

THE ALTERATION OF LUKE'S TRADITION BY
THE TEXTUAL VARIANTS IN CODEX BEZAE

by

GEORGE EDWARD RICE

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis Advisor: Eldon Jay Epp

Department of Religion
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

June 1974

COPYRIGHT BY
GEORGE EDWARD RICE
1974

THE ALTERATION OF LUKE'S TRADITION BY
THE TEXTUAL VARIANTS IN CODEX BEZAE

Abstract

by

GEORGE EDWARD RICE

The uniqueness of the Greek text of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D) has been widely acknowledged by New Testament scholars, for no other New Testament manuscript has so many and such remarkable variant readings. In the past, some of the more noticeable variations in D have been examined in detail; however, such investigations have been confined largely to the immediate context of the individual variants.

Eldon Jay Epp, in his work on The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), broke with the traditional approach to the study of D's text and discovered that by examining the whole text of Acts as a unit definite theological biases could be seen running throughout the variant readings. This approach helps to avoid erroneous conclusions concerning D's alterations by: (1) examining variations in the light of the entire scheme of alterations

within a given book, as well as in the light of the immediate context of each variant, and (2) thus allowing conclusions to be drawn which are consistent with the entire scheme of alterations and, therefore, avoiding the temptation to ignore an isolated variant because no immediate rationale presents itself to explain its presence. The close affinity of the books of Luke and Acts, as evidenced by these books' own introductions, opens the possibility that similar biases may be found running through the variant readings in D's text of Luke.

It is the purpose of this study: (1) to examine the complete text of Luke in D, (2) to isolate its variant readings by comparing D's text against the text of Codex Vaticanus (B) in Luke, (3) to determine whether D's variants alter the accepted textual tradition of Luke by manifesting certain biases, and (4) to ascertain whether these biases appear consistently in the variant readings of D.

The following theological biases would appear to emerge from the D-variants in Luke:

1. Jesus is exalted beyond his portrayal in the normal text of Luke as the Messianic son of David, as the compassionate healer, as one equal with the Father, and as the present Son of Man.

2. An anti-Judaic bias is present. This can be seen in the attempt to set aside Jewish institutions, by advancing in time priestly plottings of Jesus' death, and by portraying the people of Jerusalem as unresponsive to Jesus' ministry and as more hostile to Jesus during the passion.

3. Dominant characters, e.g. Jesus' mother, John the Baptist, and Peter, are elevated beyond their significance in the normal text.

4. The disciples in general are protected from behavior recorded by Luke that is not compatible with their position.

5. Gentiles are more favorably treated than in the normal text.

This examination of D's text in Luke leads to the further conclusion that the copyist functioned as an editor. A remaining question is the extent of D's editorial activity in the other gospels, but this is beyond the scope of the present investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For the inspiration, guidance, and encouragement that is necessary to complete an undertaking such as this, an expression of gratitude is due to a number of individuals. To Dr. Eldon Jay Epp, Harkness Professor of Biblical Literature, I owe a debt of gratitude for the inspiration to pursue the fascinating subject of textual criticism and for his guidance through the experience of producing this dissertation.

A word of appreciation is due to John Wood, a colleague at Atlantic Union College and personal friend, who read the manuscript of this work and made helpful suggestions before it was typed in final form.

A word of appreciation is due to Mrs. Anita Jacobs for her patience in typing the final draft, and especially for her effort to learn the Greek keyboard.

For the encouragement and financial help that enabled both my wife and myself to pursue our respective educational interests simultaneously, an eternal debt of gratitude is owed to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. George H. Rice and to my father and mother-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Glenn E. Bowen.

Words are not sufficient to express my gratitude

to my wife and daughter for their patience, understanding, and willingness to endure the many inconveniences that the pursual of my education has caused them. Especially am I grateful to my wife for her willingness to provide for the family when her education was completed and my time was completely occupied by class work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I.	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE TEXT OF CODEX BEZAE IN ST. LUKE	1
	The Problem	1
	The Purpose	5
	A Brief Description and History of D	6
	A Summary of Luke's Textual Tradition	8
	Methodology	11
II.	PROMINENT CHARACTERS AND THEIR ROLE IN D	14
	Mary, The Mother of Jesus	14
	John the Baptist	32
	Peter and the Close Followers of Jesus	54
	Conclusion	84
III.	THE GLORIFIED JESUS	88
	The Child Jesus	88
	The Messianic King	95
	Jesus' Relation to the Father	105
	The Miracles of Jesus	109
	Conclusion	121
IV.	THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE SON OF MAN	123
	The Kingdom of God	123
	The Son of Man	154
	Conclusion	156
V.	IN DEFENSE OF THE GENTILES	159
VI.	ANTI-JUDAIC SENTIMENTS OF D	174
	The Role of Jerusalem	175
	D's Use of πονηρός ("Evil")	180
	Other Anti-Judaic Statements	184

The Sabbath Controversies	193
Conclusion	220
VII. THE PASSION, RESURRECTION, AND ASCENSION	
IN D	223
The Lord's Supper	223
Trial and Crucifixion	230
The Empty Tomb	238
Post Resurrection Appearances	246
Ascension	253
Conclusion	258
VIII. CONCLUSION	260
BIBLIOGRAPHY	264

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

I. TEXTUAL WITNESSES

<u>Greek Codices</u>		Century or Date
Papyri		
P ⁴⁵	Chester Beatty	III
P ⁷⁵	P. Bodmer XIV, XV	Early III
Uncials		
X	Sinaiticus	IV
A	Alexandrinus	V
B	Vaticanus	IV
C	Ephraemi Rescriptus	V
D	Bezae Cantabrigiensis	V/VI
L	Regius	VIII
N	Purpureus Petropolitanus	VI
W	Freer Gospels	V
Θ	Koridethi	IX
0124		VI
Minuscules		
1		XII
4		XIII
13		XIII
28		XI
69		XV
131		XIV
157		XII
273		XIII
565		IX
1424		IX/X
1675		XIV
<u>Latin Codices</u>		
a	Vercellensis	V
b	Veronensis	V
c	Colbertinus	XII/XIII
e	Palatinus	V
f	Bixianus	VI
ff ¹	Corbeiensis I	X

ff ²	Corbeiensis II	V
i	Vindobonensis	V
l	Rehdigeranus	VII/VIII
q ¹	Monacensis	VII
r ¹	Usserianus	VII

Versions

Coptic

cop ^{bo}	Bohairic	III/IV
cop ^{sa}	Sahidic	II/III

Latin

vg	Vulgate	A.D. 384
----	---------	----------

Syriac

sy ^c	Curetonian	V
sy ^h	Harclean	A.D. 616
sy ^p	Peshitta	V
sy ^{pal}	Palestinian	VI
sy ^{ph}	Philoxenian	V/VI
sy ^s	Sinaitic	IV/V

II. MISCELLANEOUS

Q	Byzantine manuscripts
al	A greater number of manuscripts, also out of other groups
it	A greater number of Old Latin manuscripts
lat	Vulgate and some Old Latin manuscripts
latt	Complete Latin tradition
pc	A few other manuscripts
pl	Most witnesses
pm	Majority of remaining witnesses
rell	All witnesses except those enumerated
TR	Textus Receptus

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE TEXT OF CODEX BEZAE IN ST. LUKE

The Problem

In pursuit of its ultimate goal of establishing the original text of the New Testament, the work of textual criticism has centered mainly on the task of identifying the place of individual witnesses within families, tribes, sub-text-types and text-types. By collating the variant readings and computing the results, a given manuscript can be identified as being, for example, Alexandrian, Caesarean, Western, or Byzantine in character.¹ As important as this work is for purposes of building a critical text, counting variants does not aid in understanding the degree of difference in meaning between a variant reading and the accepted norm. K. W. Clark says:

Counting words is a meaningless measure of textual variation, and all such estimates fail to convey the

¹The science of manuscript identification has been refined and perfected by such scholars as Ernest C. Colwell. The results of 30 years of labor in perfecting methods of working with manuscripts can be found in a compilation of essays produced for professional publications by Colwell, Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, Vol. IX of New Testament Tools and Studies, ed. by Bruce M. Metzger (9 vols.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969).

theological significance of variable readings. Rather it is required to evaluate the thought rather than to compute the verbiage. How shall we measure the theological clarification derived from textual emendation where a single word altered affects the major concept in a passage? . . . By calculating words it is impossible to appreciate the spiritual insights that depend upon the words.²

Although Westcott and Hort championed the belief that alterations of the text did not result from motives to deliberately create changes,³ the fallacy of this position is now generally accepted.⁴ For example, after comparing various passages from the Alexandrian and Western texts, Frederic Kenyon makes the following observation:

Anyone who examines the samples given above, which include the more important and characteristic variations between the β and δ texts, will see that no theory of accidental omissions will account for them. Some of them are omissions and additions of clauses, in which

²K. W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variations in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV(1966), 4-5.

³Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, Introduction, Appendix, Vol. II of The New Testament in the Original Greek (London and New York: Macmillan and Company, 1896), p. 282.

⁴Cf. Friedrich Blass, Philology of the Gospels (London: Macmillan and Company, 1898), p. 89; Clark, pp. 4-7; Eldon Jay Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), pp. 1-3; Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn, A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts (Utrecht: Kemink, 1949), pp. 163-64; Kirsopp Lake, The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament (Oxford: University Press, 1904), pp. 10-11; C. S. C. Williams, Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951), pp. 5-6.

accident is distinctly less probable than intention; others are paraphrases, of which accident is not even a possible explanation.⁵

Until recently, however, studies, such as that of Kenyon, have centered in the more obvious variants scattered throughout the various New Testament witnesses. This has helped to affirm the error of Westcott and Hort, but it has not made it possible to understand the contribution that is made by a particular manuscript through its variant readings. This can only be done by a systematic evaluation of variants within their immediate context and within the context of a whole book that is being studied.⁶

For example, an examination of the Western non-interpolations in the Gospel of Luke will affirm that alterations have been made ". . . in which accident is distinctly

⁵Frederic Kenyon, "The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts," The Proceedings of the British Academy, XXIV (1938), p. 307.

⁶Michael Mees has undertaken a systematic survey of variants in D in the Gospel of Luke. Although his introductory material to each article stresses the problems faced by an investigator of Luke in D, his examination of the variants fails to develop the editorial scheme that gives relatively sure answers for the existence of numerous variants. Indeed, he completely skips over variants that are vital to understanding D's thinking and which help to explain the presence of other variants. Cf. Michael Mees, "Lukas 1-9 in der Textgestalt des Codex Bezae: Literarische Formen in Dienste der Schrift," Vetera Christianorum, V(1968), 89-110; idem, "Sinn and Bedeutung literarischer Formen für die Textgestalt des Codex Bezae in Lukas 10-11," Vetera Christianorum, VII, 1(1970), 59-82; idem, "Jesusworte in Lukas 12 und ihre Komposition nach Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis," Vetera Christianorum, VII, 2(1970), 285-303.

less probable than intention." However, a study of these variants, restricted to their immediate context and isolated from the rest of the text of Codex Bezae (D) in Luke, may lead to erroneous conclusions as to their true nature. Therefore, in order to understand adequately the thinking and biases that may have led to some variant readings that exist in New Testament witnesses, these variants must be viewed from the vantage point of examining all the variants within a particular book.

