at the same time to liberate us from anxious and superstitious use of formulas."⁹³

The prayer falls naturally into two distinct divisions, the one general and the other particular and personal. The first objects of the believer's request should be those which concern the glory of God. The hallowing of God's name is a request "that God should be sanctified not only in the one praying, but in all creation."⁹⁴ It is significant that although Jesus taught that God may be addressed as intimately as a child addresses his father, he also taught that God's name is to be hallowed or revered.

The request for the coming kingdom is not merely a prayer that the "Father's divine sovereignty should more and more fully attain its rightful place in the heart and life of fallen

⁹¹ Hans Schönweiss, "Gebet," *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther, and Hans Bietenhard (10 vols.; Wuppertal: Brockhaus Verlag, 1965), 1, 428.

⁹² It is a disputed point, though not a material one, whether the Lucan prayer is but a varied rendering of Matthew's prayer, or whether Jesus gave, on a later occasion, an epitomized form of the prayer He had prescribed before. From the circumstantial evidence of Luke the second view seems to be correct. For a comparison between Jewish prayers of that time and the Lord's Prayer cf. Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5 vols.; Munchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), I, 1120.

⁹³ Cited by Frank Stagg, "The Journey Toward Jerusalem in Luke's Gospel," *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (Fall, 1967), 508. Against this view cf. Geldenhuys, p. 322, who sees in the model prayer "a perfect prayer which we must often address to God."

⁹⁴ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 319.

mankind,"⁹⁵ but for the coming of the Davidic kingdom (1:32-33) which Luke sees still in the future (14: 15).

Prayer can also be made for personal needs, both physical and spiritual. The prayer for bread in Luke's Gospel is unambiguously a concern for actual bread for each day,⁹⁶ although it can stand for all of man's physical needs which man has in his earthly existence. In the parable of the Unjust Judge, for example, Christ shows that prayers for physical deliverance from oppression would likewise be answered (18:7-8).

The forgiveness of sins is a request for the person's spiritual life. Christ shows that He who asks for forgiveness should also forgive those who have done him harm.

The final petition refers especially to the internal solicitation of the devil and is a request which Christ repeatedly impressed on His disciples (22 :32, 40) and which He Himself made to God in behalf of Peter and the disciples. By example, then, Christ taught the prayer of intercession.

Its efficacy as seen in Luke's emphasis on prayer

No aspect of Luke's unique material on prayer is more pronounced than that prayer is efficacious. Luke gives no conditions for the answer of sincere prayer. The theme running through Luke's prayers is "Everyone that asketh receiveth" (11:10a). Luke indicates this in his own narrative early in the Gospel, illustrates it from the Lord's prayers, and demonstrates it from the instructions of the Lord.

The indications in Luke's narrative. – Only Luke records that the Savior appeared in answer to the prayerful expectation of devout saints at Jerusalem among whom were Simeon (2:25) and Anna (3:37), "who waited for the consolation of Israel." He also gives prominence to the fact that Gabriel appeared to Zecharias while the multitude prayed (1:10) and in answer to Zechariah's prayers: "Thy prayers have been answered." Apparently Zecharias and Elisabeth had been requested of the Lord a son in their old age and had looked to God for the salvation of Israel. Luke emphasizes the miraculous (1:18) but nonetheless certain answer to prayer (1:20,

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 320.

⁹⁶ In both Matthew 6:11 and Luke 11:3 *epiousion* ("needed") is uncertain as to etymology and usage. There is no certain occurrence outside the model prayer. Cf. Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 296: "The petition in Lk. embraces more than the petition in Mt. In Mt. we pray, 'Give us to-day our bread for the coming day,' which in the morning would mean the bread for that day, and in the evening the bread for the next day. In Lk. we pray, 'Continually give us day by day our bread for the coming day.' One stage in advance is asked for, but no more: 'one step enough for me.' "

57-66).

The illustrations from the Lord's prayers. – God's response to the prayers of Christ inspires confidence in the believer that, his prayers will be efficacious as well. Navone demonstrates that the Lucan Gospel teaches that Jesus' prayers are always answered:

He receives the Holy Spirit at his baptism (3:22); he receives the Twelve after his night of prayer (9:20); he receives Peter's confession of faith after his prayer (9:20); his glorification at the Transfiguration follows upon his prayer (11:1); Peter repents (22:62) because Jesus prayed that his faith would not fail (22:32); the apostles preach the forgiveness of sins to the people of Jerusalem (Acts 2:38, etc.) which Jesus had requested of his Father at the Crucifixion (23 :46). Luke implies that what follows upon Jesus' prayer is the answer to his prayer and the sign of its efficacy.⁹⁷

The instructions of the Lord. – No one point of Christ's teaching concerning prayer is more clear or more emphatic than that God answers prayers. To be sure, in some cases God delays the answer (18:7-8) but delays are not denials. God will answer prayer because He is not an unjust judge but a sympathetic Father (18:8), because He is not an indifferent friend but the perfect Friend (11:8), because He, much more than the imperfect earthly father, is the perfect heavenly Father (11:13). Christ gave His divine promise that God would answer prayer, because He is our friend and, most importantly, He is our Father. Twice in succession Christ repeats the assuring "I say unto you" (11:8, 9), so that His disciples, together with the disciples of all ages, would always pray and not faint.

The Lucan Perspective on Pride

Among the six sins which God hates most Solomon mentions pride first (Prov. 6 :17). In the Gospel of Luke the sin of pride is mentioned as often as the sin of unbelief. It is the theme of parables⁹⁸ and the subject of the Savior's teaching. His rebuke of sin is never more stern nor His revelation of judgment more ominous than when He denounces the pride of the Pharisees. Luke shows that pride is a universal sin and reveals its wickedness, its results, and its remedy.

The reprehensibility of pride

Pride insidiously undermines the spiritual and moral life of man. The Gospel of Luke shows how widespread and wicked this sin really is.

It is widespread among men. – First of all, pride manifests itself among all types of

⁹⁷ Navone, "Prayer," 120.

⁹⁸ The parable of the Prodigal Son (15:11-32), of the Wedding Feast (14:7-11) and of the prayer of the Pharisee and Publican (18:9-14).

individuals. It is apparently the besetting sin of the Pharisees (7:39; 11:43; 14:7-11; 15:2; 18:11-13) and other religious leaders as well. Luke mentions scribes (11:44; 15:2; 20:47), priests (10:31), and Levites (10:32). Nor are Christ's disciples exempt from the sin of self-exaltation (9:46-47), nor men in general (18:9), although it seems to be primarily a sin of the mighty of this world (1:51-52).

Pride manifests itself also in every area of life. Religiously and spiritually, it manifests itself as an unwarranted self-confidence as in the case of those who "trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others" (18:9). Trust in God is replaced by a trust in one's own ability and superiority over others. Lenski writes concerning these men:

These men were convinced that they had God's verdict, in their favor; but the only ground on which they were resting this conviction was "themselves" (ἐφ' expresses the basis). The result of this self-righteousness was that they were considering others as nothing; in their estimation they alone amounted to something – and that just about everything – before God.⁹⁹

The Pharisee's prayer of Luke 18:11-13 illustrates that the proud measures himself with a wrong human rule and not with the rule of God's word. That such self-righteous prayers of Pharisees were no unusual occurrence has been sufficiently documented by Strack-Billerbeck who write that "the prayer of thanksgiving put into the Pharisee's mouth in Luke 18:11f is not at all a free or tendentious invention but has been overheard in real life."¹⁰⁰

Socially, pride is in evidence by a love of places of prominence at meal time among those who are social equals (11:43; 14:7; 20:46) and by a love of recognition in the synagogues and market places (11:43; 20:46). Pride causes social ostracism and detestation of others (18:9) who may be poor or considered more sinful (15 :2).

There is also a political aspect to pride. The Jewish nation looked down upon all other nations. The parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-37) has these political overtones. Jews would only help their neighbors, and a Jew's neighbor "was solely the person from his own nation but never a non-Israelite."¹⁰¹

Furthermore, while the Jewish nation as a whole was proud, this applied to the individual cities as well. Christ condemns Capernaum for its rejection of His message and with His

⁹⁹ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel* (Columbus: The Wartburg Press), p. 899.

¹⁰⁰ Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 241. For negative opinions concerning Pharisees cf. the chapter "Die Pharisäer u. Sadduzäer in der altjüdischen Literatur," IV, 332-352.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, II, 177.

question, "Shalt thou be exalted to heaven?" He may well refer to its spiritual pride which gave it the feeling of self-sufficiency when the Savior appeared.

Luke's description of the prevalence of pride is undoubtedly a sign that he considers his readers no less susceptible to this sin and warns them by these examples and by the Savior's precepts.

It is wicked in the sight of God. – Pride is an abomination to God because it shows the corruption of man. A proud man has lost all perspective of sin and the proper subjection to God. He is satisfied with who he is and what he does, as Geldenhuys shows in relation to the Pharisee:

He bases this delusion on two real facts: firstly, he is not a wicked person outwardly, for he is not a robber, or unjust in his actions, or an adulterer, or such a contemptible sinner as the "publican" who is also in the temple; in the second place, he performs certain exceptional acts of piety.¹⁰²

Proud men, whether disciples or Pharisees, underestimate their own sin and expect blessing from God on the basis of their merit. Pride not only shows the corruption of man but it stands under the condemnation of God. Four times in Luke's Gospel is the refrain of the humiliation of the proud and the exaltation of the humble repeated: 1:52; 10:15; 14:11; 18:14. In the latter two passages the identical words are employed by Christ to contrast the fate of the proud with the felicity of the humble: "Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted." Grundmann notes that

behind the passive verbal forms the name of God is hidden, who wishes to put man in his proper place. Along with the repeated announcements since 1:46ff this refers to the eschatological inversion of all relationships. The proud and the jealous (ehrsüchtige und ehrgeizige) man is called upon by God to become small.¹⁰³

As if the repeated warnings to the proud were not enough; Luke reveals the true feeling of God concerning pride in recording Christ's devastating words: "And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God" (Luke 16:15).

Pride is an abomination. The word "abomination" is only here used in a general sense of abomination. It referred originally to that which offends the nostrils and is used in the Septuagint

¹⁰² Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 450-451.

¹⁰³ Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966), p. 294.

of the abominations of idolatry.¹⁰⁴

The result of pride

The results of pride are deadly and lead to certain destruction, as Luke so forcefully repeats time and again.

Division among men. – Pride is a repelling and separating force. Instead of God-ordained peace it brings disunity. Each of the disciples is concerned only about his own place of prominence. The Pharisees deprecate the publicans and sinners. The priests and Levites are too noble to help a robbed and beaten man. The religious leaders vie with each other for superiority. The cities of Palestine are enamored with their own success and position. The Jewish nation sees itself alone worthy of God's favor and can thus despise the inferior Samaritans and Gentiles. Burton's words, though picturesque, are patently true:

The proud heart is the loveless heart, one huge inflation; if she carries others at all, it is only as a steadying ballast; she will not hesitate to throw them over and throw them down, as mere dust or sand, if their fall will help her to rise. Pride, like the eagle, builds her nest on high, bringing forth whole broods of loveless, preying passions, hatreds, jealousies, and hypocrisies.¹⁰⁵

Deafness to divine truth. – Pride hurts others but it also harms self. It turns a deaf ear to divine truth. This is why Christ can say in His filial prayer that God has hid divine truth from the wise and prudent and has revealed them unto babes (10:21). The lawyers of Israel, thinking themselves wise in their own eyes, "have taken away the key of knowledge" (11:52). Being unable to find the way of salvation themselves, they are unable to show it to others. The scribes and Pharisees have been more concerned with self-adulation than with Scripture (11:43) and have contaminated people rather than converted them (11:44). According to Strack-Billerbeck, some Jewish authorities themselves declared that "a certain amount of pride is very fitting for a scribe."¹⁰⁶

With repeated references to spiritual leaders it appears that Luke emphasizes the prevalence of pride among those who should be the most humble. The perniciousness of pride blinds these leaders to the way of life who should be showing others the way.

Destruction of the proud. – The ultimate destiny of the proud is his punishment from the presence of God. Christ suggests in 18:14 that divine pardon is received by the humble who

¹⁰⁴ Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 388.

¹⁰⁵ Burton, *Gospel*, p. 341.

¹⁰⁶ Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 102.

desire it but not by the self-righteous who spurn it. Capernaum, because of its pride, shall be "thrust down to hell" (10:15). Pride, at its core is idolatry.¹⁰⁷ "Exaltation that disregards God and all true, divine exaltation by way of his grace must be crushed as an imitation of the devil's own pride."¹⁰⁸

The remedy for pride

In the same passages in Luke's Gospel in which the abhorrent sin of pride is mentioned, the remedy is suggested as well.

A comprehension of one's position. – To prevent pride man must see himself as he is, must recognize his worthlessness as poor sinner, deserving not honor but rejection. Thus is Luke's message. There can be no true advance without readiness to receive grace, that is, humility. Humility expects nothing and deserves nothing. Christ's words concerning man's obligation in this respect are very significant: "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do" (17:10).

No false claims of merit must enter man's mind. The Publican's prayer was heard because he understood his own sinfulness and need of grace (18:14). To the disputing disciples, Christ showed a humble child which was great in His eyes because of the absence of any pretense on part of the child (9:48).

A concern for others. – A loving concern for others will banish pride from the heart. Christ's important words, when rightly understood, are the antidote to selfish ambition and pride: "And as ye would that men should do you, do ye also to them likewise" (6:31).

The parable of the Wedding Feast, given in answer to the self-promotion of the Pharisees, is followed by a practical illustration how true humility is confirmed, namely, by doing good to those who cannot recompense the kindness (14:12-13). And the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-37) has as the counterpart of national and religious pride the touching concern for others which knows no bounds of nationality nor anything else. A love for others replaces a love for self.

Christ-likeness. – A final remedy for pride is the emulation of Christ's humility. It involves obedience to Him, for Christ was always subject to the Father's will. He describes Himself as "meek and lowly in heart" (Matt. 11:29) and sets a perfect example of humility in His washing of the disciples' feet (John 13:1-17). Luke presents Jesus as the lowly Son of Man. The

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 101: "The proud person is an idolater; therefore he deserves to be cut down like an oak tree. God cannot live with the proud in the same world."

¹⁰⁸ Lenski, *Interpretation*, p. 839.

humble circumstances of His birth, the humility of His thirty years' subjection to His parents, and His three years of unceasing toil, privation, and opposition, as well as His constant dependence on the Father in prayer, are climaxed in the supreme humiliation of enduring the cross, despising the shame (Heb. 12:2). The life of Christ cannot help but remove pride from the responsive heart and elicit the words of humility: "We are unprofitable servants."

The Lucan Perspective on Possessions

The emphasis of the Gospel

A special theme of Luke. – Luke had a special interest in the problems of money, and above all a sympathy with the poor. For this reason he has been called the socialist among the Evangelists and his Gospel the Ebionite Gospel.¹⁰⁹ He very often represents Jesus as deriving illustrations from finance, as in the parables of the Two Debtors, the Rich Fool, the Tower Builder, the Lost Coin, the Unjust Steward, Dives and Lazarus, and the Pounds. In many other passages Luke refers to money matters.¹¹⁰ Luke's chief interest seems to be, however, the special question of poverty and wealth, the generosity of the rich toward the poor, and the right stewardship of one's possessions.¹¹¹

A significant teaching of Christ. – Luke's special emphasis on poverty and wealth reveals that Christ had much to say on the subject of money. Both Luke and Jesus have been

¹⁰⁹ W. Graham Scroggie, *A Guide to the Gospels* (London: Pickering and Inglis, Ltd., 1965), p. 373: "This has been called the Gospel of the Ebionites (a word derived from the Hebrew *ev-yohn*, the poor), because it delights to record the Savior's mercy towards the poor, the humble, and the despised."

¹¹⁰ Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: The Macmillan Company; 1927), p. 260: "See Luke iii. 13, 14; x, 35, 41 (?); xii. 13-14; xvi. 14 (lovers of money); xvii. 28 (bought and sold, not in Matthew). . . . Among phrases in his gospel where his difference from his parallels may suggest financial connotations are his word 'purse' (ballantion x. 4; xii. 33), 'store room' (xii. 24), the 'cares' or 'pleasures of property' (βίον, βιωτικός viii. 14; xxi. 34) and especially the use with 'life' or 'soul' of verbs implying acquisition as property, or purchase (xxi. 19; xvii. 33; cf. also xvii.2 'it pays,' and contrast all the parallels) or loss as a fine or refund ix. 25; xii. 20; v. 1). It is Luke alone who at the call both of the four fishermen and of Levi reports that they 'left all' as well, as 'followed him' (v. 11, 28)."

¹¹¹ Friedel Selzer, "Besitz;" *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther, and Hans Bietenhard (10 vols.: Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1965), I, 103. The term πλούτος, "riches," only appears once in Luke. "Luke does not speak of riches as such but concerning those who are rich and being rich." Cf. Hans-Helmuth Esser, "Arm," p. 41 of the above work: "In the NT πτωχός poor, appears 34 times, mainly in the Gospels (24 times), especially by Lk. (10 times, of which 6 times in his special material.)"

accused of hostility to wealth and its possessions. They are held to teach that wealth in itself is evil and that poverty in itself gains automatic entrance to the kingdom.¹¹² Closer attention, however, to Christ's words makes it clear that such an interpretation is superficial. As Scroggie points out, Christ's "teaching is not that poverty is good, and that wealth is bad, but that while poverty is not a spiritual handicap, wealth may be."¹¹³ And, in addition, there are also passages in Luke's Gospel which run counter to any alleged antagonism to the rich. Dives' exclusion from paradise could not be solely on the basis of wealth, for wealthy Abraham is there as well as the beggar Lazarus. Luke alone mentions that a group of wealthy women financed, at least in part, the work of Jesus (8:2-3). Christ had praise for the rich publican at Jericho, though he apparently retained much of his wealth (10:1-10) and spoke of the profitable use to which "the mammon of unrighteousness" might be put in making friends. Luke speaks with respect and approval of the wealthy Joseph of Arimathea (23:50-53). Instead of condemning wealth, Jesus' first concern was to free man from the servitude of things and to see man exercise such stewardship over things that they serve man and God.

The evil of greed

Sins to avoid. – Luke actually emphasized the perils of possessions more than the evils of drunkenness or sexual vice. The sins which Jesus most frequently denounces are unbelief, pride, and greed. In the area of wealth, two prominent sins must be avoided according to Luke: an attitude of superiority towards the poor and an attachment to money and things. The story of Dives and Lazarus shows the heartless attitude of rich toward the poor. Emerson underscores this point in his explanation:

We must infer that the rich man while not necessarily guilty for being rich became guilty through that supreme regard for money and the things that money can purchase

¹¹² Hugh Martin, *Luke's Portrait of Jesus* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1949), p. 73. Martin lists the passages which seem to give this impression: "The Magnificat sets the tone: 'The hungry he hath filled with good things and the rich he hath sent empty away' (1.53). At Nazareth Jesus applies to Himself the passage from Isaiah 61: 'The Lord . . . anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor' (4. 18; cf. 7.22). Luke alone reports the woes upon the rich: 'Woe unto you that are rich, for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you, ye that are full now, for ye shall hunger' (6.25f.). He alone gives us the stern story of the foolish rich man who laid up treasure for himself but was not rich towards God (12.1)-21). Here alone is told the story of the Rich Man and the Beggar (16. 19-31). In his Gospel alone is found the unqualified assertion: 'So therefore whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple' (11:33). . . . Matthew tells us that Jesus said: 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.' Luke renders it: 'Blessed are ye poor,' apparently changing the emphasis from a spiritual condition to a material (Matt. 5.3; Luke 6.20). When both record the exhortation not to lay up treasures on earth, Luke adds: 'Sell that ye have and give alms' (Matt. 6.19-21; Luke 12.33)."

¹¹³ Scroggie, *Guide*, p. 373.

which made him heartless and indifferent towards his neighbor's need, and that having made such a choice, carried his choice with him over into the next world, and found that such a choice there could yield him nothing. ¹¹⁴

Dives had one thing in common with the Pharisees, namely the feeling of superiority. The Pharisees despised the poor and Christ (16 :14) because they felt that riches came as a result of righteousness and their wealth thus proved that they were honored of God. Whom the Lord loveth He maketh rich, was their maxim. This was based on a false concept of Old Testament revelation concerning wealth, as Rohrbough shows:

Because God's promises of material blessings to Israel were conditioned upon the nation's obedience and faithfulness to Him (Deut. 28:1-14), wealth and riches came to be considered a tangible evidence of personal or national righteousness and God's resultant blessing. The Pharisees of Christ's day reflected this viewpoint. ¹¹⁵

Their superiority manifested itself in selfishness as well. Luke speaks of another rich man, the rich young ruler, whose meeting with the Lord is recorded in Luke 18: 18-27. He was a "very rich" man and thus "very sorrowful" at the prospect of giving his fortune to the poor. In short, he was selfish. And the words of Christ reveal that unless the sin of selfishness is forsaken, there is no possibility of salvation (18:24-25). How vastly different was the response of a third rich man of whom Luke writes, Zacchaeus (10:1-19), who had met Christ in faith. He willingly gave half of his goods to the poor and made over three times the restitution required by law to those whom he had cheated. ¹¹⁶

Thus, both the danger of an attitude of superiority and selfishness as well as the remedy are seen in the examples of the three rich men in Luke's Gospel.

Another sin to be avoided is the attachment to money. This sin primarily manifests itself in irresponsibility in stewardship, in covetousness, and in prodigality of spending. Luke records the parable of the Unjust Steward (16:1-18) which affords an illustration of a man who has misused the trust of his master. Geldenhuys comments on the lesson of the parable:

Everything that man possesses on earth (talents, privileges, money, etc.) belongs primarily to the Creator, who lends it so liberally in order that it may be a blessing to man

¹¹⁴ F. F. Emerson, "The Teaching of Christ Concerning the Use of Money," *The Expositor*, VIII (1888), 107.

¹¹⁵ Robert T. Rohrbough, "Christ's Teaching on the Use of Money," (unpublished Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1966), p. 4.

¹¹⁶ F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans, M. D. Cusin (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1870), II, 218.

himself and to his fellow-men and that it should be used to the honour of God. Accordingly, if anyone is unfaithful in connection with these "borrowed goods" how can he expect to receive God's eternal riches, the spiritual gifts given for time and eternity to the redeemed as their own.¹¹⁷

Irresponsible management of things entrusted to man is sin. Further, Luke says much concerning the sin of covetousness. It is especially said of the Pharisees that they were "lovers of money" (16:14). But it is also the sin of the publicans who exact more taxes than they ought (3:13), of soldiers who are dissatisfied with their wages (3:14), of the two brothers fighting over their inheritance (12:13), and of the rich fool who made his possessions the chief end of life (12:16-21). This sin is deadly because it excludes God from life (12:21) and chokes the word of God in the heart of unbelievers (8:14).

In the list of the Lord's parables Luke puts before the reader every imaginable phase of use and misuse of money. For example, the parable of the Unjust Steward shows the misuse of other people's money. The parable of the Rich Fool illustrates the hoarding of money, and the parable of the Prodigal Son speaks of the wasting of money. This latter parable graphically depicts how property may become the instrument of evil. Emerson comments on this fact:

A man covets wealth not to hoard it but to spend it upon his lusts. When we are warned against covetousness in Scripture and books and sermons, we usually think of the hoarding miser, but all the covetous people are not misers. The prodigal coveted his patrimony that he might spend it; and he did spend it in riotous excesses and with reckless waste.¹¹⁸

Attitudes to cultivate. – In light of the sins which must be avoided by men of wealth, Luke mentions certain positive attitudes which Christ sought to impart to His disciples. These include a dedication of life and possessions to eternal values, a deliverance of the mind from the servitude of things, and a complete dependence on God.

Christ repeatedly emphasized the eternal nature of man's soul and the utter frailty of earthly possessions. Man's life is far more important than material wealth (12:15). The rich man was a fool because he made no plans for eternity (12:16-21). Every one of the Synoptics records the important warning issued by Christ: "For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away" (9:25; cf. Matt. 16:26; Mark 8:36-37). One's real wealth must be in God and in the eternal things, to be of lasting value (12:34). **To become rich in heavenly things, Luke shows, it is necessary for a person to trust in the goodness of God (12:22-30) and follow the will of God (12:31).** Earthly desires must make place for eternal

¹¹⁷ Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 417.

¹¹⁸ Emerson, "Teaching," 104. Very fitting is also the German proverb: Hie gevronnen , so zeronnen.

values.

Another attitude to cultivate is freedom from the servitude of things. As Stagg correctly notes: "A man may be owned by what he thinks he owns."¹¹⁹ Man must possess wealth but it must not possess him. The true way of holding wealth, therefore, is to hold it in trust, recognizing God's ownership and man's stewardship. Luke's Gospel makes repeated references to the fact that the absolute title of man's possessions is in God, and that man's right is under God as a tenant or steward. Consecration of one's possessions to God results in inward freedom from selfishness and covetousness.

Finally, the disciples must live in wholehearted dependence on God. This third attitude is the high standard for believers, while attention to eternal values and freedom from subjection to possession are principles which are urged upon the unsaved multitude as well, as the disciples (12:13, 16). Christ's word to His disciples is: "Take no thought for your life, "That ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on. The life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment" (12 :22-23). The passage consists of an injunction and the principle upon which it is based. Christ's disciples are not only not to be covetous, they are not even to be anxious about daily needs.¹²⁰

The principle upon which this injunction rests is, according to Godet, an a fortiori argument: "He who gave the more (the life, the body), will yet more certainly give the less (the nourishment of the life, the clothing of the body)."¹²¹

The kindness of God as well as His knowledge concerning the daily needs should inspire trust in the believer: "Your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things" (12:30). The trust of earthly goods is replaced by a trust in a wise God who knows man's needs. Divine trust, however, does not exclude human planning. Indeed, wise planning is encouraged in the parable of the Unjust Steward. Luke's Gospel is, on the one hand, against care, while, on the other hand, it is against carelessness in financial matters.

The ethic of giving

Instructions to obey. – Luke records the Savior's direct and indirect instructions concerning the dispersing of one's possessions. The exhortations are varied and relate primarily

¹¹⁹ Stagg, "Journey," 511.

¹²⁰ William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 506: The verb *μεριμνάω*, translated by the Authorized Version as "take no thought," is better translated, "Do not be anxious, or unduly concerned."