This has been done by E. J. Epp⁷ with D in the Book of Acts. His work indicates that throughout the variant readings that appear in this book definite biases can be identified. Because of the close affinity attributed to Luke and Acts by the introduction of the books themselves, it becomes necessary to ask whether D in Luke displays alterations of a similar nature to those found in Acts. In reviewing Epp's work on Acts, Ian A. Moir says of similar phenomena in Luke:

At page 26 Epp quotes Lake for the opinion . . . that 'one who proposed to study the "Western" problems should begin with the Acts, applying the results to the study of the gospels.' It would take too long to test Epp's views here in extenso, but as a rough check, the evidence of the new U.B.S. report of D-variants for Luke was examined (they are, of course, a restricted selection) and . . . they would seem to yield support to Epp's contentions. . . .⁸

⁷Epp, Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae.

⁸Ian A. Moir, Journal of Theological Studies, XIX (1968), p. 280.

The Purpose

It is the purpose of this work:⁹

⁹We are not concerned in this study with a quest for the "original text," nor with D's relationship to this "original text." Ample information on this problem can be found in the various handbooks. Cf. also: Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967); Friedrich Blass, Philology of the Gospels; F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and its Transmission (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906), pp. 40-58; Bulletin of the Bezan Club, I-XII(1925-37); J. Chapman, "The Original Contents of Codex Bezae," Expositor, VI, 12 (1905), 46-57; T. F. Glasson, "Did Matthew and Luke Use a 'Western' Text of Mark?" Expository Times, LV(1943/44), 180-4; LVII(1945/46), 53-4; F. Graefe, "Der Codex Bezae und das Lukas Evangelium," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, VII(1898), 116-40; J. Rendel Harris, Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament (Cambridge: University Press, 1891); W. H. P. Hatch, The 'Western Text' of the Gospels (Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1937); Kenyon, Proceedings, pp. 287-315; G. D. Kilpatrick, "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV(1943), 24-36; Eberhard Nestle, "Some Observations on the Codex Bezae," Expositor V, 2(1895), 235-40; W. B. Sedgwick, "St. Luke and the δ -Text," Expository Times, LIX(1947/48), 222-3; H. C. Snape, "The Composition of the Lukan Writings: A Re-assessment," Harvard Theological Review, LIII(1960), 27-46; B. K. Soper, "St. Luke and the 'Western' Text," Expository Times, LX(1948/49), 83; Burnett Hillman Streeter, The Four Gospels (London: Macmillan & Co., 1961); C. C. Torrey, Documents of the Primitive Church (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941); H. J. Vogels, Die Harmonistik im Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs' sche Buchlandlung, 1910); idem, "Methodisches zur Textkritik der Evangelien," Biblische Zeitschrift, XI(1913), 367-96; Westcott and Hort, Introduction, Appendix; C. S. C. Williams, "Did Matthew and Luke Use a 'Western' Text of Mark?" Expository Times, LVI(1944/45), 41-5; idem, "St. Luke and the 'Western' Text," Expository Times, LX(1948/49), 24-6.

1. To identify in the textual tradition of St. Luke those points where D presents variants that make a change in the meaning of Luke's tradition.¹⁰

2. To see if these variants in Luke indicate a consistent pattern of thought (compared, for example, with the results of previous work on Acts).

3. To endeavor to isolate the reason for the change; whether, for example, it was a simple attempt to harmonize Luke with the other two synoptics, harmonization resulting from a bias, theological or anti-Judaic, or additions or omissions designed to develop a point or bias, etc.

4. To observe whether these alterations in the text were made to change the probable original emphasis of the Lucan tradition or to strengthen it.

A Brief Description and History of D

Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis is the chief Greek witness to the Western text of our Gospels and Acts. This fact in itself should have accounted for the detailed study of its text in comparison with the other types of texts that have come to us from the earliest years of the church's history. However, D has actually become the one New Testament

¹⁰The text of D in St. Luke was chosen because its variants are more unusual than in Matthew and Mark. For the purposes of this study Scrivener's edition of D will be used: F. H. A. Scrivener, Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis. Being an Exact Copy, in Ordinary Type . . . (Cambridge: 1864).

manuscript that has received more attention from scholars than any other witness because it contains such unusual readings in so many passages.¹¹

Produced around the fifth century A.D., D is a bilingual manuscript with Greek on the left and Latin on the right. Each page contains a single column of text with each line divided into κῶλα, i.e. lines of varying length so as to make the pauses in sense come at the end of lines.¹² Of its earliest known history W. H. P. Hatch says:

The manuscript was taken to the Council of Trent in 1546 by the Bishop of Clearmont, who had borrowed it from the Monastery of St. Irenaeus in Lyons. When the council was over, the codex was returned to the monastery; and there it was found when Lyons was sacked by a Huguenot army in 1562. About this time the manuscript came into the possession of Théodore de Bèze, the Geneva scholar and reformer; and he presented it to the University of Cambridge in 1581.¹³

In 1899 a photographic reproduction was made by Cambridge University.¹⁴ Kenyon believes that the presence of a Latin text is sufficient proof that the manuscript was produced in the West of Europe, where Latin was the

¹¹Bruce M. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration (2nd ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 51.

¹²Ibid., p. 49.

¹³William Henry Paine Hatch, The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), N.P.

¹⁴Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis Quattuor Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum complectens Graece et Latine Sumptibus Academiae phototypice repraesentatus (Cambridge, 1899).

language of literature and daily life.¹⁵ However, he adds that the manuscript "... seems to have been used somewhere where the Scriptures were publicly read in Greek, for the liturgical directions are all on the Greek pages."¹⁶ Concerning its text, Metzger says; "No known manuscript has so many and such remarkable variations from what is usually taken to be the normal New Testament text."¹⁷

A Summary of Luke's Textual Tradition

Because this study will concern itself with the textual tradition of St. Luke and how this tradition is dealt with by D, it might be well to survey quickly the major aspects of this tradition as it appears in the normal text. In dealing with his sources Luke has developed an exegetical tradition of the life and activities of Jesus that is uniquely his own. For example:

1. The beginning of Jesus' ministry in Galilee marks the arché ("beginning") in Luke, whereas in Mark the beginning is marked by the appearance of John. The precursor-motif is absent in the main body of Luke's material;

¹⁵Frederic Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, rev. by A. W. Adams (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958), 208.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 209.

¹⁷Metzger, p. 50.

John is not the precursor of the Messiah, he is the last of the prophets--the last of the old age.¹⁸

2. Luke handles the disciples with gentle hands, especially Peter; ". . . their faults--ignorance, weak faith, mutual rivalries--are acknowledged, yet touched with sparing hand."¹⁹

3. Messiahship and Lordship are acknowledged early by the earthly Jesus in Luke's tradition (4:21);²⁰ however, this accentuation in no way prevents Luke from stressing Jesus' feelings of sympathy. In Luke, more than in Mark

¹⁸Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1961), pp. 22-27. Cf. W. Barnes Tatum, "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," New Testament Studies, XIII(1966/67), 184-95, who points out that John plays his role as the "Elijah-like messianic forerunner" in Luke 1 and 2, and thus is not emphasized by Luke out of this context. Tatum points out that Conzelmann does not concern himself with Luke 1 and 2 because the theology there is different from the remainder of the gospel. Cf. H. H. Oliver, "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," New Testament Studies, X(1963/64), 202-26.

¹⁹Alexander Balmain Bruce, The Synoptic Gospels, Vol. I, Part 1 of The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970), pp. 46-47.

²⁰Cf. G. W. H. Lampe, "The Lucan Portrait of Christ," New Testament Studies, II(1955/56), 160, who describes Luke as an author who prefers to synthesize his material and does not ". . . press any one idea to its ultimate conclusion or content himself with drawing out the significance of a single Scripture image. He prefers to hold a large number of threads in his hand at once, introducing first one and then another into a somewhat untidy and ill-defined pattern, without allowing any one of them so to predominate over the rest as to give unity and coherence to the whole. This tendency is perhaps especially marked in his presentation of the person and work of Christ."

and Matthew, Jesus expresses God's love for the despised through his conduct and his message.²¹

4. Luke's tradition places the history of Jesus in clearly recognizable connection with the history of his time by connecting narrative events with the political context of Roman history, e.g. the census commanded by the Emperor Augustus and the chronological fixing of the Baptist's appearance.

5. Luke was probably first to represent the history of Jesus as the beginning of the currently-continuing church history. Kümmel believes that Luke's change in the Markan design of the material which they hold in common resulted from a wish "to describe the history of Jesus as the preparation for the activity of the disciples after Easter," i.e. "the place of Jesus' life in God's salvation history."²²

6. An attempt is made to show the political innocence of Jesus in the eyes of the Romans while the Jews unjustly seek to accuse Jesus as a political agitator.²³ Conzelmann makes the interesting observation that in Luke's tradition, "it is the Jews who throw the name of Barabbas

²¹Werner Georg Kümmel (ed.), Introduction to the New Testament, trans. by A. J. Mattill, Jr. (14th revised ed.; New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 98. Cf. Bo Reicke, The Gospel of Luke, trans. by Ross MacKenzie (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), pp. 63-74.

²²Kümmel, p. 99.

²³Ibid., pp. 98-99. Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 88-93.

into the discussion," thus showing their solidarity with the rebels.²⁴

Methodology

The following methodology will be used in this study:

1. D in St. Luke will be collated against a standard text in order to isolate its variants. Codex Vaticanus (B)²⁵ was chosen as a standard for purposes of collation.²⁶ The generally conservative character of B is recognized, thus making it the best representative of the main-line text.²⁷

2. Once the variants are isolated they will be examined to see if there is any possibility that they involve a change in Luke's tradition.

²⁴Conzelmann, p. 87.

²⁵Constantinus Tischendorf (ed.), Novum Testamentum Vaticanum, post Angeli Maii aliorumque imperfectos labores ex ipso codice (Lipsiae: Giesecke et Devrient, 1868).

²⁶Cf. Epp, p. 33 and Klijn, p. 163. The ideal standard would be the original text which Luke himself wrote, but, since this is an elusive text, some other standard must be chosen. A critical edition, such as Nestle or the United Bible Societies' text, gives a text which never existed in manuscript form. K. W. Clark points out that even ". . . the best critical text so far achieved now holds little assurance of being the original text." "The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism upon New Testament Studies," The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, W. D. Davies and D. Daube (eds.), (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), p. 30. On the other hand B represents a real text.

²⁷Metzger, p. 216.

3. If a variant or a group of variants scattered throughout the text shows evidence of altering the meaning of the Lucan tradition on any given subject, Luke's tradition on this subject will be isolated by comparing his text with that of the other two synoptics as they appear in B.

4. The variant readings of D will then be compared with the isolated tradition as it reads in B. At this point an alteration in Luke's tradition made by D should be evident.²⁸

5. Where parallel passages exist in Matthew and Mark they have been examined in D to determine if similar alterations were made in the other two synoptics. One purpose for this is to determine if the alterations made by D will show a consistent theological position or a bias of any other nature. Where such alterations have a direct bearing on D in Luke, they will be noted.

6. The sixth and final step will be an attempt to identify the reasons for the alterations. Although it

²⁸Witnesses supporting the variant readings will be taken from the critical apparatuses of Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Bruce M. Metzger, Allen Wikgren (eds.), The Greek New Testament (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1966), Joseph M. Bover, Novi Testamenti Biblia Graeca et Latina (3rd ed.; Madrid: Matriti, 1953), Eberhard Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. by Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland (25th ed.; London: United Bible Societies, 1967), Augustinus Merk, Novum Testamentum (7th ed.: Romae: Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1951), Constantinus Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, Vol. I (8th ed.; Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869).

should be possible to state the reasons for most alterations in Luke's tradition, it is readily admitted that some changes may defy adequate explanation even though the alterations may be readily identified. K. Lake believes that doctrinal modifications of the text were very early, before the existence of our oldest manuscripts; therefore, it is vain to look for much manuscript evidence of doctrinal modification: ". . . [a] small amount of evidence is sufficient to establish the claim to consideration of readings which are likely to have been obnoxious to early doctrine."²⁹

K. W. Clark supports Lake's position:

The amount of textual change that involves theological alteration is a small proportion but it is a nugget of essential importance for interpretation. It is this smaller portion for which textual criticism must search especially.³⁰

As is indicated by Lake and Clark, we might expect to find some alterations that arise from theological biases. However, this is only one reason for textual changes. In this sixth step it will be discovered that there are various reasons lying behind the alterations made in Luke's textual tradition by Codex Bezae.

²⁹Kirsopp Lake, The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament (Oxford: University Press, 1904), 10-11.

³⁰K. W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variations in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (1966), p. 15.

CHAPTER II

PROMINENT CHARACTERS AND THEIR ROLE IN D

Within D, one can observe a tendency to magnify the major personalities that are closely connected with Jesus' person and ministry, if this magnification will serve the purpose of exalting Jesus and His earthly mission. This is true of the two predominant characters found in the first three chapters of St. Luke, i.e. Mary, the mother of Jesus, and John the Baptist. The alterations made by D are not necessarily numerous, but they are of such a nature as to indicate the possible presence of an editorial design. Outside of Luke 1-3, it is Peter that receives D's attention. The remaining followers of Jesus figure into D's interest only in a minor way.

Mary, Mother of Jesus

In Luke's tradition, Mary is seen as playing a more prominent role in the early life of Jesus than in Matthew. One can see this by the amount of space Luke allots to Mary in the first two chapters of his gospel. Of the 132 verses, four are devoted to the introduction, 45 to the announcement of John's birth and the birth itself, and 83 verses, or 63% of the total, deal with the

nativity and early life of Jesus, in which Mary figures as a prominent character. In some of this material she is the dominant figure, e.g. in the announcement of Jesus' birth (13 verses); her visit to Elizabeth (7 verses); her song of praise (11 verses), for a total of 31 verses of the 83 in which she plays a prominent role.

The prominence of Mary in Luke's tradition stands out in bold relief when it is compared with Matthew's account of the nativity and infancy of Jesus, which covers a total of only 31 verses. At no time is Mary a dominant figure as she is in Luke's tradition. She is not visited by a heavenly messenger in Matthew as in Luke's account. It would seem that Matthew gives the greater prominence to Joseph in the nativity scenes, for he is visited at least three times by the heavenly messenger, and possibly four if 2:22 were to be counted: e.g. (1) Joseph is told not to hesitate to take Mary as his wife (1:19-25); (2) he is told to take the child and his mother and to go to Egypt to escape Herod's wrath (2:13-15); (3) he is told to return to Israel with the child and mother (2:19-21). A fourth appearance to Joseph may very well be seen in 2:22, for here Joseph is warned in a dream not to settle down in the territory ruled by Archelaus.

Outside of the context of the nativity and infancy, Mary is mentioned twice by Matthew and Mark, and once by Luke:

1. All three synoptics record the episode of the search by Mary and Jesus' brothers to find Jesus and of their desire to speak with him (Matthew 12:46-50; Mark 3:31-35; Luke 8:19-21).

2. Mary figures in Matthew's and Mark's account of Jesus' visit to Nazareth (receiving only passing notice, however). In Mark, the amazed crowd asks, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary . . .?" (6:3). Matthew reads, "Is not this the son of the carpenter? Is not his mother named Mary . . .?" (13:55). Luke's account is as follows, "Is this not the son of Joseph?" (4:22). Although a transition can be seen here from "the carpenter, the son of Mary" in Mark, to "the carpenter's son? Is not his mother named Mary" in Matthew, to "the son of Joseph" in Luke with the mention of Mary being dropped, Conzelmann's comment that Mary ". . . disappears to a greater extent in Luke than in Mark and Matthew"¹ seems rather strange, for the example given above is the only place where Luke fails to mention Mary when Matthew and Mark have done so.

¹Conzelmann, p. 127. Tatum (pp. 184, 193) agrees that Mary is ". . . pushed further into the background" after chapters 1-2. However, he maintains that one of Conzelmann's weaknesses is his failure to recognize the role of Mary in what Tatum calls "The epoch of Israel" (Luke 1-2); the same is true of John the Baptist. The reason for failing to recognize the role of Mary is that Conzelmann ". . . maintains that Luke i-ii preserve a theology different in many respects from the rest of Luke-Acts." Thus in his work, Theology of St. Luke, Conzelmann does not treat these two chapters.

The phrase employed by Luke, "Is this not the son of Joseph?" is very close to John; however, the settings in which this question is asked are entirely different. Whereas Luke uses the setting of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth, in agreement with the other two synoptics, John's statement is connected with Jesus' sermon on the bread of life, which also, we must hasten to add, is found in the context of rejection. Whereas in Luke the rejection of Jesus is by his fellow townspeople, in John it is by the multitude in Galilee, plus many of Jesus' disciples: "And they said, Is this not Jesus, the son of Joseph, the father and mother of whom we know? How then does he say, I have come down from heaven?" (John 6:42).

In light of the above, there can hardly be any question that Mary plays a far more prominent role in Luke's tradition than in that of Matthew and Mark, even though Luke does prefer Joseph instead of Mary in one verse.

We will now look at two alterations made by D in the first two chapters of Luke which are intended to magnify the significance of Mary's role.

The first variant is found in Luke's account of the annunciation. Here D preserves a variant that is found in a number of other manuscripts, but one that fits the pattern of his editorial work. This reading is omitted

by χ , B, W, f¹, cop^{sa}, bo--some of the most important
Alexandrian and Caesarean witnesses:

Luke 1:28

Codex B

και εισελθων
προς αυτην ειπεν χαιρε
κεχαριτωμενη ο $\kappa\varsigma$ μετα
σου

"And when he came
to her, he said, Hail!
The grace of the Lord
attend you."

Codex D

και εισελθων ο αγγελος
προς αυτην ειπεν χαιρε
κεχαριτωμενη ο $\kappa\varsigma$ μετα
σου ευλογημενη συ εν
γυναιξιν

"And when the angel came
to her, he said, Hail!
The grace of the Lord
attend you. Blessed are
you among women."

+ ο αγγελος post εισελθων, C \mathcal{D} D al vg (χ 69 al it sy^p)
+ ευλογημενη συ εν γυναιξιν post σου, C \mathcal{D} D Θ pm latt sy

The comment of the angel, "Blessed are you among women," is probably borrowed from Elizabeth's exclamation in v. 42 of the same chapter. However, this proclamation changes in significance when it is spoken by a heavenly messenger as compared with the utterance of a mortal. That Mary should be thus addressed by the heavenly messenger appears to heighten her significance. Concerning this variant and its possible relationship with Elizabeth's words in 1:42, Mees says, "The attentive reader could hardly think that the angel had given less prominence to this woman than Elizabeth."² Although this addition may be

²Mees, "Lukas 1-9," p. 94.

of little consequence when taken by itself--because of the number of manuscripts that have it--it may be an ancient reading that found its way from the Western text into the later Byzantine texts and thus into the TR. When it is placed beside the second variant reading of D, it fits D's emerging editorial pattern of magnifying the personalities who have a close relationship with Jesus' life.

The second variant is an apparent attempt to place Mary in the Davidic line of Kings:

Luke 2:4,5

Codex B

4. ανεβη δε και ιωσηφ απο της γαλιλαιας εκ πολεως ναζαρετ εις την ιουδαιαν εις πολιν δαυειδ ητις καλειται βηθλεεμ δια το ειναι αυτον εξ οικου και πατριας δαυειδ
5. απογραψασθαι συν μαριαμ τη εμνηστευμενη αυτω ουση εγγυω

"4. And Joseph went up also from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth unto Judah, to the city of David which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and parentage of David,
"5. To be registered with Mary his wife, who was pregnant."

Codex D

4. ανεβη δε και ιωσηφ απο της γαλιλαιας εκ πολεως ναζαρεθ εις γην ιουδα εις πολιν δαυειδ ητις καλειτε βηθλεεμ
5. απογραφεσθαι συν μαριαμ τη εμνηστευμενη αυτω ουση ενκυω δια το ειναι αυτον εξ οικου και πατριας δαυειδ

"4. And Joseph went up also from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth into the land of Judah, to the city of David which is called Bethlehem,
"5. To be registered with Mary his wife, who was pregnant, because he was of the house and parentage of David."

v. 4 την ιουδαϊαν] γην ιουδα, D it Tatian
 v. 5 δια το ειναι . . . δαυειδ post ενκωω, D sy^S
 αυτον] αυτους, 348, 1216, e; αμφοτερις, sy^S

The Old Latin manuscript e, along with 348 and 1216, read "they" in place of "he" in the phrase as it appears at the end of verse four in the B text, thus saying, "because they were. . . ." F. Blass sees this change as support for the Davidic descent of Mary:

It seems to me an unwarranted supposition that the genealogy given by Luke is that of Mary and not of Joseph, although, by the way, the Davidic descent of Mary is also attested by the Western reading in ii. 4,5, which runs thus: 'And Joseph also went up unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, to be taxed with Mary his wife, because they were of the house and lineage of David.'³

Blass suggests that this reading gives the reason for Mary accompanying Joseph instead of remaining in Nazareth, which would have been more suitable for her condition.⁴

³Friedrich Blass, Philology of the Gospels, pp. 170-71. Mees (96), sees D simply clarifying an awkward reading. He does not see D as attempting to elevate Mary into a position of royal descent. C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (Vol. II; 2nd ed.: London: Macmillan and Company, 1927), p. 367, makes the following observation, "Joseph, not Mary, is of the royal Davidic house. . . . If Jesus had no human father, it is of no value that Joseph was a descendant of David." In the light of Luke's clear statement that Joseph is not Jesus' father, would Montefiore see D's apparent attempt to establish Mary in David's royal line as a necessary adjustment to keep Jesus' position intact?

⁴Blass, p. 171. Cf. Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke, Vol. XXVII of The International Critical Commentary, ed. by Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer (43 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), p. 53.

Sy^S substitutes "both" for "he" in this phrase and places it at the end of verse five where it appears in D, thus saying, "because both were. . . ." D, being sensitive to the thought that occasioned the alterations appearing in e and sy^S, moved the phrase to the end of verse five, yet felt he could retain the original wording while saying essentially what e and sy^S say.

By moving this phrase, D appears to accomplish two things: (1) Mary is tied more intimately to the city of David; the phrase that disrupts the smooth presentation of this thought is transferred to the end of verse five. This in turn emphasizes the position taken by Luke in his normal text, i.e. the Messiah is to be born in Bethlehem in fulfillment of the prophecy of Micah 5:2. (2) By moving the phrase to the end of verse five a possible constructio ad sensum⁵ results, which would be in agreement with the alterations which appear in e and sy^S, i.e. by transferring the phrase and allowing a smooth flow of thought between Mary and the city of David, the registration of Mary along with Joseph now suggests more forcefully Mary's Davidic descent.