¹²¹ Godet, *Commentary*, II, 99.

to sacrificing for Christ, to stewardship in the light of eternity, to shrewdness in financial matters, and to spontaneity in giving.

Luke alone reports that the ministry of Christ was supported by sacrificial gifts of women (8:1-3) and he relates the sacrifice of the widow who gave all she had (21:1-4).¹²² The story of the poor widow shows that riches are relative. The amount given does not matter with God and, as Canstein so aptly states, "It is something comforting and refreshing to the poor, that they can give more than the rich."¹²³ The widow's sacrificial spirit rather than the size of the gift counted in God's sight.

Jesus calls on His disciples to sacrifice for Him (12:33) and, like the widow, wants them to trust God to meet their needs. It is significant that the first evidence of Zacchaeus' salvation was a sacrificial gift to the poor. Inward spiritual realities have a close relationship to concrete external actions, especially in stewardship and the distribution of one's wealth. This seems to be an underlying Lucan theme.

Stewardship is further to be carried on in the light of eternity. The parable of the Unjust Steward, already repeatedly referred to, shows the need to prepare for the future. As Plummer points out:

The steward, however, wanting in fidelity and care, showed great prudence in the use which he made of present opportunities as a means of providing for the future. The believer ought to exhibit similar prudence in using material advantages in this life as a means of providing for the life to come.¹²⁴

The parable of Dives and Lazarus (16:19-31) furnishes a further illustration, by contrast, of a man who did not provide for eternity but used all his money on himself. Christ clearly teaches that man can convert his earthly goods into heavenly treasure by giving it to those in need (12:33-34).

Then too, a shrewd management of one's possessions is urged by Christ. Swete explains the meaning of the difficult parable of the Unjust Steward thus:

Its chief purpose is to claim for the service of God the best side of the worldly

¹²² A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930), II, 256. The widow's abject poverty is indicated by the word *πεινυρός*, only here in the New Testament, "from *penes* (*penomai*, to work for one's living)," meaning "penniless," or "destitute."

¹²³ Van Oosterzee, "Gospel," VIII, 316.

¹²⁴ Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 380.

wisdom so often displayed in transactions of this kind . . . the intelligence and quickness of observation, the good sense and promptness in action which it manifests. Our Lord would isolate this property, in itself a valuable one, from unworthy surroundings, and recommend it to His stewards for their use in the stewardship of God's gifts. Scrupulous conscientiousness need not be divorced, as it too frequently is, from ordinary prudence and knowledge of the world; the sons of light should not be less shrewd or well equipped than those who have no higher aim than to promote their selfish ends.¹²⁵

It may be concluded from this parable that there is a place in Christian stewardship of operating on sound business principles in the managing and dispersing of one's possessions.

And, finally, Luke gives great prominence to the instructions to give spontaneously and freely. John the Baptist encouraged all the people to give liberally (3:11). Christ instructed His disciples to "give to every man that asketh of thee" (6:30),¹²⁶ to give freely (6:38), to sell what they have so that they can give alms (12:33).¹²⁷ And the Pharisees are to give alms as well (11:41)¹²⁸ as a test of their genuine spirituality, much as the rich young ruler is asked to sell all that he has to prove that the barrier between him and God might become evident. As the women gave freely to Christ and the widow to God, so Christ's disciples are to give liberally, without thought of recompense (14:12-14). Jesus never required renunciation of wealth as the condition of discipleship, but commended the free distribution of wealth as an evidence of discipleship. Even the smallest gift given out of love is great in God's sight.¹²⁹

¹²⁵ Henry Barclay Swete, *Studies in the Teaching of Our Lord* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903), pp. 106-107.

¹²⁶ It does not mean however, that a person is to give always, under every circumstance. Plummer writes (p. 186): "Our being able to give . . . depends not only on what is asked, but upon who asks it. Some things must not be conceded to anyone. Others ought to be given to some petitioners, but not to all. In every case, however, we ought to be willing to part with what may be lawfully given to any."

¹²⁷ Lenski, *Interpretation*, p. 698: "Jesus does not say, 'Sell all your possessions, give everything as alms,' although he has been understood to say just that. If this were put into practice, all believers would, in short order, themselves need alms." The passage guards against selfishness (vv. 13-21).

¹²⁸ Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, 340: "Jesus estimates alms as an outward indication of a complete inward change of mind; in so far as they show that, instead of the former covetousness and malice, mercy and goodness have entered, the inference can be drawn from them: See, you are wholly clean!"

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, IV, 536-58, "Die altjüdische private Wohlthätigkeit," ("The Ancient Jewish Private Benevolence") an excellent discussion of poverty and riches among the Jews. P. 537: "Benevolence is the greatest sacrifice and has more weight, than all the other commandments.

Promises to claim. – As any dedicated act for God, faithfulness in the stewardship of one's possessions brings temporal as well as eternal blessings. Promises of rewards are not the motivating factors to generosity; love for God is (12:34). Nevertheless, God has promised to bless those who show benevolence. In this life He will supply the daily necessities of food, drink, and clothing. Christ told His disciples: "Your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But rather seek ye the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you" (12:30-31). This promise of the immutable God still stands. Further, to him "tho gives, God will answer with an abundance of gifts (6:38). There will be a conformity between the measure of reward and the faithfulness and benevolence of the person concerned (cf. Matt. 25:31-46).

Luke's Gospel has also eternal rewards in view. Luke speaks of a future recompense for faithful stewardship, for sacrificial service, and for godly submission. The wise use of that which is entrusted to the believer now is the basis for God entrusting the true, heavenly riches to them. Barclay's exposition of Luke 16:10-11 takes the form of a promise:

Upon earth you are in charge of things which are not really yours. You cannot take them with you when you die. They are only lent to you. You are only a steward over them. They cannot, in the very nature of things, be permanently yours. On the other hand in heaven you will get what is really and eternally and essentially *yours*. And what, you get in heaven depends on how you used the things of earth. What you will be given as your very own will depend on how you used the things of which you were only a steward.¹³⁰

Sincere giving to those who are in need will be rewarded in form of "a treasure in the heavens that faileth not." (12 :33).

It is likewise impossible to sacrifice in a material or financial way for the Lord without His knowledge of it. The dedicated servant shall receive much more in this present time and in the world to come (18:29-30). Service rendered on earth to those who cannot, reciprocate the kindness will be "recompensed at the resurrection of the just" (14 :13-14).

Lastly, the Lucan beatitudes speak of an eternal reward in the kingdom for those who are

No matter how much in the way of alms one might give, he always only gives that which belongs to God. Therefore it is the duty of everyone to exercise benevolence for the sake of God, not merely once, but continually, and that with a willing, humble, and loving heart, for every gift receives its "forth according to the measure of love, on which it is based. . . . Moreover, the one who is supported does always more for his benefactor than the benefactor for him. For that reason not even the poorest person in Israel should omit to give alms, from his small possessions, and if he has really nothing to give, then let his alms be sympathetic, encouraging word."

¹³⁰ William Barclay, *The Gospel of Luke* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956), p. 217.

"poor" (cf. Matt. 5:3, "poor in spirit"). By Luke there is a marked contrast in the beatitudes between those who are poor, hungry, weeping, and hated on the one hand and those who are rich on the other hand. Who are these poor? The fact that they are addressed in the second person as "ye poor" (6 :20) makes it apparent that Christ is specifically referring to those who follow Him or, as Esser remarks:

The beatitudes have the poverty of the disciples in view: For all promises of God for the poor and suffering, the miserable and bowed down (e. g. Isa. 57, 15; 61, 1), the weeping (Psalm 126, 5f) and the hungering (Isa. 49, 10; Ezek. 34, 29) are fulfilled in those who believe in the Son.¹³¹

Geldenhuis writes in detail concerning these poor:

The reference is, therefore, to persons who do not seek their wealth and life in earthly things, but who acknowledge their own poverty and come to Him to seek real life. Where outward poverty leads anyone to realize his utter dependence on God and to walk humbly with his Lord, such person will be blessed – in measure even in this life, and more abundantly in the next, he may expect rich and glorious fulness of spiritual life and joy.¹³²

Only at the final consummation will they enjoy the: full blessings of their inheritance as participants in the kingdom and are seen among those who have their place at the eschatological supper (14:21).

Throughout the ages the gospel has always been especially good news to the poor. It always will be so. Deissmann writes with insight on this point:

Even when Christianity had risen from the workshop and the cottage to the palace and the schools or learning, it did not desert the workshop and the cottage. The living

¹³¹ Esser, p. 42. Cf. Martin, *Luke's*, p. 74: "Already in the later Old Testament writings 'poverty' had acquired religious associations (e.g. Isa. 66.2). By New Testament times 'poverty' implied not only social status but even more the religious attitude of humility and receptiveness." The concept of poverty is almost, synonymous with spirituality at Qumran. Cf. Walter Grundmann, p. 142: "In Qumran the concept 'fellowship of the poor' ('Gemeinde der Armen') becomes a special honorific designation for the assembly of the saints. If Esser, p. 103, sees also in the rich of the Third Gospel more than wealthy individuals when he writes: "The total thrust of the relationships of the passages in which Luke contends against the rich brings the thought near that the rich are the opponents of Jesus, that the opponents are in fact labeled collectively as "the rich. So it is that the rich receive a blanket condemnation."

¹³² Geldenhuis, *Commentary*, p. 210.

roots or Christianity remained in their native soil and in the lower ranks of society.¹³³

The matter of possessions, then, is one of Luke's prominent ethical themes. Although in essence it may seem unrelated to Luke's other emphases on prayer and pride, yet these concepts all tie together in that they express ethical duties for the believer. Prayer is exercised God-ward and its importance in the life of the perfect Son or Man reveals its far greater importance in the life of frail man. Pride is a false evaluation of oneself and can only be remedied as the individual sees himself as God sees him. And possessions are important because they influence man in his relationship to other people. No other human response will so effectively divulge the spiritual condition of a man than his disposal of his possessions. Luke highlights three key problem areas of the believer. They involve man's relationship to God, to himself, and to others. In each case the Son of Man is held up as an example to be emulated and as a teacher to be followed.

¹³³ Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965), p. 404.

CHAPTER X

THE LUCAN PANORAMA OF THE FUTURE

Among contemporary Lucan scholars the controversy centers around Luke's eschatological viewpoint or, more precisely, the *parousia* and the kingdom of God.¹ Luke is generally seen as a creative theologian who substituted the expectation or the near kingdom of Matthew and Mark with his conception of a Heilsgeschichte. The various attempts to achieve a consistent Lucan eschatology have been doomed to failure, for no sooner does a new theory arise than it is promptly refuted with another equally untenable theory. The basic error of Conzelmann and others is their failure to study Luke-Acts inductively² and to let Luke speak for himself. His claim to accuracy which extends both to historical matters as well as the recorded words of Christ, has never been taken seriously. If it were, a consistent and harmonious view of Lucan eschatology would emerge. Luke, far from creating his own material, chose it carefully in line with His purpose of presenting Jesus Christ as the Son of Man. In the realm of eschatology, two main concepts stand out: the Son of Man as the coming King and Judge, or the kingdom and judgment.

The Promised Kingdom

The proclamation of the kingdom

Luke rivals Matthew in his strong emphasis on Jesus as king and on the kingdom of God.

The meaning of the kingdom of God. – The term "kingdom" may refer to both the reign of God and the realm over which the reign functions in the context. Each passage must be interpreted separately to see which idea dominates. Schmidt finds this same balance between reign and realm:

βασιλεία signifies the "being," "nature" and "state" of the king. Since the

¹ For a discussion of the approaches to Lucan eschatology cf. Fred O. Francis, "Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XXXVII (March, 1969), 49-63.

² *Ibid.*, 49, 51: "One can verify that the presently dominant view of Luke-Acts' eschatology – as epitomized, say, in Conzelmann's *Die Mitte der Zeit* – was not arrived at inductively. One need only list the numerous passages in Luke's volumes that reflect another eschatological point or view. Such passages are shunted aside either in silence or as being insignificant remnants or earlier pre-Lukan tradition. . . . As we have intimated, Conzelmann, Vielhauer, Käsemann, Haenchen, and others really start outside the data, knowing in advance what eschatology is and what its relation to history can be – and, by the way, knowing what history necessarily is for Luke."

reference is to a king, we do best to speak first of his "dignity" or "power" . . . Almost spontaneously there then intrudes a richly attested second meaning; the dignity of the king is expressed in the territory ruled by him, i.e. his "kingdom" . . . Both meanings are present in βασιλεία .³

Luke, in speaking of the kingdom of the Son of Man, refers to it as the "kingdom of God." This expression is used twenty-nine times out of at least forty-four references to a kingdom. Matthew, on the other hand, primarily speaks of the "kingdom of heaven."⁴ The kingdom of heaven is similar in many respects to the kingdom of God, but there is some evidence that the two concepts are not synonymous. Walvoord notes the difference:

In contrast to the kingdom of God which includes the elect both of men and angels whether in heaven or earth, the kingdom of heaven seems to be limited to the earthly sphere and excludes angels and other creatures, but includes those who profess salvation and who are outwardly identified with God whether or not they are actually saved.⁵

On the basis of these definitions, Luke refers to the kingdom as either the reign or realm of God, or both, to which those belong who accept Christ as the rightful king. The various historical aspects of the kingdom would be (1) God's universal kingdom, (2) the mystery form or the kingdom, (3) the Messianic kingdom, and (4) a spiritual kingdom.