Even though Blass speaks in terms of a "Western reading," his translation of Luke 2:4,5 (above) is essentially

⁵F. Blass and A. DeBrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and ed. by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 74,147. Cf. A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), pp. 400-24.

that of the text of D. If it were that of 348, 1216, and e, the phrase we are discussing would appear after the word "Bethlehem." If Blass were translating $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$, the phrase would be in the correct position but it would read "both were" instead of "they were." This is mentioned merely to show that it would seem that Blass also understood D's αὐτόν ("he") to include Joseph and Mary, and thus he translated it as a constructio ad sensum--"they."

In Luke's normal tradition, Mary is not to be considered a descendant of David. D's alteration appears to be an attempt to elevate the stature of Mary by implying a direct descent from David. The reason for this may be twofold:

1. Luke is quite clear that Joseph is not Jesus' natural father. If the conception of Jesus was through the supernatural intervention of the Holy Spirit (1:35), Jesus could not establish a direct blood line to the throne through Joseph.
2. By making Mary a descendant of David, D removes any question of Jesus' claim to the throne. The concern of D for establishing a direct blood line for Jesus with the royal house is illustrated by the alterations made in Luke's genealogy (which will be investigated in the following chapter).

C. S. C. Williams says that the Davidic descent of

Mary is one of the test readings that indicates the influence of the Diatessaron upon our gospel manuscripts.⁶ The question here is: (1) whether D is under the direct

⁶C. S. C. Williams, Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, p. 21. For a discussion of the possible influence of a gospel harmony on Codex Bezae, cf. Bulletin of the Bezan Club, I (1925), 5-14; V. F. Büchner, "Some Remarks on the Tradition of the Armenian Translation of Ephrem Syrus' Commentary on the Diatessaron," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, V(1928), 34-36; J. Rendel Harris, "The Mentality of Tatian," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, IX(1931), 8-10; C. A. Phillips, "Diatessaron-Diapente," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, IX(1931), 6-8; idem., N.T., Bulletin of the Bezan Club, II(1926), 1-8; Daniel Plooiij, "σωζειν-~~mark~~-salvare," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, V(1928), 38-44; idem., "The Bezan Problem," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, IX(1931), 12-17; idem., "The Papyrusian Harmony," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, II(1926), 14-16; G. Quispel, "The Latin Tatian or the Gospel of Thomas in Limburg," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVIII(1969), 321-30; Heinrich Joseph Vogels, Die Harmonistik in Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs' sche Buchhandlung, 1910); idem., "Methods zur Textkritik der Evangelien," Biblische Zeitschrift, XI(1913), 376-81. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1966), pp. 145-46; cf. p. 150, believes that controversial readings found in D, which have been traced to Tatian or Marcion for their origin, are really readings that these men found in existence in Rome. His observation is significant enough to warrant its inclusion here: "First, Marcion: When we encounter in a variant reading the combination D it (vet-syr) Marcion, we do not have before us the influence of Marcion upon the text read in the West, but simply that text which Marcion found in Rome c. AD 140. The independent and confirmatory studies by A. Pott and A. von Harnack have definitely established this. This pre-Marcionite Western text is characterized in its text of Luke by numerous assimilations to Matthew (and Mark). Already before Marcion, therefore, there ruled in Rome the tendency to harmonize the synoptic gospels by assimilation; it is no accident that Tatian at that very place had the idea of constructing a harmony of the gospels. With regard to Tatian, what was valid for Marcion can be applied equally to the combination D it (vet-syr) Tat, namely that we do not have before us influences of Tatian upon the text read in Rome, but the text which Tatian found in Rome during his stay (c. 150-72)."

influence of the Diatessaron, or (2) whether D used a reading with which he was familiar to carry out his editorial designs, thus using a Diatessaron reading (possibly taken from a Latin harmony?)⁷ as a means to an end. It would appear that the latter is the case, for reasons which will be detailed below.

Luke alone gives the reason for the birth of Jesus taking place in Bethlehem, i.e. the decree of Caesar Augustus that all should be registered in the cities of their ancestors. Because of the decree, Joseph and Mary, who was approaching the time of her delivery, made their way to Bethlehem:

Luke 2:6

Codex B

ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΕΙΝΑΙ
ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΕΚΕΙ ΕΠΛΗΣΘΗΣΑΝ
ΑΙ ΗΜΕΡΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΤΕΚΕΙΝ
ΑΥΤΗΝ

"And it came to pass,
while they were there
the days of her delivery
were fulfilled."

Codex D

ΩΣ ΔΕ ΠΑΡΕΓΕΙΝΟΝΤΟ
ΕΤΕΛΕΣΘΗΣΑΝ
ΑΙ ΗΜΕΡΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΤΕΚΕΙΝ
ΑΥΤΗΝ

"And as they arrived
the days of her delivery
were accomplished."

ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΕΚΕΙ ΕΠΛΗΣΘΗΣΑΝ] ΩΣ ΔΕ
ΠΑΡΕΓΕΙΝΟΝΤΟ ΕΤΕΛΕΣΘΗΣΑΝ, D

This variant alters Luke's tradition. From the B text one sees Joseph and Mary already settled in Bethlehem for their stay--even though there was no room for them in

⁷Bulletin of the Bezan Club, I(1925), pp. 5-6.

the inn--before Mary begins her labor and gives birth to Jesus. However, in D's account one can imagine the stress and anxiety under which Joseph searched for shelter for Mary. Concerning this variant, Mees says that it was popularly understood that Jesus was born immediately after the arrival of Joseph and Mary in Bethlehem. He suggests that the normal reading does not portray this accurately so D altered the normal text to read, "And as they arrived . . .," thus stressing the immediacy of Jesus' birth in relation to the arrival in Bethlehem.⁸ There is some evidence that there existed in the early church a tradition that Jesus was either born prior to the arrival in Bethlehem,⁹ or immediately upon arrival in the city.¹⁰

D may be reflecting this early tradition, as Mees suggests, or simply stressing the fulfillment of the words of the prophet (Micah 5:2) by indicating that any delay in Joseph and Mary's journey could very well have nullified the prophecy. We shall see shortly that D is interested in the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy when it

⁸Mees, p. 96.

⁹Montague Rhodes James, "Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew," The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 74.

¹⁰Edgar Hennecke, "Protevangelium of James," New Testament Apocrypha, Wilhelm Schneemelcher, ed., English trans. ed. by R. McL. Wilson (Vol. I; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 383-84.

further his editorial scheme; therefore, it seems more probable here that D wished to stress the fulfillment of Micah's prophecy with respect to Jesus' place of birth.

There is one further area that deserves investigation before we leave the place of Mary in Luke's tradition. According to Luke's account, both Joseph and Mary were natives of Nazareth before the birth of Jesus (1:26; 2:4). Matthew does not make either Joseph or Mary residents of Nazareth until the return from their forced exile in Egypt; and even then they would not have gone to Nazareth if it had not been for the divine communication not to reside in Archelaus' territory. Therefore Matthew could say, "Thus what was spoken through the prophets might be fulfilled, He shall be called a Nazarene" (2:23).¹¹

D makes an interesting change in Luke's tradition in this connection:

Luke 1:26,27

Codex B

26. εν δε τῷ μηνι τῷ ἐκτῷ
ἀπεσταλὴ ὁ ἀγγελὸς γαβριηλ
ἀπο τοῦ θ̅υ̅ εἰς πόλιν τῆς
γαλιλαίας ἡ ὄνομα ναζαρετ
27. πρὸς παρθένον ἐμνη-
στευμένην ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὄνομα
ἰωσήφ ἐξ οἴκου δαυὶδ καὶ
τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου
μαριαμ

Codex D

26. εν δε τῷ ἐκτῷ μηνι
ἀπεσταλὴ ὁ ἀγγελὸς γαβριηλ
ὑπο τοῦ θ̅υ̅ εἰς πόλιν
γαλιλαίαν
27. πρὸς παρθένον μεμνη-
σμένην ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὄνομα
ἰωσήφ ἐξ οἴκου δαυειδ καὶ
τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου
μαριαμ

¹¹cf. John Martin Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Macmillan & Co., 1960), p. 6, and Plummer, p. 20.

"26. And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent by God to a city of Galilee which is called Nazareth,

"27. To a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary."

"26. And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent by God to a city of Galilee,

"27. To a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary."

v. 26 om. η ονομα ναζαρετ, D 255, 259, 990

D identifies Mary as a native of Galilee but not necessarily of Nazareth. Luke's tradition concerning Joseph is preserved intact by D, however. Why is D unwilling to identify Mary as a native of Nazareth before the birth of Jesus and yet willing to preserve Luke's tradition concerning the residence of Joseph (cf. 2:4)?

One might suggest that D makes this change in an attempt to harmonize Luke's tradition with Matthew.¹² But if D were attempting to harmonize Luke with Matthew here, it would seem probable that he also would have altered the verse that says Joseph was a native of Nazareth (2:4), for Matthew 2:22 implies strongly that Joseph was a native of Judea.¹³

Hence, it is likely that D's alteration is not an attempt at harmonization. The change may have resulted

¹²Mark says nothing of the residence of Joseph and Mary explicitly; he simply says that at the time of Jesus' baptism he came from Nazareth to be baptized, thus implying the residence of Joseph and Mary.

¹³Creed, p. 6.

from Nathanael's remark in John 1:46, "Is it possible for any good thing to come out of Nazareth?," which precedes Luke in the so-called "Western" order of the Gospels.¹⁴ If D is seen as elevating and magnifying the role of Mary, this alteration would remove from her any stigma that might be attached to the name of this town.¹⁵ The fact that Joseph is retained as a native of Nazareth by D is not inconsistent with D's editorial designs, for Joseph has no blood relationship with Jesus.

D permits Luke to return Joseph and Mary to Nazareth after Jesus' birth because Joseph is a native of this city and Mary, of course, would go with Joseph to his home as his wife. But now, Jesus becomes a native of Nazareth. Hence, D harmonizes Luke 2:39 with Matthew 2:23 for the solution of this problem:

Luke 2:39

Codex B

Codex D

και ως ετελεσαν παντα τα
κατα τον νομον κυ επεστρεψαν
εις την γαλιλαιαν εις πολιν
εαυτων ναζαρεθ

και ως ετελεσαν απαντα
κατα τον νομον κυ υπεστρεψαν
εις την γαλιλαιαν εις πολιν
εαυτων ναζαρεθ καθως ερεθη

¹⁴For an interesting and informative study of the gospel order in D, cf. the arguments presented by John Chapman, "The Order of the Gospels in the Parent of Codex Bezae," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, VI(1905), 339-46, that Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark is technically a "Latin" order, while the true "Western" order is Matthew, Mark, John, and Luke: idem., "The Original Contents of Codex Bezae," Expositor, VI,12(1905), 46-53.

¹⁵Cf. Montefiore, who believes that Nazareth was the true birthplace of Jesus, p. 395.

δια του προφητου οτι ναζωραιος κληθησεται

"And when they completed all the things according to the law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own city of Nazareth."

"And when they completed all the things according to the law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own city of Nazareth. As it was spoken through the prophet, he shall be called a Nazarene."

+ καθως ερεθη δια του προφητου οτι ναζωραιος κληθησεται post ναζαρεθ, D a

Thus D allows Jesus to be called, "Jesus of Nazareth" (cf. Luke 4:34; 18:37; 24:19; Matthew 21:11; 26:71; Mark 1:24; 10:47; 14:67), with one exception, Mark 16:6.