The messengers of the kingdom. – Luke specifically mentions several individuals and groups who proclaim the kingdom of God. The first messenger is the angel, Gabriel, who announces to Mary that Jesus shall be given the throne of David on which He would rule over the house of Jacob forever (1:32-33).

That John the Baptist preached the kingdom of God is strongly implied even if not directly stated. The angelic announcement of his ministry relates John to Malachi 3 :1, 23 and to the royal messenger of Isaiah 40:3. Luke notes that the kingdom of God has been preached since John (16:16).

It is noteworthy that in two places Luke introduces the heralding of the kingdom where the other Gospels are silent (4:43; 9:2). In 4:43, Jesus indicates that it is God's will that He

³ Karl Ludwig Schmidt, "βασιλεία," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey O. Bromiley (6 vols.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), I, 579-80.

⁴ He does so thirty-six times. The exceptions are 12:28; 13:38; 13:43.

⁵ John F. Walvoord, "The Kingdom of Heaven," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXIV (July-September, 1967), 203. Cf. Charles C. Ryrie, *The Basis of Premillennial Faith* (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1958), pp. 98-99.

announce the good news of the kingdom in many different cities. Writing of the Savior's Galilean ministry, Luke describes Him as passing through cities and towns preaching the kingdom (8:1). Likewise, near the city of Bethsaida Christ spoke to the multitude of the kingdom of God (9:11).

Luke makes a unique reference to the Twelve observing that Christ sent them as well "to preach the kingdom of God" (9 :2). Christ further appoints his Seventy to preach that the kingdom of God is near (10:9, 11) and it is evident that there were other individuals who heralded the kingdom, for Christ commanded a certain man to go and preach the kingdom of God (9:60).

The message of the kingdom. – In distinction to Matthew and Mark who give the direct messages of both John (Matt. 3:2) and Jesus (Matt. 3:17; 10:7; Mark 1:15), Luke merely speaks in summary fashion of the announcement of the kingdom. Only 10:9, 11 give a clue to the content, namely that "the kingdom of God is nigh unto you." According to at least four references the message of the kingdom is spoken of as "good news" (4:34; 16:16; A.S.V. and 8:1; 9:6). The announcement, of the kingdom involved therefore the proclamation of the good news that the kingdom was near.

As to the nature of the promised kingdom, the angel's words to Mary are very revealing. Godet sees in these divine promises references to the Davidic covenant of II Samuel 7:12-13 and to Isaiah 9:5-7. He explains:

The *throne* of David should not be taken here as the emblem of the throne of God, nor *the house of Jacob* as a figurative designation of the Church. These expressions in the mouth of the angel keep their natural and literal sense. It is, indeed, the theocratic royalty and the Israelitish people, neither more or less, that are in question here; Mary could have understood these expressions in no other way.⁶

Luke makes much of the fact that the Jewish hope at the time of Christ was for an earthly, Messianic kingdom which would be set up on earth and included a release from foreign domination (1:71; 19:17; 24:21). This kingdom is proclaimed by the angel before the Savior's birth and it is still expected by the disciples at the Savior's ascension (Acts, 1:6).

Never once did Christ reinterpret the Old Testament concept of the kingdom although He had many opportunities to do so. Rather, Christ told the Pharisees in answer to their question when the kingdom should come: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there I for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you" (17:20b-21). Plummer comments on the controversial words $\epsilon \nu \tau \omicron \varsigma \upsilon \mu \omega \nu \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \acute{\iota} \nu$:

⁶ F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans. M. D. Cusin (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1870), I, 91.

Usage sanctions either translation: "within you, in your hearts" . . . or, "among you, in your midst" . . . The latter seems to suit the context better; for the Kingdom of God was not in the hearts of the Pharisees, who are the persons addressed. The meaning will then be, "so far from coming with external signs which will attract attention, the kingdom is already in the midst of you (in the person of Christ and of His disciples), and you do not perceive it."⁷

Pentecost follows Plummer in the interpretation of this key phrase:

The Lord is not asserting that His kingdom was to be a spiritual kingdom in the hearts of men. Such is contrary to the entire tenor of the Word of God. He is asserting that the kingdom to which they were looking is already "at hand" in the person of the king. The rightful king was present and all that was required was repentance on the part of the nation and a reception of Christ as the theocratic Messiah.⁸

Christ further argued that His expelling of demons by the finger of God proved that the kingdom of God was upon them (11:20) and that it was nigh (21:32).

From what has been said thus far, it is evident that the kingdom which John, Christ, and His disciples proclaimed was the same kingdom that had been predicted in the Old Testament. The seventy proclaimed that the kingdom had come near. Christ said that the kingdom was in their midst and throughout His ministry Jesus offered Himself as King. The disciples recognized this (19:38); His enemies understood His claim (23:2, 37-38). To Pilate's inquiry the Lord affirmed it (23:2-3) and the dying thief confessed it (23:42). Hastings correctly comments:

Luke's is a kingly gospel. Jesus is Lord because he is the messianic king of all ages and all lands. "The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob eternally; his kingdom shall never have an end" (1:32-3). "As my Father has allotted a kingdom to me," Jesus said to his disciples during the last supper, "so I allot to you a place to eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" (22:29). It was as king that he was received in Jerusalem. . . . Luke's messianic doctrine

⁷ Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), p. 406. Cf. Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 124-25. Even Conzelmann, after five pages of discussion concludes that the meaning of ἐντός "is not as important as is often supposed."

⁸ J. Dwight Pentecost, *Things to Come* (Findlay: Dunham Publishing Company, 1961), p. 452.

is both royal and prophetic.⁹

Luke intends to convey the fact that the kingdom was present historically in the person of the Messiah. But the form which the kingdom took was conditioned on the response of Israel. Peters writes concerning the offer of the kingdom:

This Kingdom was offered to the nation in good faith, i.e. it would have been bestowed provided the nation had repented. The foreknown result made no difference in the tender of it, so far as the free agency of the nation is concerned; that result flowed from a voluntary choice. The national unbelief did not change God's faithfulness, Rom. 3:3. It would be derogatory to the mission of Christ to take any other view of it, and the sincerity and desire of Jesus that the nation might accept, is witnessed in His tears over Jerusalem, in His address to it, in His unceasing labors, in sending out the twelve and the seventy and in His works of mercy and love. It follows, then, that the Jews had the privilege accorded to them of accepting the Kingdom, and if the condition annexed to it had been complied with, then the Kingdom of David would have been most gloriously re-established under the Messiah.¹⁰

The postponement of the kingdom

The national rejection of the kingdom. – The fact of the rejection becomes evident in the reception which the ministry of John and Jesus received. Luke shows that while the common people received John's message, "the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized" (7:29-30). Christ's rejection initially started at Nazareth where the enraged multitude tried to push Him over the brow of the hill (4:28-29). But official and organized opposition did not start until some time later when the nation's religious leaders came from all the towns of Galilee and Judea as well as Jerusalem to test Him (5:17). It was then that Christ claimed the power to forgive sins and forced the people through a display of His power to a decision. The response was skepticism as the leaders charged Jesus with blasphemy (5:21). From then on various tactics were used to discredit Jesus. His social conduct is condemned. The fact that He associated with sinners is taken as an indication of His own sinfulness (5:39), and His lack of fasting is condemned (5:33). He was further accused of the sin of breaking the Sabbath (6:2; 13:14; 14:4), but His rejection reached a climax when He was accused of casting out demons by the power of Satan (11:15). His rejection by the nation meant certain judgment and no further sign would be given to it (11:29).

The mystery form of the kingdom. – It is obvious that the Davidic kingdom was not set

⁹ Adrian Hastings, *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem* (Baltimore: Helicon Press Inc., 1956), p. 152.

¹⁰ George N. H. Peters, *The Theocratic Kingdom* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1952), I, 377.

up while Christ was on earth, and yet Luke has at least twenty-four references to the kingdom in the first advent, compared to nine explicit references to the future kingdom. It must be concluded that **some form of the kingdom has been established during the first advent of Christ**. This is the mystery form or the kingdom. Christ remarked to His followers after the leaders rejected Him: "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God; but to others in parables, that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not hear" (8: 10). The term "mystery" (μυστήριον) is used to describe

the secret thoughts, plans, and dispensations of God which are hidden from the human reason, as well as from all other comprehension below the divine level. and hence must be revealed to those for whom they are intended.¹¹

Christ indicated therefore that the form which the kingdom was to take now was hidden in the Old Testament, but now is revealed through the new teaching in parabolic form. Luke records three main parables in which the Lord reveals the features of the present kingdom.¹²

The first parable is that of the Sower and the Soils (8:1-15), teaching that the mystery form of the kingdom is characterized by a sowing of the seed of the Word of God with various responses, Johnson points out the significance of this parable:

The very fact that Christ comes as the sower proved that Israel was now set aside. For Israel was His vineyard planted long before. Thus if He were going to Israel, He would need to go to harvest. But He comes into a waste world, where there was nothing, and He begins a fresh work. Further, the work of establishment rests in the Word alone. Here resides the life, power and authority of the King to work.¹³

The parable of the mustard seed teaches the abnormal growth of the mystery form of the kingdom and the presence of demonized human beings who are present in the kingdom but are not a true part of it.¹⁴

¹¹ William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 532.

¹² Stanley D. Toussaint, "The Argument of Matthew" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1957), p. 203. Toussaint writes that "the kingdom exists in this intercalation only in the sense that the sons of the kingdom are present." To him there is no real mystery form of the kingdom.

¹³ Elliott E. Johnson, "A Study of BASILEIA TOY QEOY in the Gospel of Luke," (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1968), pp. 132-133.

¹⁴ Ryrie, *Basis*, p. 97.

The parable of the leaven teaches that the "kingdom of God contains leaven, that is, evil doctrine, externalism, unbelief, and worldliness (13:20-21.)" ¹⁵ While the shrub marks primarily outward appearance, the leaven emphasizes the inner influence. ¹⁶

These new teachings concerning too kingdom do not contradict or change the Old Testament revelation of the kingdom but simply expand the original teaching. The parabolic form of teaching is used to withhold these truths from the indifferent crowd while revealing them to serious listeners (8:10).

Besides recording the Lord's explanations concerning the new form of the kingdom, Luke also mentions the means of entrance into the kingdom. The condition for entrance is the receiving the kingdom as a child (18:17). Lenski states the main import of this teaching: "The child is the model, not the man. It is the unassuming humility and the unquestioning trustfulness of the child that makes it a pattern for all adults," ¹⁷ and Godet adds: "There is in children a twofold receptivity, negative and positive, humility and confidence." ¹⁸

The kingdom is further a gift from the Father, for, as Christ said to His disciples, "Fear not little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (12:32). Supremely then, the kingdom is received in faith apart from merit. Twice when Christ was asked about the possibility of obtaining eternal life (10:25; 18:18), He pointed to the law to demonstrate to men their insufficiency of personal merit and sought to convict them of their sin. Faith prompted the dying thief to request a place in the kingdom from the dying King (23:39-43). The thief contributed nothing in His life which would merit the Lord's promise.

Those poor in this world's goods but rich in faith are citizens of the kingdom (6:20). The patriarchs, prophets, and Gentiles will also have a part in the future kingdom (13 :28-29). It is interesting to note that Luke emphasizes the position of security which each true member of the kingdom possesses. The kingdom is a gift (12:32) and the disciples' names are already written in heaven (10:20). Luke also identifies inheriting eternal life (10:25; 18:18) with being tantamount to entering the kingdom (18:24-25) and being saved (18:26).

The interim abode of departed believers. – A place is promised in the future kingdom

¹⁵ Walvoord, "Kingdom," 198.

¹⁶ For the contrast between the two parables cf. Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. S. M. Hooke (London: S.C.M. Press, 1954), p. 90.

¹⁷ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel* (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1946), p. 910. Johnson, "Study," 258, erroneously states that "the condition for entrance is receiving the Kingdom as though it were a child."

¹⁸ Godet, *Commentary*, II, 205.

to the patriarchs, prophets, Gentiles, and disciples. But since the establishment of the Davidic kingdom has been postponed, where is their habitation during this present mystery form of the kingdom? Luke gives some helpful information about this present abode of believers. It is called "Abraham's bosom" (16:22) or "Paradise" (23:1.3) by Christ. Lazarus was transported by the angels into "Abraham's bosom." Concerning this name Strack-Billerbeck write:

Lying or sitting in Abraham's bosom . . . is . . . a pictorial expression to indicate the loving fellowship which exists in the beyond between Abraham and his pious descendants, derived from the love of a mother, who cherishes and protects her child in her lap.¹⁹

The dying thief was promised a place in "Paradise," a word probably of Persian origin meaning a royal park. The word is only used once by the Lord and speaks of heavenly bliss in the presence of the Father.²⁰ That the believer enters this place of God's presence (cf. II Cor. 12:2-4) at the point of death can be seen from Christ's words, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost." Smith remarks on this passage: "It is impossible to interpret this in any other way than what the text clearly implies, that while the body of Jesus was sleeping in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, His spirit went to God."²¹

The dying thief was promised an immediate place in Paradise (23:43) and apparently was with Christ in the presence of the Father. With these two expressions, all the saints are seen as being in a state of bliss in the presence of God, awaiting the time of resurrection into the kingdom.