Thus far we have noted the following:

1. D allows Mary to be called a native of Galilee, but not of Nazareth.

2. Joseph is allowed to maintain his connection with Nazareth because there are no blood ties with Jesus.

3. Jesus is permitted to be taken to Nazareth after his birth (2:39) and again after his first trip to the temple (2:51), because this is the home of his adoptive father.

4. Jesus' connection with Nazareth is defended by a harmonization with Matthew, which uses fulfillment of prophecy, "he shall be called a Nazarene," as reason for his childhood and early adult life being spent in Nazareth.

5. This now permits D to retain accounts of various occasions where Jesus was referred to as a Nazarene or as being from Nazareth.

Thus far the reasoning lying behind D's editorial work can be followed logically. However, when we come to Luke 4:16 we find an apparent inconsistency. In contrast to B, D retains an alternate reading which omits reference to Jesus' childhood in Nazareth. However, this omission need not pose a problem to D's editorial pattern being developed here:

Luke 4:16

Codex B

και ηλθεν εις ναζαρα ου
ην τεθραμμενος και εισ-
ηλθεν κατα το ειωθος
αυτω εν τη ημερα των
σαββατων εις την συν-
αγωγην και ανεστη
αναγνωσαι

"And he came into Naza-
reth where he had been
brought up, and he en-
tered the synagogue on
the Sabbath day according
to his custom and stood
up to read."

Codex D

ελθων δε εις ναζαρεδ οπου
ην
κατα το ειωθος
εν τη ημερα των
σαββατων εις την συν-
αγωγην και ανεστη
αναγνωσαι

"And when he came to Naza-
reth,
where it was the custom
on the Sabbath to be in
the synagogue, he stood
up to read."

om. τεθραμμενος, D
om. και εισηλθεν, D
om. αυτω, D

Some scholars see in these omissions the results of Marcionite influence. Harris says, "It is generally reckoned, therefore, that Marcion omitted the words οὗ

ἦν τεθραμμένος and κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτοῦ.¹⁶ For some reason this Marcionite rendition of Luke 4:16 fits D's thinking and he uses it.

We must ask, of the three "Marcionite" omissions in this verse, which one fits into D's editorial scheme and thus prompted the use of this "Marcionite reading?" It does not appear that D is interested in this alternate reading because it omits the statement that Jesus was brought up in Nazareth. D is not adverse to having Jesus reared in Nazareth, as we have just seen. Therefore it seems that D used this so-called "Marcionite reading" of Luke 4:16 for a reason other than removing Jesus' place of residence from Nazareth.

Once τεθραμμένος ("had been brought up") is eliminated as a possible motivation for D's use of this reading, we are left with two alterations that reflect a biased attitude toward the Sabbath as a Jewish institution.¹⁷ D simply carried over the omission of τεθραμμένος ("had been brought up") into his text along with the other omissions in which he was theologically interested. D has made his position clear concerning Mary's and Jesus' relation to Nazareth in his editorial work prior to 4:16. That the

¹⁶J. R. Harris, Codex Bezae, p. 232. Cf. idem, Bulletin of the Bezan Club, III(1926), p. 5.

¹⁷D's theological bias on the Sabbath will be dealt with in detail in a later chapter.

omission of τεθραμμένος ("had been brought up") appears to be inconsistent with D's earlier position on Jesus' relation to Nazareth only strengthens an observation made by Eldon Epp in another connection:

Thus one finds that, while a manuscript may show a dissident reading in one synoptic passage, it may not appear in the parallel passage(s). Nor is there always consistency within a single book, and certain emphases present in one place may not be found at other expected points. In the gospels, for example, the 'Western' text often neglects this general consistency, but frequently maintains consistency in the context.¹⁸

John the Baptist

As has been pointed out, the second prominent character in Luke's three chapters of material introductory to Jesus' ministry is John the Baptist. Throughout this introductory material D makes several interesting changes in connection with John. Before examining these alterations in detail, it might be well if some of the aspects of Luke's tradition concerning John were pointed out:

1. Luke alone has a detailed account of the "announcement" and birth of John (1:5-25, 57-80).
2. Luke alone ties in the beginning of John's ministry, chronologically, with various men in political offices (3:1,2).

¹⁸Epp, p. 38.

3. Luke alone records the questions that are pressed upon John by the conscience-smitten crowd and how John replied to these questions (3:10-14).

4. Luke restricts the Elijah motif in connection with John to 1:14-17; 2:68-79, whereas Matthew carries it into the ministry of Jesus (11:7-14; 17:10-13).

5. Conzelmann sees John playing a lesser role in Luke than in the other two synoptics.¹⁹ For example, Conzelmann says: (a) Luke excludes any suggestion that John plays an important part in Jesus' baptism; (b) because Luke does not connect the Elijah motif with John (outside of chapters 1-2), it is John's ministry and not his person that prepares the way for Jesus; (c) the appearance of John marks the end of the old epic and the beginning of the new; but John belongs to the old; he is the last of the prophets.²⁰

In Luke's exclusive material dealing with the birth of John, D makes minor alterations in the text. However, each change seems to be designed to heighten the significance of John within the tradition. Again it must be emphasized that the alterations need not be major changes in order for D to accomplish his purposes.

When Gabriel appeared to Zacharias in the temple and announced the coming birth of John, he was very specific

¹⁹Cf. Tatum, p. 184. ²⁰Conzelmann, pp. 18-27.

in his instructions as to the naming of the child: καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννην ("You shall call his name John"-- 1:13). When it was time to name the child, D has Gabriel's command quoted as directly as possible. Thus divine authority is appealed to in the naming of John, and moreover the threefold repetition of the angel's command (1:60,61, 63) emphasizes the uniqueness of John's position in D's text.

Luke informs us that on the eighth day, when the child was to be circumcised, "they" named him after his father Zacharias. Elizabeth's reaction was immediate:

Luke 1:60,61

Codex B

60. και αποκριθεισα η μητηρ
αυτου ειπεν ουχι αλλα κλη-
θησεται
ιωαννης.

61. και ειπον προς αυτην
οτι ουδεις εστιν εκ της
συγγενειας σου ος καλειται
τω ονοματι τουτω.

"60. And answering, his
mother said, No, but he
shall be called John.

"61. And they said to her,
there is no one of your
relatives who is called
after this name."

Codex D

60. και αποκρειθεισα η μητηρ
αυτου ειπεν ουχι αλλα κλη-
θησεται το ονομα αυτου
ιωανης.

61. και ειπαν προς αυτην
οτι ουδεις εστιν εν τι
συγγενεα σου ος καλειται
το ονομα τουτο.

"60. And answering, his
mother said, No, but his
name shall be John.

"61. And they said to her,
there is no one among your
relatives who is called
this name."

v. 60 + το ονομα αυτου post κληθησεται, C* D 213 cop^{bo}
sypal

v. 61 εκ της συγγενειας] εν τι συγγενεα, D
τω ονοματι τουτω] το ονομα τουτο, D

In v. 60, D puts the command of the angel into Elizabeth's mouth, τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννης ("his name . . . John"). Thus, Elizabeth is made to appeal directly to divine authority in the naming of her child, and by so doing emphasizes the divine commission of John.

In v. 61, a perfectly allowable grammatical change is made. In v. 59, when those who were present to circumcise John called him Zacharias, the normal text reads, καὶ ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ζαχαρίαν (And they called him after the name of his father, Zacharias"). In v. 61, B drops the preposition ἐπὶ but retains the dative case for the noun. D changes the dative case to the nominative. Arndt and Gingrich says that καλέω, in the passive, ". . . approaches closely the meaning to be."²¹ In Kittel, we are told that καλέω, in the passive form, ". . . is linked with a nominative subject and predicative nominative."²² The question is, of course, Why is D the manuscript to make this change?

²¹William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (4th ed.; Chicago: University Press, 1960), pp. 399,400.

²²Gerhard Kittel, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Vol. III, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968), p. 488. Cf. A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 457.

Before an answer is suggested, we must observe one more minor addition which fits a developing pattern:

Luke 1:63

Codex B	Codex D
και αιτησας πεινακειδιον εγραψεν λεγων ιωαννης εστιν ονομα αυτου . . .	και αιτησας πινακιδα εγραψεν ιωαννης εστιν το ονομα αυτου . . .
"And when he asked for a writing tablet he wrote saying, John is his name . . ."	"And when he asked for a writing tablet he wrote, John is his name . . ."

om. λεγων, D 4 273 e sy^s
+ το ante ονομα, X C^R D Θ pl

We may now safely ask, What was D's purpose in making the changes we have noted? As nearly as possible, D uses the original command of Gabriel as a sacred formula to emphasize the uniqueness of John's divine command. In each place thereafter the formula has been used in such a way as to bring Gabriel's words to mind. A simple listing of the variants will make D's pattern in naming John clear:

Codex B		Codex D
το ονομα αυτου	1:13	το ονομα αυτου
	1:60	το ονομα αυτου
τω ονοματι τουτω	1:61	το ονομα τουτο
ονομα αυτου	1:63	το ονομα αυτου

It appears to the eye that this formula is set at τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, with τοῦτο ("this") replacing αὐτοῦ ("his") in one case.²³

²³That the original command of the angel is one part of a double accusative and the restatement of the command

Because of Zacharias's unbelief at the announcement of John's birth, he was stricken dumb and remained silent according to the word of Gabriel. Not only were the people at the temple amazed at Zacharias's inability to speak when he emerged from its sacred precincts, but also the acquaintances of Zacharias and Elizabeth must have wondered at this strange silence and the events surrounding it.

We have already dealt with a portion of what follows, but it must now be repeated in order to understand the background for the next alteration made by D. In Luke's normal tradition, those who came to circumcise John called him Zacharias; we have seen Elizabeth's response; now these people turn to the father as a final source of appeal:

Luke 1:63,64

Codex B

63. και αιτησας πεινακει-
διον εγραψεν λεγων ιωαννης
εστιν ονομα αυτου

Codex D

63. και αιτησας πινακιδα
εγραψεν ιωαννης
εστιν το ονομα αυτου και

are in the nominative case would not seem to detract from D's scheme. That is to say, if we take the formula in 1:60,61 as predicate nominatives, which seems to be the case. This would then make all three restatements agree in case usage. If we take the formula in 1:60,61 as a double accusative this would make these two restatements agree with the angel's original command, as far as case is concerned, but would then put the formula in 1:63 out of harmony with the restatements in 1:60,61. In any case, it is impossible to harmonize all four statements as far as case is concerned. The important thing is that D alters Luke's normal text to obtain a relatively harmonious formula for the naming of John that emphasizes above the normal text the divine commission of this child.

και εθαυμασαν παντες
64. ανεωχθη δε το στομα
αυτου παραχρημα και η
γλωσσα αυτου και ελαλει
ευλογων τον θ̄ν

"63. And when he asked
for a writing tablet he
wrote, saying, his name
is John,

and
they all marvelled.

"64. And immediately his
mouth was opened and his
tongue loosed and he
spoke, praising God."

παραχρημα ελυθη η γλωσσα
αυτου και εθαυμασαν παντες
64. ανεωχθη δε το στομα
αυτου

και ελαλει
ευλογων τον θ̄ν

"63. And when he asked
for a writing tablet he
wrote, his name
is John, and immediately
his tongue was loosed and
they all marvelled.

"64. And his
mouth was opened
and he
spoke, praising God."

-
- v. 63 om. λεγων, D 4 273 e sy^s
+ το ante ονομα, X C R D Θ pl
+ και παραχρημα ελυθη η γλωσσα αυτου ante και
εθαυμασαν, D it
- v. 64 om. παραχρημα και η γλωσσα αυτου, D it

According to Luke's normal tradition, those present on this occasion were amazed at Zacharias's desire to name his son John and not Zacharias, after himself. Once Zacharias had fulfilled the instruction of Gabriel and consented to the name of John, he could speak once again. In the text of D, the loosening of Zacharias's tongue is moved into a position immediately following the commitment to the name of John. In doing this D heightens the significance of Zacharias's silence and the miraculous loosening of his tongue. The people now marvel and are amazed, not so much at the choice of John for a name, but at the miraculous

event that is connected with the naming of this unusual child.²⁴

D now intensifies the reaction of the people:

Luke 1:65

Codex B

και εγενετο επι παντας
φοβος τους περιτοικουντας
αυτους. . . .

"And awe came upon all
those living around them.
. . . ."

Codex D

και εγενετο φοβος μεγας
επι παντας τους περιτοικουντας
αυτον. . . .

"And great awe came upon all
those living around him.
. . . ."

+ μεγας post φοβος, D 50 b c
αυτους] αυτον, D

By the addition of μέγας ("great"), D accentuates the effects of the supernatural upon those who lived in the surrounding area. Plummer and Meyer take the αὐτούς ("them") of B to be Zacharias and Elizabeth.²⁵ D changes αὐτούς ("them") to αὐτόν ("him"). There is little question but that D used αὐτόν ("him") for John and not Zacharias, thus placing the child at the center of community "awe." This change in pronoun would arise from D's editorial

²⁴Mees essentially agrees with this position (p. 95), but he fails to tie this variant into an editorial pattern that could reveal a consistent scheme behind many of D's variants.

²⁵Plummer, p. 37 and Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospels of Mark and Luke, trans. from the 5th ed. by Robert Ernest Wallis (Vol. I; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880), p. 305.

scheme to magnify the role of John, which would, in turn, be supported by the next verse in St. Luke:

Luke 1:66

Codex B

και εθεντο παντες οι
ακουσαντες εν τη καρδια
εαυτων λεγοντες τι αρα
το παιδιον τουτο εσται
και γαρ χειρ κυ ην μετ
αυτου

"And all those who heard
stored up these things
in their heart, saying,
What sort of child shall
he be? For the hand of
the Lord was with him."

Codex D

και εθεντο παντες οι
ακουοντες εν ταις καρδιαις
αυτων λεγοντες τι αρα
το παιδιον τουτο εσται
και γαρ χειρ κυ μετ
αυτου

"And all those who heard
stored up these things
in their hearts, saying,
What sort of child shall
he be, for the hand of
the Lord is with him?"

om. ην, D 59 it sy^s

Concerning this omission Metzger says:

Not noticing that the last clause of the verse is an observation made by the evangelist (such occasional remarks are characteristic of Luke: cf. 2.50; 3.15; 7.39; 16.14; 20.20; 23.12) several Western witnesses (D itd, ff², l, q, 26 syrs) omit ην, thus bringing the clause within the question of those who had heard about Zechariah ("What then will this child be for the hand of the Lord is with him?").²⁶

From the point of view of D, the alterations in vv. 65,66 support each other and thus this appendage to the question ("for the hand of the Lord is [not was] with him") is asked by those who heard about John and not Zacharias. By following the developing pattern of variants, there is a serious question as to whether the omission of ην in v.

²⁶Metzger, p. 131, cf. Plummer, p. 38.

66 was really accidental on the part of D, as Metzger suggests. That the last clause of this verse is an observation by Luke and not intended to be part of the question posed by John's neighbors is clear in the normal text. But it is equally clear that the omission fits nicely into D's editorial pattern. For now the people who have been "greatly awed" by this unusual child not only ask the question, "What sort of child shall he be?," but also bear testimony that John's uniqueness stems from God's own hand, being evident in all the preceding events.

D seems to lessen further the role of Zacharias in his attempt to elevate the significance of John's role. Gabriel had previously identified John as the chosen instrument of God when he originally talked to Zacharias in the temple. D guards this unique position assigned to John by God and minimizes as much as possible the prophetic gift given to Zacharias. It appears that D wishes to preserve this honor for John, although D will allow John's father to be filled with the Holy Spirit:

Luke 1:67

Codex B

και ζαχαριας ο πατηρ
αυτου επλησθη πνευματος
αγιου και επροφητευσεν
λεγων. . . .

"And Zacharias, his
father, was filled

Codex D

και ζαχαριας ο πατηρ
αυτου επλησθη πνευματος
αγιου και
ειπεν. . . .

"And Zacharias, his
father, was filled

with the Holy Spirit
and prophesied, saying
. . . ."

with the Holy Spirit
and said,

επροφητευσεν λεγων] ειπεν, D

Tatum points out that the role of the Holy Spirit in Luke 1-2 ". . . lies in the realm of prophecy"; thus Zacharias is filled with the Spirit and ". . . immediately he prophesied."²⁷ Mees recognizes that the alteration made by D is significant, but attributes the change from "prophesied" to "said" to the fact that the Benedictus immediately follows and D did not recognize it as prophecy in the fullest sense.²⁸ It seems more consistent with D's text to say that D permits Zacharias to be filled with the Spirit but minimizes the activity so as not to overshadow the position given to his son by divine commission.

Leaving Luke's exclusive material on John's birth, we will now observe that D continues his editorial scheme by making alterations in the material Luke holds in common with Matthew and Mark.

The beginning of the ministry of John is introduced by Mark with a quotation from Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3, identifying John as the promised messenger who would precede the coming of the Lord and prepare his way.

Before Matthew quotes Isaiah 40:3, he introduces

²⁷Tatum, p. 187. ²⁸Mees, p. 95.

John's ministry by saying, "And in those days John the Baptist came preaching . . ." (3:1). Luke's introduction to John's ministry expands Matthew's simple statement, "In those days . . .", by pinpointing the time of John's appearance by listing the men who were in prominent offices, including the year of the emperor and the name of the high priest in Jerusalem.

Matthew briefly touches upon the heart of John's message in his introduction, "Saying, repent, for the kingdom of heaven is near" (3:2). Luke follows Mark at this point by indicating that John's message was a call to repentance for the forgiveness of sin: "Proclaiming the baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sin" (Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3).

D now carries the theme of John's preaching into the quotation taken from Isaiah 40, which Luke holds in common with Mark and Matthew. Luke modifies Mark's introduction to this Old Testament quotation, but follows Matthew's chronological order in presenting it. Luke's quotation of Isaiah is expanded by two verses over that of Mark and Matthew. Because all three synoptics agree exactly in quoting Isaiah 40:3, only the text of Luke, as seen in B, will be presented in contrast to D:

Luke 3:4

Codex B

Codex D

φωνη βοωντος εν τη ερημω
 ετοιμασατε την οδον κυ
 ευθειας ποιειτε τας
 τριβους αυτου

"A voice crying in the
 wilderness, Prepare the
 way of the Lord, make
 straight his paths."

φωνη βοωντος εν τη ερημω
 ετοιμασατε την οδον κυ
 ευθειας ποιειτε τας
 τριβους υμων

"A voice crying in the
 wilderness, Prepare the
 way of the Lord, make
 straight your paths."

αυτου] υμων, D

That all three synoptics apply the words of this prophecy to the ministry of John indicates that this was a primitive Christian interpretation of Isaiah 40:3. Also, that all three synoptics substitute αὐτοῦ ("his") for τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ("of our God") of the LXX indicates that αὐτοῦ ("his") was taken as referring to the Messiah in the primitive tradition.²⁹

The alteration presented by D makes Isaiah's prophecy apply specifically to the message of John's preaching. The call to prepare the way of the Lord by having the people straighten out their own paths appears to be a direct call to repentance and the forsaking of sin. Thus D again heightens the significance of John by tying this Old Testament prophecy directly to the message being preached by John.

D in Matthew retains the primitive church's interpretation of Isaiah 40:3 by reading "his." D in Mark

²⁹Plummer, pp. 86-87.

alters the original LXX reading, writing "of your God" instead of "of our God." The question immediately arises, did D also intend to write "of your God" in Luke as well, or did D drop the τοῦ θεοῦ ("God") of Mark intentionally, thus leaving ὑμῶν ("your"), and thereby altering the sense of Isaiah's prophecy? The fact that Nestle-Aland questions Mark's ὑμῶν ("your") in D only points out the uncertainty of the origin of this variant in Luke.³⁰ However, as it stands in D's text, ὑμῶν ("your") supports his redactional intentions. B. S. Easton describes this variant as "obviously moralizing."³¹ Mees says that John the Baptist predicted the atonement at the Jordan and D viewed the quotation taken from Isaiah as a summons to repentance in the preaching of John and accordingly altered the pronoun so that the quotation read, "Make straight your paths."³² Although we may not be able to settle conclusively the origin of this variant, its presence strengthens D's concept of the ministry of John.

As the fame of John spread, large crowds gathered to hear him preach and to be baptized by him. Luke and Matthew draw upon a common source that presents John's

³⁰Nestle-Aland, p. 84.

³¹Burton Scott Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), p. 36.

³²Mees, p. 97.

message to those who came to hear him. However, in Matthew's account John's scathing message is addressed to the Pharisees and Sadducees; in Luke it is addressed to the crowds. In this context D makes a change concerning the mode of baptism:

Luke 3:7

Codex B

ελεγεν ουν τοις εκπορευ-
ομενοις οχλοις βαπτισθησαι
υπ' αυτου. . . .

"He said, therefore, to
the crowds that came out
to be baptized by him
. . . ."

Codex D

ελεγεν δε τοις εκπορευ-
ομενοις οχλοις βαπτισθησαι
ενωπιον αυτου. . . .

"And he said to
the crowds that came out
to be baptized before him
. . . ."

ουν] δε, D 1 13 28 69 700 1071 e f r sy^{CSP}
υπ'] ενωπιον, D it

This alteration ("before" for "by") is not held by D alone, but it also receives support from Old Latin manuscripts. The immediately obvious solution is that which is offered by a number of scholars, i.e. the people stood in the water and immersed themselves at John's bidding.³³ Hatch also suggests a second alternative: it was thought that John could not possibly baptize all of the people that came to him, therefore, he had assistants to help him perform the rite.³⁴

³³Creed, p. 51; Easton, p. 37; Hatch, pp. 30-31; and Montefiore, p. 7.

³⁴Hatch, pp. 30-31.

Both points might have something said about them. First, when a Gentile accepted Judaism as his religion and showed himself sincere in his request to become a proselyte, he was required, after circumcision, to immerse himself completely in water while two men stood by and informed him of some of the light and some of the heavy aspects of the law.³⁵ In chapter six numerous examples will be given that illustrate what seems to be an anti-Judaic bias in D in Luke. In view of this apparent anti-Judaic bias, it seems rather unlikely that D would replace a reading that would favor the personal baptism of each candidate by John with a reading that would suggest the Jewish mode of baptism.