The presence of the Davidic Kingdom in the future

The return of the King. – Luke clearly shows that the mystery form of the kingdom is not the fulfillment of the promised Davidic kingdom. He shows both the necessity why the King

¹⁹ Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5 vols.; München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), II, 225-26. The authors show further that Abraham's bosom is not merely a section of Sheol or Hades designed for the pious as Christians often assume, e.g. Henry Alford, "St. Luke," *The New Testament for English Readers* (5 vols.; Boston: Lee and Shephard, 1872), I, 402: "The expression Abraham's bosom signified the happy side of Hades, where all the Fathers were conceived as resting in bliss."

²⁰ G. F. Wright, "Paradise," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. James Orr (5 vols.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960), IV, 2246.

²¹ Wilbur M. Smith, *The Biblical Doctrine of Heaven* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1968), p. 160.

must return as well as the nature of that return.

Luke alone records Christ's words in 4:16-19 as He was reading from Isaiah 61:2-3 and by omitting the words "the day of vengeance of our God" distinguished between His first coming and a coming yet future for vengeance. The Lord prepared His disciples for a time when they would be without their King (5 :35) and would fast in the absence of the bridegroom. Because they thought that the kingdom of God would immediately appear, He described Himself as a nobleman going into a far country to receive a kingdom and to return (19:11-27). While He is away deceivers will draw unsuspecting people after them by claiming to be the Messiah (17:22-24) but believers are to pray for the kingdom (11:2). When the kingdom comes, Christ will again drink of the fruit of the vine (22:18). The kingdom is yet future. Christ afforded His three intimate disciples a glimpse of the true kingdom on the Mount of Transfiguration (9:27). Johnson writes of this event in relation to Luke's specific emphasis:

Luke's emphasis is distinct. He does not concentrate his attention on the coming of the Kingdom before the Mount but after it. After the Kingdom had been rejected by Israel, the Lord introduced the mysteries of the Kingdom. This was new revelation about the Kingdom not before revealed. They revealed a form of the Kingdom to exist which was hidden from unbelievers. It is this form of the Kingdom which was inaugurated at the Mount. Thus the Transfiguration was both a fulfillment in the remnant of the announced Kingdom and simultaneously the inauguration of the form of the Kingdom hidden from unbelievers.²²

The nature of Christ's return is described as sudden and glorious. Contemporary Lucan scholars have commonly taken the position that the early church was convinced that the return of Christ would necessarily occur within a very short time, but that by the time Luke wrote the non-occurrence of the *parousia* had become a pressing problem, so that he deliberately altered the eschatology of Matthew and Mark of an imminent *parousia* and placed the return of the Lord into the distant future. But this is wrong. Luke speaks frequently of the necessity of preparedness for the Lord's return. Although "there shall be signs" (21:25), nevertheless, the Lord's return will take place when it is least expected (21:34) and shall come without warning (12:35-40). For that reason it is imperative that believers are found watching and prepared (12:37; 21:36). One of the strongest proofs of the imminency of the King's return is found in the parable of the Unjust Judge (18:1-8). Verse eight is of the greatest importance: "I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Cranfield, in combating Conzelmann's erroneous view, comments on the significance of the verse:

It surely does refer to the coming of the Son of Man at the Parousia. The effect of it is to encourage the reader to take the preceding parable in an eschatological sense, as referring to the help which will be brought to the elect by the Parousia rather than to any

²² Johnson, "Study," p. 213.

divine, help in the meantime. Interpreted in the light of v. 8b, ἐν τάχει in v. 8a must surely refer to the nearness (in some sense) of the Parousia.²³

Cranfield then gives a summary of linguistic evidence:

It is to be noted that Liddell and Scott do not give, "suddenly" or "unexpectedly" as a possible meaning either of ταχέως or of the various adverbial phrases which use the noun τάχος. Similarly W. Bauer's dictionary gives no hint of the possibility of ἐν τάχει meaning "suddenly" or "unexpectedly." I take it, therefore, that in Luke 18.8 it means "quickly" or "soon."²⁴

His conclusion is devastating to most Lucan scholars when he writes:

In some sense (but not in the sense in which Conzelmann and Barrett understands the primitive Naherwartung!) the Parousia is near. It is near, not in the sense that it must necessarily occur within a few months or years, but in the sense that it may occur at any moment and in the sense that, since the decisive event of history has already taken place in the ministry, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, all subsequent history is a kind of epilogue, an interval inserted by God's mercy in order to allow men time for repentance, and, as such an epilogue, necessarily in a real sense short, even though it may be a very long time.²⁵

Luke makes no attempt to set a date for the Lord's return but He emphasizes a constant readiness and indirectly suggests that the second advent does not take place until after the rapture. He records Christ's words which indicate His return to be after the wedding (12:36), an oblique reference to the uniting of Christ with His church, as Chafer shows.²⁶

The King's return will occur in royal splendor. All men will see Him return in a cloud of power and great glory (21:26-27), accompanied by His holy angels (9:26). At His first advent Jesus came as the suffering Son of Man; at His second advent He will expire as the reigning Sovereign. Luke presents the return of Christ as being a time of resurrection and rewards for the believers and a time of judgment for the unbelievers.

²³ C. E. B. Cranfield, "The Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, XVI (1963), 298-299.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 299.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 300.

²⁶ Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology* (8 vols.; Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947), V, 306.

That Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are in the future kingdom is certain (13:25-29), and since already Moses showed²⁷ that the patriarchs would be resurrected and Christ affirmed this (20:37-38), it must be concluded that the resurrection of the Old Testament saints will take place at Christ's return. It will be a resurrection for rewards, which play such an important part in the Third Gospel. Persecution on this earth will be greatly rewarded in heaven (6:2) and kindness towards enemies and benevolence towards the poor will reap rich rewards (6:35). Faithful stewardship in expectation of the Lord's return will be abundantly blessed (12:41-47), and the disciples which left all are promised manifold more in this world and in the world to come (18:29-30). Those who are hospitable to the destitute without thought or recompense shall be rewarded at "the resurrection or the just" (14:13-14). It is the only passage in which rewards are tied to the time of the resurrection. Ryle observes that this passage "confirms the doctrine of a reward according to works, though not an account of works, in the judgment day,"²⁸ and he comments on the term "resurrection or the just":

This expression is remarkable. I cannot think that our Lord used it in deference to an opinion common among the Jews, that resurrection was the special privilege of the righteous. It seems to me far more probable that our Lord refers to the first resurrection, spoken of in the 20th chapter or Revelation. It is hard to put any other sense on the expression than this, that there is a resurrection of which none but the just shall be partakers, – a resurrection which shall be the peculiar privilege of the righteous, and shall precede that of the wicked.²⁹

Luke sees reward as being given during this life as being granted at death, as in the case of Lazarus, and as being ultimately bestowed at the return of Christ when the resurrected saints shall enter the kingdom. Luke's doctrine of rewards, salvation, and damnation, is very individualistic, in line with the distinctive emphasis on individuals of his Gospel. Hastings writes concerning this:

Luke's interest in individual eschatology, individual salvation or damnation, is unique among the synoptics; but it is very important for his own thought. . . . Individual beatitude consequent upon death is the promise of Jesus' preaching and the term of the Christian life, as they are described by Luke in gospel and Acts.³⁰

²⁷ The word "showed," according to Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 255, means "to give a hint," "to indicate something."

²⁸ John Charles Ryle, "Luke," *Expository Thoughts on the Gospels* (2 vols.; London: Charles J. Thynne, 1897), II, 158.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 158-59.

³⁰ Hastings, *Prophet*, pp. 171-72.

The revelation concerning the kingdom. – Luke relates several important facts concerning the characteristics and conditions of the Messianic kingdom. There are four significant aspects of the kingdom mentioned in the Third Gospel. First, it will be an eternal kingdom. The angel announced to Mary that Christ's kingdom would be without end (1:33). Also, the kingdom is an earthly kingdom, if the angelic promise is taken literally: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David" (1:32). Walvoord forcefully defends the literal fulfillment of the promise:

A literal promise spiritualized is exegetical fraud. The point of the Davidic covenant is that the Son of David will possess the throne of His father David. To make His person literal but His throne a spiritualized concept is to nullify the promise.³¹

Luke further states that the kingdom would be a political kingdom. Jerusalem has been under Gentile dominion since the time of Nebuchadnezzar, 600 B.C., and will be until the Son of Man returns (Dan. 7:13, 14) for the establishment of His eternal kingdom. At this time, according to Luke, the times of the Gentiles will come to an end³² and the long awaited redemption of Israel from Gentile dominion (1:68; 2:38; 21:28) will be effected by the appearance of the kingdom of God (21:31). The political hope or pious Jews will find realization (24:21). It will be the distinctive honor of the disciples "to sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (22:30).

The kingdom will be universal, for Gentiles "shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit in the kingdom of God" (13: 29). And according to Daniel's prophecy which the Lord applied to Himself, the Son of Man will receive "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him" (Dan. 7:14).

The conditions in the kingdom will be completely different from anything known heretofore. The kingdom affords superior privileges. Even the least in the kingdom of God will be greater than John (7:28). Moreover, the Gentiles, who had been last in God's program, will be first, and the Jews will be last (13:30). The kingdom was offered to Israel and rejected by them, but through their rejection the entrance into the kingdom has been opened for the Gentiles. The Lord further teaches that unlike the standards for greatness of this age, humility will characterize true greatness in the kingdom (22:26).

Besides these inversions of present conditions and values in the kingdom, several other

³¹ John F. Walvoord, *The Millennial Kingdom* (Findlay: Dunham Publishing Co., 1963), p. 200.

³² John F. Walvoord, "The Times of the Gentiles," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXV (January-March, 1968), 3-9. For an opposing view cf. Johnson, "Study," p. 169. "It is the time of opportunity set aside for the Gentiles."

aspects of kingdom life are revealed. It will be a time of fellowship, for Christ is seen eating and drinking with His disciples (22:18, 30). The saints will enjoy one another's presence (13:28-29; 14:15) and the blessings of the kingdom are likened to a great supper (14:16-24).

The kingdom is also characterized by peace. The peace which the angels promised (2:14) will be fully realized when Christ the King will return in glory and peace (19:38; cf. Rom. 14:17) and God's will shall be carried out (11:2).

The Predicted Judgment

Alongside or the Lucan theme of the kingdom there runs a parallel emphasis of judgment throughout the Third Gospel. In many different ways Luke gives prominence to this eschatological aspect.

The declarations concerning judgment

The messengers of judgment. – The first announcements of judgment recorded in Luke's Gospel are made by John. He depicts the judgment as the "wrath to come" (3:7) and pronounces it as imminent (3:9). Godet writes to John's solemn warnings:

John knew the prophecies; he was not ignorant that Moses and Isaiah had announced the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles. It is by this threatening prospect, that he endeavours to stir up the zeal of his contemporaries.³³

It is interesting to note that besides John only Jesus proclaimed judgment, whereas His disciples announced the good news of the kingdom. John had referred to the judgment which would be executed by the Messiah (Mal. 4:5-6; Isa. 61:2b) in His coming to set up the kingdom. Christ's first coming, however, was in humility as suffering Savior, so that these predictions of judgment anticipated His return as King.

The message of judgment. – Luke says much about the eternal consequences of men's actions during this life. He tells of Jesus' prediction that Capernaum would be brought down to hell (10:15). He records the Savior's exhortation, "Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him" (12:5).³⁴ God is to be feared because death does not end it all. There is something worse than physical death. Those who deny the Lord on earth will be denied in the presence of the angels or God (12:9) and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will never be forgiven (12:10). The most unsparing condemnations were made

³³ Godet, *Commentary*, I, 176.

³⁴ Plummer, *Commentary*, p. 319: "There is little doubt that this refers to God and not to the devil.

against the religious professors whose lives failed to back up their profession. For those with greater responsibility there would be "greater condemnation" (20:47).

As Luke shows, judgment is rooted squarely in the will of God, for Christ spoke solemnly of the coming "days of vengeance" which are the fulfillment of "all things which are written" (21:22). Christ's message of judgment is one of finality as to man's present decisions. It is as well a message for the religious Jews, as Morris states:

It is clear enough that Luke is trying to present us with something radically new. And it is equally clear that the radical element is the disowning of the characteristic Jewish approach and the replacing it with a complete reliance upon God, upon God alone, for salvation.³⁵

The dispensing of judgment

Luke speaks of Christ as the suffering Son or Man, the glorious King, as well as the judge of mankind. John spoke of one who would come to baptize the world with the fire of judgment.³⁶ Christ would separate the wheat from the chaff and destroy the latter (3:16-17). The Messiah's future ministry is seen as a proclamation of vengeance (Isa. 61:2b). In the parable of the nobleman, in which Christ plainly refers to Himself, the nobleman returns and utterly destroys his enemies (19:22). Those who rejected his rule are slain before him. The pronouncements of woe upon the leaders of Israel (6:24-26; 11:52) are the official act of the Son or Man who has the right to judge (cf. John 5:22).

In the explanation of the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (20:9-16), Christ makes reference to Psalm 118:22, a Messianic passage, and applies it to Himself: "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner" (20:17). The meaning of the thinly veiled parable is apparent. As the son of the vineyard owner Christ would be killed, but as the Messiah He would return in judgment. Hastings' words show the paradox of the personal culpability of the Jews and the divine choice of the cross:

The vineyard, as every reader of Isaiah 5 knew, was Israel; scribes and priests the vine-dressers; Jesus himself is the Son and in his audience are his murderers. . . . If the Passion and cross were Jesus' free choice, they were also Jerusalem's responsibility and guilt.³⁷

³⁵ Leon Morris, *The Cross in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), p. 82.