Or, secondly, John may have baptized through the use of assistants. This reminds one of the method followed by Jesus, as reported by the evangelist John: "When, therefore, the Lord knew that the Pharisees heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, although Jesus himself did not baptize, but his disciples . . ." (4:1-2). It seems that Paul followed the example set by Jesus, at least in Corinth. He preached and ministered spiritually to the people, but left the rite of baptism to be completed

³⁵C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1963), pp. 578-579, and Bernard J. Bamberger, Proselytism in the Talmudic Period (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1939), p. 44.

by the aid of his assistants. After chastizing the Corinthians for their senseless quibbling over the origin of their spiritual rebirth, Paul said:

I am thankful that I baptized none of you, except Crispus and Gaius; so no one could say that you were baptized in my name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas; I am not aware that I baptized any others. For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel (I Corinthians 1:14-17).

Of course, the question then immediately arises, is it possible that Jesus was not baptized personally by John in D's account of Luke's tradition? In the light of the alteration presently under consideration and with the absence of a specific statement in Luke's tradition telling us that Jesus was baptized by John, as is found in Matthew 3:13-16, one can conclude that he was not.³⁶ Without taking into consideration D's alteration, Conzelmann says:

According to iii.21f Jesus is baptized as one of the people, like everyone else. Luke excludes any suggestion that John plays an important part in the incident. This is in keeping with his whole conception of the significance of John.³⁷

³⁶Cf. G. O. Williams, "The Baptism in Luke's Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIII(1944), 34, who says of Luke's normal text that the imprisonment of John preceded the baptism of Jesus, thus he is removed from the scene. "John's significance is therefore not that he baptized Jesus but that in the course of his ministry he bore witness to the approach of a Greater One who was destined to eclipse his own fame."

³⁷Conzelmann, p. 21.

It would appear that D, by this alteration in 3:7, is strengthening a position like that of Conzelmann, that John the Baptist fills a lesser role in Luke than in the other two synoptics. However, we have seen enough of D's editorial scheme thus far, as it relates to John, to make this idea unlikely. What is the reason for the alteration? Two possibilities offer themselves: (1) it may not have mattered to D if John personally baptized or whether the people were baptized by assistants, as long as the significance of John's role is clearly seen through other means. (2) There is always the possibility that the reading in Luke was affected by John 4:1-2 (Jesus did not personally baptize), which preceded it in Codex Bezae, and D wished to present the Messiah and his forerunner as using the same methods in ministering to the people. If the latter is the case, and there is no reason why it could not be, the ministry of John is again heightened by its similarity in methods with that of Jesus.

Luke alone reports the reaction of the people to John's preaching. Three groups are represented as responding, the people (3:10), the publicans (3:12), and the soldiers (3:14). D here makes three additions that markedly increase the significance of John's ministry and thus the importance of John himself:

Luke 3:10, 12, 14

Codex B

10. και επηρωτων αυτον
οι οχλοι λεγοντες τι ουν
ποιησωμεν
12. ηλθον δε και τελωναι
βαπτισθηναι και ειπον
προς αυτον διδασκαλε τι
ποιησωμεν
14. επηρωτων δε αυτον και
στρατευομενοι λεγοντες τι
ποιησωμεν

"10. And the people asked him
saying, What then should we
do?

"12. And publicans
came also to be baptized and
they said to him, Teacher,
what should we do?

"14. And the soldiers asked
him also, saying, What
should we do?"

Codex D

10. και επηρωτησαν αυτον
οι οχλοι λεγοντες τι
ποιησωμεν ινα σωθωμεν
12. ηλθον δε και τελωναι
ομοιως βαπτισθηναι και ειπαν
προς αυτον διδασκαλε τι
ποιησωμεν ινα σωθωμεν
14. επηρωτησαν δε και
στρατευομενοι λεγοντες τι
ποιησωμεν ινα σωθωμεν

"10. And the people asked him
saying, What then should we
do that we might be saved?

"12. And publicans, likewise,
came to be baptized and
they said to him, Teacher,
what should we do that we
might be saved?

"14. And soldiers asked
him also, saying, What
should we do that we might
be saved?"

-
- v. 10 επηρωτων] επηρωτησαν, D 244 it
+ινα σωθωμεν post ποιησωμεν, D cop^{sa} (b q sy^c)
om. ουν, D N 713 1396 it
v. 12 + ομοιως post τελωναι, D a
+ινα σωθωμεν post ποιησωμεν, D
v. 14 επηρωτων] επηρωτησαν, C D b c
om. αυτον, D c
+ινα σωθωμεν post ποιησωμεν, D

The three significant changes in verses 10,12, and 14 are the addition of *ἵνα σώθωμεν* ("that we might be saved"). In order for us to appreciate properly D's motives in making these additions, we must return to an earlier observation. We have already seen that Luke begins the ministry of John, as do the other synoptics, by quoting from Isaiah 40, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness,"

etc. However, Luke extends the quotation from Isaiah 40:3 to verse 5, and concludes with the final clause of verse 5: καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ("And all flesh shall see the salvation of God"--Luke 3:6). We here see Luke directly linking John, as the forerunner of the Messiah, to the salvation that is to be made manifest to the world through the Messiah by the presence of Isaiah 40:5 in Luke's normal tradition. However, this tie between God's messenger and the coming salvation is only implicit, but D alters the text to make it explicit.

Putting the words, ἵνα σώθωμεν ("that we might be saved"), into the mouths of the people was a natural addition to τὸ ποιήσωμεν ("what should we do") if the normal text of Luke is followed to its logical conclusion. First, because Luke follows Mark (1:4) in saying that John's preaching was a call to repentance for the forgiveness of sins, as opposed to Matthew (3:2), who simply says that John's message was a call to repent. Secondly, because Luke ties John, as God's chosen messenger, into the coming Messianic salvation by quoting Isaiah 40:5. Therefore, when John begins to warn the people in the next verse (v. 7) of God's coming wrath and concludes (v. 9) by saying that those who do not produce the fruits of repentance in their lives will be "cast into the fire," D uses the inquiry of the people, τὸ ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σώθωμεν ("what

should we do that we might be saved"), to say explicitly what he evidently believes Luke is saying implicitly, that John and his message have a direct connection with God's plan of offering salvation to πᾶσα σὰρξ ("all flesh"). So again, D has heightened the significance of John.

These additions would seem to show an anti-Judaic bias. Luke has already substituted ὄχλοι ("people"--3:7) for Matthew's φαρισαίων καὶ σαδδουκαίων ("Pharisees and Sadducees"--3:7) as those who heard and responded to John's preaching and were baptized. Although surely there were religious leaders in the crowds that heard John, Luke does not present any indication of a favorable response on their part. In Luke's normal tradition those who ask, τί ποιήσωμεν ("what should we do") are the ὄχλοι ("people"), τελῶναι ("publicans") and στρατευόμενοι ("soldiers").

Conzelmann says:

He [Luke] creates a further discrepancy by introducing a motif of his own: in place of Pharisees and Sadducees he puts the ὄχλοι. This might be derived from Mark i, 5, but with variations. Verses 7, 10 and 20 show how consistently this has been done, and in vii, 29 Luke attributes to Jesus the statement that 'all' were baptized.

In other words, all the people are baptized but their leaders without exception refuse to be baptized.³⁸

Taken in the light of D's emphasis, the leaders'

³⁸Conzelmann, pp. 20-21. Cf. F. W. Farrar, The Cambridge Bible: The Gospel According to St. Luke (Cambridge University Press, 1891), p. 88.

refusal of John's ministry now becomes much more serious, for their rejection of John indicates a rejection of the salvation that will be extended through the one John is preparing the people to receive.

In the following alteration we again see D identifying John's ministry with that of Jesus:

Luke 3:15,16

Codex B

Codex D

15. προσδοκωντος δε του λαου
και διαλογιζομενων παντων
εν ταις καρδιαις αυτων
περι του ιωανου μηποτε
αυτος ειη ο $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$
16. απεκρεινατο λεγων
πασιν ο ιωαννης . . .

15. προσδοκωντος δε του λαου
και διαλογιζομενων παντων
εν ταις καρδιαις αυτων
περι ιωανου μηποτε
αυτος ειη ο $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$
16. επιγνους τα διανοηματα
αυτων ειπεν . . .

"15. And the people were
in a state of anticipation
and thought all these things
through in their hearts
concerning John, whether he
was the Christ, or not.
"16. John answered, saying
to all, . . .

"15. And the people were
in a state of anticipation
and thought all these things
through in their hearts
concerning John, whether he
was the Christ, or not.
"16. Knowing their thoughts
he said . . .

v. 16 απεκρεινατο λεγων πασιν ο ιωαννης] επιγνους τα
διανοηματα αυτων ειπεν, D

There was probably little doubt in John's mind concerning what the people were thinking as they came to the Jordan to hear him. Luke indicates that John was sensitive to their messianic expectations when he made John answer the unspoken question. However, D sees another opportunity to take what Luke implies and to present it in such a way that John is once again made to remind us of

Jesus' ministry. Throughout the synoptics we are periodically informed that Jesus was aware of the thoughts that raced through the minds of the people he confronted (Matthew 12:25; Mark 8:17; Luke 6:8; 11:17, etc.). Then by various methods he would lay bare their thoughts and use them as vehicles for spiritual lessons. Here, D gives John the ability to know the thoughts of his listeners and to use these thoughts for the basis of instruction, much the same way as Jesus does.

This incident, coupled with the alteration made by D concerning John's mode of baptism, may indicate that D wished to present John as ministering in a similar manner as Jesus, thus bringing the forerunner closer, in spirit, to the one he was preparing the people to receive. This, of course, would make John more significant and tie his ministry closer to the ministry of the Messiah.

Peter and the Close Followers of Jesus

The apostles of Jesus play a major role in the gospel tradition, as well as in the establishment of the primitive church in Acts. Epp has noted two things in particular concerning the apostles as a result of his investigation of D in Acts: (1) the leading apostles are accentuated, "Peter and John, as well as Paul, Barnabas, and Silas, etc.," (2) Paul is the predominant figure in Acts, but D endeavors to secure a balance between him and Peter

by heightening the latter.³⁹ In Luke's gospel, however, a dominant personality like Paul is not present among the apostles to challenge the position of Peter; therefore, while D's alterations are intended only to support his prominent position the remaining apostles are virtually ignored as individuals in D's editorial changes (with the call of Levi being a single exception); they figure into his interest as a group in a minor way only.

Luke introduces us to the roster of apostles in chapter six. We shall begin our investigations here by giving the variants in this roster as they appear in D, but noting only the one that deals with Peter; then we shall pursue several variants concerning Peter and, finally, note the changes that have been made in connection with the apostles as a group and in connection with the topic of discipleship in general:

Luke 6:14-16

Codex B

14. σιμωνα ον και
ωνομασεν πετρον και
ανδρεαν τον αδελφον αυτου
και ιακωβον και ιωαννην

και φιλιππον και βαρθο-
λομαιον
15. και μαθθαιον και θωμαν

ιακωβον αλφαιου

Codex D

14. πρωτον σιμωνα ον και
πετρον επωνομασεν και
ανδρεαν τον αδελφον αυτου
και ιακωβον και ιωαννην τον
αδελφον αυτου ους επωνομασεν
βοανηργες ο εστιν υιοι βρον-
της και φιλιππον και βαρθο-
λομαιον
15. και μαθθαιον και θωμαν
τον επικαλουμενον δυδυμον
και ιακωβον τον του αλφαιου

³⁹Epp, p. 163.

και σιμωνα τον καλουμενον
ζηλωτην
16. και ιουδαν ιακωβου και
ιουδαν ισκαριωθ ος εγενετο
προδοτης.