³⁶ John F. Walvoord, *The Holy Spirit* (Findlay: Dunham Publishing Co., 1958), pp. 148-49.

³⁷ Hastings, *Prophet*, pp. 114-15.

Deliverance from judgment

A period of grace. – Although judgment is absolutely necessary, it is never proclaimed without the exhortation or opportunity for repentance. In the graphic parable of the Barren Fig Tree (13:6-9) the Lord planted a fig tree, Israel, which would not bear fruit for three years. It was clearly an unproductive tree and yet, at the request of the vine-dresser, Christ, it was allowed to remain one more year to test its productivity. The three years and the one year of delayed judgment seem to portray the ministry of Christ and Peter until Stephen's death.

A prayer for grace . – The prayer of Christ on the cross echoes the vine-dresser's request, "Father, let them go (from immediate judgment) for they do not know what they do" (23:34). The ignorance of the nation, permitting a stay of judgment and the possibility of deliverance, was underscored by Peter in Acts 3 :17.

The possibility of deliverance. – Both John and Jesus proclaimed that there is a way of deliverance from judgment or at least protection in judgment. John's prediction of the wrath to come is coupled with the exhortation to bring forth "fruits worthy of repentance" (3: 8) and a detailed explanation how a change of life should manifest itself (3:11-14).

As the Savior, Christ shows the way of deliverance from judgment even before His death. In Luke 12:1-2, after warning of "the leaven of the Pharisees," Christ implies that a true confession of Himself will bring deliverance (12:8-9). Remedy from judgment is further found in repentance, as Christ emphatically repeated in Luke 13:3, 5. In the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Christ indicates that a true understanding of Moses and the prophets is able to keep a soul from hell (16:30).

The description of the judgment

Christ's warnings had gone unheeded and His lament over Jerusalem sets the mood for the announcements of impending judgment (13:34).

The causes for judgment. – Judgment was pronounced because of a failure to receive the message of the kingdom through the disciples (10:11), because of the rejection of the miraculous works of the Messiah (10:13), and because of a failure to repent at Christ's preaching, who was "greater than Jonas" (11:32). The Pharisees, scribes, and lawyers were condemned because of their perversion of religion and worship (11:42-44, 46-47, 52). The martyrdom of all righteous persons from Abel to Zacharias would be "required of this generation" (11:50-51), which was responsible for the final rejection of God's messengers and was guilty in an absolute sense because they rejected and crucified even the Son of God.

The time of judgment. – Two major judgments are predicted for Israel. One judgment is to fall on the generation of Jews which crucified the Messiah. Luke has four references in

chapter 11 to "this generation" (11:31, 32, 50, 51). While some ³⁸ think that the judgments referred to here befall the whole nation at the second coming of Christ other references clearly indicate a devastating judgment which would befall Israel and specifically Jerusalem in the near future. In A.D. 70 the Roman armies under Titus invaded Palestine and it is to this event that the prophecies against Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum (10:13, 15), as well as against Jerusalem and the temple (19:41-44; 21:6, 24; 23:28-30) are directed.

The very clarity of these prophecies of the fall of Jerusalem has been a cause of offense for rationalists as well as contemporary Lucan scholars. For instance, Luke alone mentions Jerusalem by name in the eschatological discourse; instead of Mark's "abomination of desolation" (Mark 13:14), he has "Jerusalem compassed with armies" (Luke 21 :20). Hastings write s concerning the detailed Lucan references:

This sort of thing has made the Rationalists allot to the third gospel a date after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but this is really very unlikely; Harnack rightly insisted on a date about A.D. 63. Luke's particular stress on Jerusalem's siege and destruction is easily understood once we grasp the continuity of the Jerusalem theme throughout his work. His purpose required as that of the two first evangelists did not, that Jerusalem, the holy-unholy city, should be mentioned by name in the prophecies of woe.³⁹

It is wrong to think that Luke's passages give an eye-witness or contemporary account of Titus taking the city. As Rengstorf⁴⁰ shows, here, if anywhere Luke's language is based on the Old Testament.

While Luke shows that one judgment is close, he indicates that the final judgment coincides with the return of the Lord. Even as judgments fall on Noah's generation (17:26-27) and on wicked Sodom (verses 28-29) "even so shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed" (17:30). The judgment will come with lightning-like suddenness (17:24),⁴¹ the ungodly will be removed for judgment (17:34-37). While it will be a time for redemption for the godly (21: 28), sudden destruction will come on the ungodly. In view of the certain and sudden judgment, believers are to watch and pray always, so that they may "escape all these things that

³⁸ Ryle, "Luke," II, 56, who sees in "this generation" not a reference to time but to the nation or people.

³⁹ Hastings, *Prophet*, p. 116.

⁴⁰ Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 236-37.

⁴¹ Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), p. 538. Geldenhuys shows that there really is no discrepancy between this passage where the coming of the Son of Man is said to be unheralded by signs and chapter 21 where signs are given.

shall come to pass and to stand before the Son of man" in His kingdom (21:36).

The extent of judgment. – There is a large number of passages which, although they do not directly assert the certainty of the endlessness of future punishment, yet strongly imply that all will not be saved. In Luke 13:23 the question is asked by one, "Are there few that be saved?" In response to Christ's warning of verse 5, "Except ye repent ye shall likewise perish." The question plainly implies that the Savior was understood to teach that some will be lost. This is the implication of the exhortation as well, of verse 24, "Strive to enter in at the straight gate, for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter and shall not be able," followed by the certainty that the door will be shut (verse 25), and that utter exclusion will follow (verses 27, 28).

Luke curiously omits any direct reference to the nature of the final judgment. History teaches that the doom which Jerusalem brought on itself was a bloody judgment of the nation, resulting for many in physical death (11:50-51). There are strong indications that the eschatological judgment will be physical death as well. Christ compared the judgment of the unrepented Israelites with those few who were slain by Pilate and those upon whom the tower of Siloam fell (13:1-5). The coming judgment will be worse than that which fell on Sodom (10:12; 17:29). The final judgment to some seems to include therefore a physical destruction of buildings (19:44; 21:6) and persons, but will ultimately involve a consignment of the wicked to hell ⁴² (12:5; 16:23). Luke makes a distinct and unique reference to the soul of the wicked and its activity when it leaves the body. In Luke 16:19-31, the Savior speaks of a rich man ⁴³ who is consigned to the realm of woe. The man understands his state is final. He does not ask for deliverance but merely that some alleviation be given to his torment in flames. ⁴⁴ He addresses Abraham, not God, and gives no appearance that repentance would be of any avail to him now. Besides, a great gulf is fixed for the purpose (ὄπιως) that there should be no passing from the abode of the righteous and wicked to the other. The fate is permanent. Robbins asserts this eternal character of the judgment when he writes:

The fact that no reference to or hint at any change of character in the intermediate state is found in connection with the description of proceedings at the day of judgment after the resurrection would by itself seem to be conclusive in regard to any change or

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 429 for a discussion of 'Αίδης .

⁴³ Marchant A. King, "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Luke," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXII (July-September, 1965), 239. Some ancient manuscripts give the name of the rich man as "Nineue" or "Neue" i.e. "Mr. Nod."

⁴⁴ Schilder, cited by Geldenhuys, *Commentary*, p. 430: He writes concerning the flame: "Let no one say: it is only symbolic and therefore not so terrible. By mere inversion one could say: if the symbol, the mere picture, is already awe-inspiring, how terrible must the original (the actual) be!"

character or destination there.⁴⁵

Besides showing that the judgment is actual, final, and eternal, Luke shows that it is just. On the one hand, he presents punishment as almost a natural outgrowth of the sinful character and on the other hand, his close connection of judgment with the return of the King relates it to the authority of the Messiah, to inflict the penalty for sin. He who has the power to forgive sin has the power to punish it. He does so in perfect justice. Luke notes two instances when Christ refers to degrees of punishment. A neglect of a greater opportunity to hear the truth (10:13) and a greater responsibility to teach the truth (20:47) will receive a greater penalty.

For Luke judgment is only the dark background against which he the salvation of the Son of Man. The repeated warnings in his Gospel show that it was no mere theory that the angels called Jesus a Savior in that first Christmas night. Fellowship with Him indeed effects salvation when his royal wrath is poured out on a rejecting world.

⁴⁵ R. D. C. Robbins, "Does the New Testament Warrant the Hope of a Probation Beyond the Grave?" *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXVIII (July, 1881), 475. Cf. James H. Gray, "The Rich Man and Lazarus; or, what the Lord Taught about Future Punishment," *Our Hope*, XLIV (April, 1938), 698-708.

CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSION

A Review of the Importance of Lucan Theology

This study of a biblical theology of Luke was concerned with the special revelation which God made through Luke. In concrete terms, it tried to view Luke's particular contributions to Biblical Theology, in a sense, through the eyes of Theophilus, the recipient of the Gospel. The Third Gospel, of course, does not reveal all that Luke knows about the Christian faith, neither is Theophilus' knowledge of Christianity confined to the contents of this Gospel alone, inasmuch as he has been instructed in the rudiments of Christianity previously. But Luke's Gospel reveals far more concerning the content of Christianity than any of the other Gospels. Luke's writings – the Third Gospel and the Acts – form the largest single coherent literary bloc within the New Testament; they provide a bridge between the earlier gospels and John; and, as the work of a Gentile Christian, they have a character all of their own.

Until recent years Luke's distinctive theological emphasis has been ignored. In the past Luke the historian has been highlighted at the expense of Luke the theologian. Now the pendulum has swung in the other direction, and Luke is considered a creative theologian. Contemporary New Testament scholarship has finally discovered Luke's importance. C. H. Dodd has remarked that "it is a great merit of modern critical study of the New Testament that it has made us appreciate the individuality of the great theologians of the apostolic age, and the rich diversity of their teaching."⁴⁶ It is therefore not sufficient to admit that there is a synoptic teaching in general. Each Evangelist has his own approach and interest. The finer points of their presentation become inevitably blurred if instead of considering their works in themselves, one interprets them in terms of their neighbors. While the Gospels are never contradictory and often mutually enlightening, they remain distinct works.

It has been objected that Luke was the least theologically minded of the New Testament writers, but it has been shown in this study that Luke is, on the one hand, not merely a reliable historian who gave the first historical chronicle of the content of Christianity in his Gospel and the communication of that content in Acts, but on the other hand, he is also a theologian in his own right.

The Relating of the Study to Contemporary Lucan Theology

This study has taken into account recent developments in the resurgence of Lucan Theology both in this country and on too continent. The investigation of the background of this

⁴⁶ C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 13.

Gospel and of pertinent introductory matter has shown that Luke the Physician was indeed the author of the Third Gospel, although this fact is denied almost universally by Lucan scholars, who erroneously place the date of the Gospel after the fall of Jerusalem because of their aversion of Luke's predictive prophecy concerning the doom of Jerusalem. Through a scrutiny of the presuppositions of outstanding Lucan scholars, several reasons for their general rejection have suggested themselves. Lucan scholars confound the purpose of Luke. He asserted to write history. They maintain that he crudely composed large sections himself. They further err concerning the person of Luke. He purports to be a companion and contemporary of Paul. They place the writer in the second century. They also fail in relation to the word of God. Luke gives a personal and inspired record, whereas Lucan scholars fail to trust his inspired word and vie with each other for the most novel theories to propound. Finally, they ignore the promise of Christ for the Spirit's supernatural enablement of the Evangelists. The composition of Luke-Acts is explained in human and rationalistic terms.

Throughout this study reference has been made to recent Lucan scholarship and its contribution to an understanding of the Third Gospel.

A Resume of Lucan Themes

Luke the theologian did not falsify, but he did interpret Gospel history. His works present the true Jesus, but He is displayed through the eyes of Luke. A study of Luke's Gospel has made it apparent that he presents Jesus as the Son of Man who came to seek and to save that which was lost. He presents the historical Jesus of Nazareth as the universal Savior whose ministry effected a universal salvation. Luke's background, training, and presuppositions color his whole approach, and it is these factors, under the superintendence of the Holy Spirit, which guide the selections of material at his disposal, as well as too manner of presenting it.

The overriding purpose of Luke permeates the whole Gospel. It can be traced in every area of his doctrines. Luke's picture of the person and work of the Son of Man reveals the Savior's ministry to man and mercy for man in every aspect of life. The Savior's special compassion for all classes and individuals in the Third Gospel, for instance, stands in stark contrast to Matthew's Jewish Messiah. The Lucan Son of Man excludes no one from fellowship. His salvation for all is predicted by the Holy Spirit before His birth and propagated by His disciples after His ascension. The Savior's identification with man in His baptism, temptation, prayer life, dependence on the Spirit, and human suffering is accented by Luke far more than by the other Evangelists.

Luke's Gospel is an epistle of rejoicing and worship. It opens and closes with joy and worship in the temple. As the only Evangelist, Luke speaks of the Savior's rejoicing. The Third Gospel is also a gospel of prayer and submission to the Spirit. The unique Lucan examples of the Savior's sustenance by prayer and submission to the Spirit form the basis of exhortation for the believer. Luke's ethical emphasis on the sin of pride and danger of possessions is as relevant today as it was in the days when the Savior warned His hearers of these ensnaring and damning sins.

The Lucan Savior is true man but more than man. His power is especially evident in the realm of spirit beings. Luke shows how angels serve Him frequently, and how Satan and demons are submissive to Him always. His kingdom, although rejected at His first coming, will yet be revealed in glory and power. The Savior's offices of king and judge form the core of Lucan eschatology. But Luke records alongside or the proclamations of judgment the promises or deliverance, which the Son of Man extends to all those who will recognize Him as the Savior or the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aebi, Ernst. *Kurze Einführung in die Bibel*. Zürich: Verlag Bibelbund, 1949. Pp. 281.
- Aland, K; Cross, F. L.; Danielou, J.; Riesefield, H.; and van Unnik, W. C. *Studia Evangelica*. Berlin: Akademieverlag, 1959. Pp. x + 813.
- Albertz, Martin. *Die Botschaft des Neuen Testamentes*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1955. Pp. 560.
- Angus, Joseph. *The Bible Handbook*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1952. Pp. xvi + 837.
- Bailey, John. *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963. Pp. viii + 120.
- Barclay, William. *The First Three Gospels*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966. Pp. 317.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. Pp. viii + 174.
- Barrett, C. K. *Jesus and the Gospel Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968. Pp. xi + 114.
- Barrett, C. K. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*. London: The Epworth Press, 1961. Pp. 76.
- Baxter, J. Sidlow. *Explore the Book*. 6 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1964.
- Birks, T. R. *Horae Evangelicae*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1892. Pp. xxi + 401.
- Bleek, Friedrich. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. 2 vols. Translated by William Urwick. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1869.
- Bornkamm, Günther. *Jesus von Nazareth*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1956. Pp. 216.
- Briggs, Charles. *The Messiah of the Gospels*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894. Pp. xv + 562.
- Bruce, F. F. *The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?* Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963. Pp. 192.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961. Pp. 365.

- Burton, Ernest. *A Short Introduction to the Gospels*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1904. Pp. v + 144.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927. Pp. vii + 385.
- Carpenter, S. C. *Christianity According to St. Luke*. London: Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1919. Pp. xii + 239.
- Clowney, Admund P. *Preaching and Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961. Pp. 124.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960. Pp. 255.
- Crane, Louis Burton. *The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Holy Spirit*. New York: American Tract Society, 1905. Pp. xiii + 174.
- Crump, Francis Joseph. *Pneuma in the Gospels*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954. Pp. ix + 58.
- Davidson, Samuel. *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1882.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Light from the Ancient East*. Translated by Lionel R. H. Strachan. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965. Pp. xxxii + 535.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to tho Scriptures*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. Pp. 145.
- Edersheim, Alfred. *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. 2 vols. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1904.
- Farmer, William R. *The Synoptic Problem*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964. Pp. xi + 308.
- Feine, Paul; Behm , J.; and Kummel, W. G. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by A. J. Mattill. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966. Pp. 444.
- Flender, Helmut. *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*. Translated by H. and Ilse Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967. Pp. x + 179.
- Fuller, Daniel P. *Easter Faith and History*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965. Pp. 279.

- Fuller, Reginald. *The New Testament in Current Study*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962. Pp. 147.
- Gloag, Paton J. *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895. Pp. xviii + 298.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. 3 vols. London: The Tyndalo Press, 1965.
- Harnack, Adolf. *Luke the Physician*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. New York: G. Putnam's Sons, 1909. Pp. viii + 231.
- Harrison, Everett F. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964. Pp. 480.
- Hastings, Adrian. *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem*. Baltimore: Pelican Press Inc., 1958. Pp. 200.
- Hauss, Friedrich. *Biblische Gestalten*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, n.d. Pp. 174.
- Hayes, D. A. *The Most Beautiful Book Ever Written*. New York: Eaton and Manis, 1913. Pp. 183.
- Henry, Carl F. H., ed. *Jesus of Nazareth: Saviour and Lord*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966.
- Hobart, William Kirk. *The Medical Language of St. Luke*. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Company, 1882. Pp. xxxvi + 305.
- Horne, Thomas Hartwell. *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*. 4 vols. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1846.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn, and Davey, Noel. *The Riddle of the New Testament*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1963. Pp. 238.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by S. M. Hooke. London: S.C.M. Press, 1954. Pp. 178.
- Jones, Maurice. *The Four Gospels*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921. Pp. 122.
- Jukes, Andrew. *The Characteristic Differences of the Four Gospels*. London: James Nisbet and Company, 1878. Pp. 167.
- Keck, Leander E. and Martyn, J. Louis, eds. *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Nashville: Abingdon Press,

1966. Pp. 316.

Koch, Kurt. *Bessessenheit*. Berghausen: Evangelisationsverlag, n.d. Pp. 16.

Koch, Kurt. *Christian Counseling and Occultism*. Translated by Andrew Peter. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1965. Pp. 299.

Laymon, Charles M. *Christ in the New Testament*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1968. Pp. 256.

Lewis, C. S. *Miracles*. London: Collins, 1966. Pp. 190.

Lightner, Robert P. *The Saviour and the Scriptures*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1966. Pp. vi + 170.

Lockyer, Herbert. *All the Doctrines of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1964. Pp. 310.

Lohse, Eduard. *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi im Zeugnis des Lukasevangeliums*. Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961. Pp. 40.

Machen, J. Gresham. *The Virgin Birth of Christ*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930. Pp. vi + 415.

Mackinlay, G. *Recent Discoveries in St. Luke's Writings*. London: Marshall Brothers, Ltd., 1921. Pp. 282.

Martin, Hugh. *Luke's Portrait of Jesus*. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1949. Pp. 128.

M'Clymont, J. A. *New Testament Criticism*. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913. Pp. 363.

Metzger, Bruce M. *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965. Pp. 288.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Bern: Berchtold Haller Verlag, 1961. Pp. 402.

Moorehead, William G. *Studies in the Four Gospels*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1900. Pp. 230.

Morgenthaler, Robert. *Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis*. 2 vols. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1944.

Morgan, G. Campbell. *The Crises of the Christ*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1903. Pp.

477.

Morris, Leon. *The Cross in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965. Pp. 454.

Morris, Leon. *The Lord from Heaven*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1958. Pp. 112.

Nineham, D.E. *Studies in the Gospels*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Pp. xvi + 262.

O'Neill, J. C. *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*. London: S. P. C. K., 1961. Pp. 181.

Pache, Rene. *The Future Life*. Translated by Helen I. Needham. Chicago: Moody Press, 1962. Pp. 376.

Page, Curtis Hidden. *British Poets of the Nineteenth Century*. Boston: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Company, 1904. Pp. 823.

Pentecost, J. Dwight. *Things to Come*. Findlay: Dunham Publishing Company, 1961. Pp. xxx + 633.

Peters, George N. H. *The Theocratic Kingdom*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1952.

Rackham, Richard B. *The Acts of the Apostles*. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1951. Pp. 524.

Ramsey, W. M. *The Bearing of Recent Discoveries of the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915. Pp. 427.

Ramsey, W. M. *Luke the Physician*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956. Pp. 185.

Ramsey, W. M. *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1951. Pp. 402.

Ramsey, W. M. *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898. Pp. xii + 280.

Reicke, Bo. *The Gospel of Luke*. Translated by Ross Mackenzie. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964. Pp. 88.

Renan, Ernest. *Las Evangiles*. 7 vols. Paris: Calmann-Ley, 1877.

Robertson, A. T. *A Harmony of the Gospels*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1922. Pp. xxxvii + 301.

- Robertson, A. T. *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936. Pp. 257.
- Ryrie, Charles C. *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1959. Pp. 384.
- Ryrie, Charles C. *The Holy Spirit*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1965. Pp. 126.
- Schaeffer, H. M. *Einleitung zur Erklarung des Neuen Testamentes*. Cleveland: Publikationsverein der deutschen Baptisten Nordamerikas, 1888. Pp. 264.
- Schick, Erich. *Die Botschaft der Engel im Neuen Testament*. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1963. Pp. 159.
- Scroggie, W. Graham. *A Guide to the Gospels*. London: Pickering and Inglis Ltd., 1965. Pp. 664.
- Seisenberger, Michael. *Practical Handbook for the Study of the Bible*. New York: Joseph Wagner, 1925. Pp. xii + 507.
- Soames, Werner H. *Old Theology*. London: James Nisbeth and Company Ltd., 1920. Pp. xvi + 427.
- Smith, Wilbur H. *The Biblical Doctrine of Heaven*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1968. Pp. 317.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. *Jesus: Gestalt und Geschichte*. Bern: Francke Verlag, 1957. Pp. 117.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. *New Testament Theology*. Translated by John Marsh. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1955. Pp. 373.
- Stevens, George Barker. *The Theology of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1899. Pp. xvi + 617.
- Stonehouse, Ned B. *The Witness of Luke to Christ*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951. Pp. 184.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels*. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1930. Pp. xxiv + 624.
- Sweete, Henry Barclay. *Studies in the Teaching of Our Lord*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903. Pp. 186.
- Tasker, R. V. G. *The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1962. Pp. 111.

- Tasker, R. V. G. *The Old Testament in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963. Pp. 159.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Names of Jesus*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1953. Pp. ix + 129.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*. London: Macmillan and Company Ltd., 1959. Pp. x + 321.
- Thiessen, Henry Clarence. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962. Pp. viii + 347.
- Trawick, Buckner B. *The New Testament as Literature*. New York: Barnes and Noble Inc., 1964. Pp. vii + 132.
- Trench, Richard Chenevix. *Studies in the Gospels*. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner and Company, Ltd., 1896. Pp. 345.
- Unger, Merrill F. *Biblical Demonology*. Wheaton: Scripture Press, 1965. Pp. xv + 250.
- Unger, Merrill F. *Unger's Bible Handbook*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1966. Pp. 930.
- Walvoord, John F. *The Holy Spirit*. Findlay: Dunham Publishing Co., 1958. Pp. xx + 288.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. *The Lord of Glory*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d. Pp. 332.
- Wasserzug-Traeder, Gertrud. *Die Botschaft der Bibel Heute für Uns*. Beatenberg: Verlag Bibelschule, n.d. Pp. 72.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. *Introduction to the study of the Gospels*. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1887. Pp. 476.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by John Moore Trout et. al. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1953.

Commentaries

- Alford, Henry. *The New Testament for English Readers*. 5 vols. Boston: Lee and Shephard , 1872.
- Arndt, William F. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956. Pp. 523.
- Barclay, William. *The Gospel of Luke*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. Pp. xviii +

314.

- Bengel, John Albert. *Gnomon of the New Testament*. Translated by Andrew Fausset. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1860.
- Bruce, F. F. *Commentary on the Book of Acts*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956. Pp. 555.
- Burton, Henry. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d. Pp. 415.
- Caird, G. B. *The Gospel of St. Luke*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1963. Pp. 271.
- Creed, John M. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. London: Macmillan Company, Ltd., 1942. Pp. 340.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *The Gospel of Luke*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1966. Pp. xxix + 300.
- Geldenhuis, Norval. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966. Pp. 685.
- Godet, F. *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*. Translated by M.D. Cusin. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1870.
- Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966. Pp. xv + 451.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959. Pp. 611.
- Hobbs, Herschel H. *An Exposition of the Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966. Pp. 355.
- Lange, John Peter, ed. *Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*. "The Gospel According to Luke," by J. J. van Oosterzee, translated by Philip Schaff and Charles Starbuck. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1960. Pp. 450.
- Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel*. Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1946. pp. 1212.
- Luck, G. Coleman. *Luke: The Gospel of the Son of Man*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. Pp. 128.

- Meyer, H. A. W. *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospel of Mark and Luke*. Translated by William P. Dickson and Frederick Crombie. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884. Pp. xix + 598.
- Morgan, G. Campbell. *Studies in the Four Gospels*. 4 vols. Fincastle: Scripture Truth Book Company, n.d.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896. Pp. lxxxvii + 590.
- Rienecker, Fritz. *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*. Berlin: Hauptbibelgesellschaft, 1962. Pp. 379.
- Rienecker, Fritz. *Das Evangelium des Lukas*. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1966. Pp. xvi + 555.
- Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962. Pp. 294.
- Ryle, John C. *Expository Thoughts on the Gospels*. 2 vols. London: Charles J. Thyme, 1897.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1961. Pp. 409.
- Stagg, Frank. *Studies in Luke's Gospel*. Nashville: Convention Press, 1968. Pp. xii + 148.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Billerbeck, Paul. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 5 vols. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Das Evangelium des Lucas*. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920. Pp. v + 774.

Language Aids

- Arndt, William F., and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957. Pp. 909.
- Bebb, L. J. M. "The Gospel of Luke," *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911. III, 162-73.
- Bietenhard, Hans. "Engel." *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*. Edited by Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther and Hans Bietenhard. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1965. I, 226-229.

- Goetzmann, Jürgen. "Bekehrung." *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*. 3 vols. Edited by Lothar Coenen et. al. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1965. I, 72-75.
- Harrison, Everett F., ed. *Baker's Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960. Pp. 566.
- "Luke." *Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia*. Edited by John M'Clintock and James Strong. Vol. V. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1894. Pp. 551-58.
- Kittel, Gerhard and Friedrich, Gerhard, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 6 vols. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.
- Motyer, J. A. "Name," *The New Bible Dictionary*. Edited by J. D. Douglas. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d. pp. 861-62.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. I of *Prolegomena*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1957. Pp. 293.
- Robertson, A. T. *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. 6 vols. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930.
- Schönweiss, Hans. "Gebet," *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*. Edited by Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther, and Hans Bietenhard. Wuppertal: Brockhaus Verlag, n.d. I, 428.
- Selter, Friedel. "Besitz," *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*. Edited by Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther, and Hans Bietenhard. Wuppertal: Brockhaus Verlag, n.d. I, 103-105.
- Sweet, Louis M. "Demon." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by James Orr. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960. II, 827-29.
- Sweet, Louis M. "Satan." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by James Orr. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960. IV, 2693-96.
- Unger, Merrill F. *Unger's Bible Dictionary*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1957. Pp. 1184.
- Vine, W. E. *An Expository Dictionary of the New Testament*. Westwood: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1966.
- Wace, H. "Miracles." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by James Orr. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960. III, 2062-66.

Wright, C. F. "Paradise." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by James Orr. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960. IV, 2246.

Periodicals

Armstrong, John. "The Temptation of Jesus." *Bible Magazine*, II (September, 1914), 802-11.

Baker, John. "Luke the Critical Evangelist." *The Expository Times*, LXVIII (October, 1956-September, 1957), 123-25.

Bishop, Eric F. F. "Local Colour in Proto-Luke." *The Expository Times*, XLV (January, 1934), 151-156.

Braumann, Georg. "Das Mittel der Zeit." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LIV (1963), 117-45.

Cadbury, Henry. "The Style and Literary Method of Luke." *Harvard Theological Studies*, VI (1919), 1-72.

Cairns, Earle E. "Luke as a Historian." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXII (July-September, 1965), 218-23.

Citron, Bernhard. "The Multitude in the Synoptic Gospels." *Scottish Journal of Theology*, VII (1954), 408-18.

Cranfield, C. E. B. "The Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts." *Scottish Journal of Theology*, VII (1954), 291-301.

Crannell, Philip W. "The Watering of Luke." *Review and Expositor*, XXIII (April, 1926), 154-69.

Dana, H. E. "Historical Evidence of the Ascension." *The Biblical Review*, XIV (April, 1929), 101-209.

Drumwright, Hubert L. "Problem Passages in Luke: A Hermeneutical Approach." *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, X (Fall, 1967), 45-58.

English, E. Schuyler. "A Consideration of the Authorship and Purpose of the Third Gospel." *Our Hope*, L (1944), 823-29.

Emerson, F. F. "The Teaching of Christ Concerning the Use of Money." *The Expositor*, VIII (1888), 100-12.

Everts, W. W. "The Genealogy of Jesus Christ." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXXII (April, 1925),

203-9.

- Everts, W. W. "Jesus Christ, No Exorcist." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXXI (1924), 355-62.
- Foster, Lewis A. "Basis for the Historical Jesus." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society*, VI (Fall, 1963), 105-13.
- Foster, Lewis A. "The 'Q' Myth in Synoptic Studies." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society*, VII (Fall, 1964), 111-19.
- Francis, Fred O. "Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XXXVII (March, 1969), 49-63.
- Gardner, Edward P. "Christ in the Four Gospels." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXV (April, 1912), 222-41.
- Garvie, Alfred E. "Studies in the 'Inner Life' of Jesus." *The Expositor*, V (1902), 260-70.
- Getz, Gene A. "The Christian Home – II." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXVI (April-June, 1969), 109-14.
- Glombitza, Otto. "Die Titel διδάσκαλος und ἐπιστάτης für Jesus bei Lukas." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, IL (1958), 275-78.
- Goudoever, Jan van. "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel." *Novum Testamentum*, VIII (April-October, 1966), 111-123.
- Gray, James M. "The Rich Man and Lazarus; or, What the Lord Taught About Future Punishment." *Our Hope*, XLIV (April, 1938), 698-708.
- Grimm, Wilibald. "Das Proömium des Lucasevangeliums." *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, XVI (1871), 33-68.
- Guilleband, H. E. "The Travel Narrative in St. Luke (IX: 51-XVIII:14)." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXX (April, 1923), 237-45.
- Guiton, W. H. "The Virgin Birth of Our Lord." *The Reformation Review*, VII (January, 1960), 114-21.
- Harris, Lindell O. "Prayer in the Gospel of Luke." *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, X (Fall, 1967), 59-69.
- Hodges, Zane C. "The Centurion's Faith in Matthew and Luke." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXI (October-December, 1964), 321-32.

- Hodges, Zane C. "The Woman and the Empty Tomb." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXIII (October-December, 1966), 301-9.
- Horner, Joseph. "The Birthplace of Jesus, and Chronology of His Infancy." *Methodist Quarterly Review*, XXIV (1872), 216-229.
- Howden, J. Russell. "The Trilogy of Parables in Luke 15." *The Biblical Review*, XIV (July, 1929), 331-44.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "Qumran Evidence for the Reliability of the Gospels." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society*, XI (Fall, 1968), 159-67.
- Hutton, John A. "The Differentia of the Gospel According to St. Luke." *The Expository Times*, XXXIV (October, 1922-September, 1923), 306-8.
- Johnson, S. Lewis. "The Baptism of Christ." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXIII (July-September, 1966), 220-29.
- Johnson, S. Lewis. "The Genesis of Jesus." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXII (October- December, 1965), 330-36.
- Johnson, S. Lewis. "The Message of John the Baptist." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXIII (January-March, 1956), 30-35.
- Käser, Walter. "Exegetische und Theologische Erwägungen zur Seligpreisungen der Kinderlosen Lc 23, 29b." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LIV (1963), 240-51.
- Kiddle, M. "The Admission of the Gentiles in St. Luke's Gospel and Acts." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVI (April, 1935), 160-73.
- Kiddle, M. "The Passion Narrative in St. Luke's Gospel." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVI (July, 1935), 267-80.
- King, Marchant A. "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Luke." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXII (July-September, 1965), 234-40.
- Kluge, Karl. "Zur Apologie der Versuchungsgeschichte." *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, XXIII (1878), 110-125.
- Knight, W. A. "The Social Outlook in Matthew and Luke." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXVI (1909), 193-216.
- Laidlaw, J. "The Parable of the Lost Son." *The Expositor*, VIII (1888), 268-276.

- Lampe, G. W. H. "The Lucan Portrait of Christ." *New Testament Studies*, II (1955-1956), 160-75.
- Lee, G. M. "The Resurrection Appearances in Luke." *The Expository Times*, LXV (October, 1953-September, 1954), 158-62.
- Lindsey, F. Duane. "Lucan Theology in Contemporary Perspective." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXV (October-December, 1968), 346-51.
- McCaig, A. "The Title 'Son of Man' in Its Lofty Associations." *The Biblical Review*, XII (1927), 44-56.
- McDowell, Edward A. "The Gospel of Luke." *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, XVIII (Fall, 1967), 7-24.
- McKeating, H. "The Prophet Jesus – II." *The Expository Times*, LXXIII (October, 1961-September, 1962), 50-53.
- McPheeters, William M. "The Testing of Jesus." *The Biblical Review*, IV (October, 1919), 517-36.
- Mackinlay, G. "Special Words." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXVII (October, 1920), 419-23.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Questions About the Gospels – II. History or Fiction?" *TSF Bulletin*, No. 53 (Spring, 1969), 3-8.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Recent Study of the Gospel According to St. Luke" *The Expository Times*, LXXX (October, 1968), 4-8.
- Milligan, G. "On the Lucan Interpretation of Christ's Death." *The Expositor*, II (1900), 69-75.
- Moore, Albert W. "The Temptation in the Wilderness." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXVII (1920), 249-71.
- Mosley, A. W. "Jesus' Audiences in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke." *New Testament Studies*, X (1963-1964), 139-149.
- Morgenthaler, Robert. "Roma – Sedes Satanae." *Theologische Zeitschrift*, n.v. (1956), 269-304.
- Nauck, Wolfgang. "Die Bedeutung des leeren Grabes für den Glauben an den Auferstandenen." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXXXVII (1956), 243-67.
- Navone, John. "The Holy Spirit." *Scripture*, XX (July, 1968), 80-95.

- Navone, John. "Lucan Joy." *Scripture*, XX (April, 1968), 49-62.
- Navone, John. "Prayer." *Scripture*, XX (October, 1968), 115-25.
- Navone, John. "The Temptation Account in St. Luke (4:1-13)." *Scripture*, XX (July, 1968), 65-72.
- Oliver, H. H. "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts." *New Testament Studies*, X (1963-1964), 202-26.
- Parker, Pierson. "Luke and the Fourth Evangelist." *New Testament Studies*, IX (1961-1962), 317-336.
- Plitt, Hemann. "Christologische Studien nach den vier Evangelien." *Jahrbücher für Deutschen Theologie*, XVI (1671), 339-727.
- Plumtre, E. H. "St. Luke and St. Paul: An Inquiry into their Mutual Relations." *The Expositor*, IV (1902), 134-156.
- Potwin, Lemuel S. "Does the Preface of Luke's Gospel Belong also to the Acts." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXVIII (April, 1881), 328-332.
- Resch, P. "Pragmatische Analyse der grossen Einschaltung des Lukas." *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, XXI (1876), 654-696; XXII (1877), 65-92.
- Richardson, Alan. "Second Thoughts – III. Present Issues in New Testament Theology." *The Expository Times* (October, 1963-September, 1964), 109-13.
- Robbins, R. D. C. "Does the New Testament Warrant the Hope of Probation Beyond the Grave?" *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXVIII (July, 1881), 460-508.
- Schulz, Siegfried. "Gottes Vorsehung bei Lukas." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LIV (1963), 104-16.
- Sharpe, Norvelle W. "A Message of Grace to be Found in Luke II. 49 – 'My Father's Business.'" *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXVII (1920), 229-33.
- Sharpe, Norvelle W. "A Study of the Traditional 'Virgin Mary' in Light of the Word." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXX (January, 1923), 74-96.
- Simpson, P. "The Drama of the City of God. Jerusalem in St. Luke's Gospel." *Scripture*, XV (1963), 65-80.
- Smalley, S. S. "The Christology of Acts." *The Expository Times*, LXXIII (October,

- 1961-September, 1962), 358-62.
- Smith, Charles R. "The New Testament Doctrine of Demons." *Grace Journal*, X (Spring, 1969), 26-42.
- Smith, Fred. "The Gospel of Luke Considered as a Psychological Document." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXX (1923), 490-98.
- Songer, Harold S. "Luke's Portrayal of the Origin of Jesus." *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (Fall, 1967), 453-63.
- Springer, J. F. "The Synoptic Problem." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXX (1923), 79-95; LXXXI (1924), 59-88; LXXXII (1925), 89-112, 210-37, 321-53, 472-500.
- Stonehouse, Ned B. "Hans Conzelmann: The Theology of St. Luke." *Westminster Theological Journal*, XXIV (November, 1961-May, 1962), 65-70.
- Strobel, August, "Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc. 17:20f." *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXXIX (1958), 157-96.
- Tatum, W. Barnes. "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts." *New Testament Studies*, XIII (1966-1967), 184-95.
- Tolbert, Malcolm. "Leading Ideas of the Gospel of Luke." *Review and Expositor*, LXIV (Fall, 1967), 441-51.
- Turner, H. E. W. "The Virgin Birth." *The Expository Times*, LXVIII (October, 1956-September, 1957), 12-17.
- Unnik, W. C. van. "Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas VI, 32-35." *Novum Testamentum*, VIII (April-October, 1966), 284-300.
- Vos, Geerhardus. "The Name 'Lord' as Used of Jesus in the Gospels." *Biblical Review*, VII (October, 1922), 515-36.
- Walvoord, John F. "The Kingdom of Heaven." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXIV (July-September, 1967), 195-205.
- Walvoord, John F. "The Times of the Gentiles." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXV (January-March, 1968), 3-9.
- Warren, G. G. "Thoughts on the Virgin Birth." *Biblical Review*, VII (January, 1922), 48-60.

- Wilkins, W. "Zur Frage der literarischen Beziehung zwischen Matthäus und Lukas." *Novum Testamentum*, VIII (January, 1966), 48-57.
- Williams, C. S. "Luke-Acts in Recent Study." *The Expository Times*, LXXIII (October, 1961-September, 1962), 133-136.
- Winn, Albert C. "Elusive Mystery – The Purpose of Acts." *Interpretation*, XIII (April, 1959), 144-56.
- Winter, Paul. "Lukanische Miszellen." *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXXIX (1958), 65-77.
- Winter, Paul. "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel." *New Testament Studies*, I (1954- 1955), 111-121.
- Woolsey, Theodore D. "The End of Luke's Gospel and the Beginning of Acts." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXIX (1882), 593-619.

Unpublished Material

- Chovan, LaVerne M. "Christ's Message and Theology of Evangelism According to the Gospel of Luke." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1964. Pp. 150.
- Haick, Paul S. "The Argument of the Gospel of Luke." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1965. Pp. 381.
- Johnson, Elliott E. "A study of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ in the Gospel of Luke." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1968. Pp. 318.
- Lindsey, F. Duane. Unpublished class notes on the Theology of Luke, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1968.
- Rohrbough, Robert T. "Christ's Teaching on the Use of Honey." Unpublished Th.M. Thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1966. Pp. 53.
- Toussaint, Stanley D. "The Argument of Matthew." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1957. Pp. 392.
-