"14. Simon, whom he
also named Peter, and Andrew
his brother, and James and
John,

Philip, and
Bartholomew,
"15. And Matthew, and Thomas,

James, the son of Alphaeus,
and Simon, who is called
Zealot,

"16. And Judas the son of
James, and Judas Iscariot,
who became a traitor."

και σιμωνα τον καλουμενον
ζηλωτην
16. και ιουδαν ιακωβου και
ιουδαν σκαριωθ ος και εγενετο
προδοτης.

"14. First, Simon, whom he
also named Peter, and Andrew
his brother, and James and
John his brother, whom he
named Boanerges, that is sons
of thunder, and Philip, and
Bartholomew,

"15. And Matthew, and Thomas,
who is called Didymus, and
James, the son of Alphaeus,
and Simon, who is called
Zealot,

"16. And Judas the son of
James and Judas Iscariot,
who also became a traitor."

-
- v. 14. σιμωνα, ον και ωνομασεν πετρον] πρωτον σιμωνα ον
και πετρον επωνομασεν, D r
+ τον αδελφον αυτου ους επωνομασεν βοανηργες ο
εστιν υιοι βροντης post ιωανην, D
- v. 15. + τον επικαλουμενον δυδυμον και post θωμαν, D
+ τον του post ιακωβον, R D ⊕ 565 892
- v. 16. + και post ος, R D

It is obvious that D harmonizes Luke's roster of
the apostles with that of Matthew, Mark and John.⁴⁰ The
addition that interests us most is πρώτος ("first"), taken
from Matthew 10:2. Although Matthew identifies Peter with
the adjective "first," it does not have the same connota-
tion in his context as it does when D adds it to Luke's

⁴⁰πρώτον ("first") is taken from Matthew 10:2, the
sons of thunder is taken from Mark 3:17, the added infor-
mation about Thomas is from John 11:16, the two definite
articles in the genitive of relationship construction in
v. 15 are taken from Mark 3:18, and the addition of καί
("also") in v. 16 is from Mark 3:19.

context. A comparison of the background for each roster will show how πρώτος ("first") takes on added meaning in Luke's context:

Matthew 10:2

των δε δωδεκα αποστολων
τα ονοματα εστιν ταυτα
πρωτος σιμων. . . .

"And the names of the
twelve apostles are these,
first, Simon. . . ."

Luke 6:13,14⁴¹

13. και οτε εγενετο ημερα
προσεφωνησεν τους μαθητας
αυτου και εκλεξαμενος απ
αυτων δωδεκα ους και αποστο-
λους ωνομασεν
14. (πρωτον=D) σιμωνα. . . .

"13. And when day had come,
he called his disciples and
selected twelve from among
them, whom he also named
apostles.
"14. (First) Simon. . . ."

In Matthew's account Simon is identified as "first," being first in a list that is being given and not necessarily being first in station.⁴² In Luke's account, Jesus had called a large number of disciples together after a night of prayer and from this group he selected 12, the "first" selection being Simon.⁴³ The addition of πρώτος

⁴¹D reads practically the same as the normal text in these verses except for πρώτον.

⁴²Although this meaning could be inferred. However, reasons for understanding it this way are not as forceful as in D's account.

⁴³Schuyler Brown, Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), p. 95. Brown's observation that the apostle list stands in apposition to ἀποστόλους ("apostles") and is not the object of ἐκλεξάμενος ("selected") does not essentially change the impact of D's variant. He correctly points out that the object of ἐκλεξάμενος ("selected") is δώδεκα ("twelve"). "The result is that the object of the election

("first") in this context would seem to lay emphasis on rank or position. That D intended to present Peter as the leading apostle becomes obvious through additional editorial changes.

In the preceding chapter of Luke the author presents the account of the miraculous catch of fish which leads to Peter's call to discipleship. This pericope opens with Jesus being pressed by a crowd on the shore of Lake Gennesaret. He got into a small fishing boat, owned by Peter, and asked him to push away from shore a short distance; and from the boat Jesus taught the people. Upon completing his instruction, Jesus ordered Peter to go out into the lake and to lower his nets:

Luke 5:5,6

Codex B

5. και αποκριθεις σιμων
ειπεν επιστατα δι
ολης νυκτος κοπια-
σαντες ουδεν ελαβομεν
επι δε τῳ ρηματι σου
χαλασω τα δικτυα
6. και τουτο ποιησαντες
συνεκλεισαν πληθος ιχθυων
πολυ διερησσετο δε τα
δικτυα αυτων

"5. And Simon answered and
said, Master, we
labored through the whole

Codex D

5. ο δε σιμων αποκρεις
ειπεν αυτῳ διδασκαλε δι
ολης της νυκτος κοπια-
σαντες ουδεν ελαβομεν
επι δε τῳ ρηματι σου ου
μη παρακουσομαι
6. και ευθυς χαλασαντες τα
δικτυα συνεκλισαν ιχθυων
πληθος πολυ ωστε τα
δικτυα ρησσεσθαι

"5. And Simon answered and
said to him, Teacher, we
labored through the whole

of the earthly Jesus is not so much specific individuals or even 'the Twelve' in the sense of a definite group as it is the number twelve, the institution of 'twelve apostles' as such." The variant in D still lays stress upon the fact that in his text Peter is the "first" in the "number twelve."

night and caught nothing,
but at your word I shall
lower the nets.

"6. And when they had
done this they enclosed
a great multitude of
fish, and their nets
were breaking through."

night and caught nothing,
but to your word I shall
surely not be disobedient.

"6. And immediately when
they had lowered their nets
they enclosed a great mul-
titude of fish, so that the
nets began to break."

v. 5 και αποκριθεις σιμων ειπεν] ο δε σιμων αποκρεις
ειπεν, D

+ αυτω post. ειπεν, C R D Θ pl
επιστατα] διδασκαλε, D a cop^{sa}, bo
+ της ante νυκτος, C R D Θ pl

χαλασω τα δικτυα] ου μη παρακουσομαι, D e

v. 6 και τουτο ποιησαντες] και ευθυς χαλασαντες τα
δικτυα, D e

διερησσετο δε τα δικτυα αυτων] ωστε τα δικτυα
ρησσεσθαι, D e f r l

We are primarily interested in two of the above variants, the first being the change from ἐπιστάτα ("master") to διδάσκαλε ("teacher"). Before we investigate the meaning of these two words, it might be well to note that ἐπιστάτης ("master") is used in Luke alone: once by the apostle John (9:49); once by the disciples as a group (8:25); once by the ten lepers requesting healing (17:13); and three times by Peter (5:5; 8:45; 9:33). It would seem that the alteration of Peter's first use of the word might be significant. On the other hand, διδάσκαλος ("teacher") is used by Luke 17 times. Of these 17 appearances it is used by the disciples only once in addressing Jesus (21:7).⁴⁴

⁴⁴The term κύριος ("Lord") is used most frequently by the disciples in addressing Jesus, appearing 13 times.

Opinion is divided as to the significance of ἐπιστάτης ("master") in comparison with other forms of respectful address, such as διδάσκαλος ("teacher") which is substituted by D in Luke 5:5. Thayer tells us that ἐπιστάτης ("master") is to be understood as a sort of superintendent or a master, used in the sense of rabbi when used by the disciples in addressing Jesus, not necessarily from the fact that he was a teacher, but rather because of his authority.⁴⁵ J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel feel that ἐπιστάτης ("master") emphasizes an intimate, though respectful, relationship rather than authority.⁴⁶ Geldenhuys says that ἐπιστάτης ("master") is merely a synonym for διδάσκαλος ("teacher"), and both are traced back to rabbi.⁴⁷ Albrecht Oepke says that ἐπιστάτης ("master") is a translation for rabbi, and it is not an equivalent for διδάσκαλος ("teacher") or κύριος ("Lord").⁴⁸ S. M. Gilmour says that in Luke

⁴⁵Joseph Henry Thayer, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Associated Publishers and Authors Inc.), p. 243.

⁴⁶J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel, A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), p. 228.

⁴⁷Norval Geldenhuys, Commentary on the Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), p. 184.

⁴⁸Albrecht Oepke, "ἐπιστάτης," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Gerhard Kittel (ed.), trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Vol. II: Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971), p. 623.

ἐπιστάτης ("master") is used by the disciples, while non-disciples use διδάσκαλος ("teacher").⁴⁹ This would indicate that Gilmour did not view these two words as being synonymous, ἐπιστάτης ("master") being more intimate. However, Godet and Plummer take the opposite view. Ἐπιστάτης ("master") refers to any kind of oversight; it is more general than ραββί ("rabbi") or διδάσκαλος ("teacher").⁵⁰

It would seem that D did not see ἐπιστάτης ("master") and διδάσκαλος ("teacher") as being synonymous. As we have noted earlier, Jesus, prior to this pericope in chapter five, had worked in Galilee and had built a reputation as a teacher and healer. However, Luke gives no indication that Jesus had collected around him a body of disciples. Jesus had spent some time in Peter's home, but this does not seem to indicate to D that he was a disciple of Jesus (4:38-41). In chapter five, when Jesus concluded his teaching and ordered Peter out into the deep

⁴⁹S. MacLean Gilmour (ed.), The Gospel According to St. Luke, Vol. VII of The Interpreter's Bible, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (12 vols.: Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952), p. 101. We have already noted one occasion out of 17 where Luke has the disciples addressing Jesus as διδάσκαλος ("Teacher"). Luke alone uses this word, it is not in the parallel passages of Matthew and Mark.

⁵⁰F. A. Godet, A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, trans. from 2nd ed. by E. W. Shalders and M. D. Cusin (New York: I. K. Funk & Co., 1881), p. 165 and Plummer, p. 143.

for a catch of fish, D could conceive of Peter addressing Jesus as "teacher"⁵¹ but hardly as "master." There are as yet, in Luke, no grounds upon which Peter could use this term for Jesus; the call to discipleship is to follow.

After the miraculous catch, Luke changes Peter's form of address, "Depart from me, because I am a sinful man, Lord (κύριε)" (5:8). In calling Jesus "Lord," Luke indicates that Peter now sees Jesus in a different light than he did earlier. Although κύριε ("Lord") need not mean more than "sir," it seems that it must carry its full force of "Lord" here, at least for the author of Luke.⁵²

When D alters ἐπιστάτης ("master") to διδάσκαλος ("teacher") in v. 5, the change in Peter's view of Jesus by v. 8 is made more dramatic. Perhaps D is endeavoring to contrast the ready acceptance of Jesus on the part of Peter with the slowness of heart on the part of his fellow countrymen. Certainly Peter's acknowledgement of Jesus' authority stands in contrast with the reception he received just prior to this pericope at Nazareth, where the town's

⁵¹Although the word διδάσκαλος ("teacher") is used of men who have gathered about them a body of disciples, it is also used by non-disciples when addressing or referring to someone who indicates the way of God from the Torah. Luke uses the word in this latter context 14 out of 17 times, 2:46; 3:12; 7:40; 8:49; 9:38; 10:25; 11:45; 12:13; 18:18; 19:39; 20:21, 28, 39; 22:11. Cf. Kittel, pp. 152-53.

⁵²Creed, p. 75.

people tried to take Jesus' life by throwing him off a cliff.

The second variant that is of interest is at the conclusion of verse five. In the normal text Peter simply says, "I shall lower the nets," although he protests that such an action will be futile in view of the results of their night's work. D makes an interesting alteration. Although he may not be able to conceive of Peter calling Jesus "master" at this point, yet by this alteration he shows a changing attitude on Peter's part that culminates in Peter addressing Jesus as "Lord."

The statement, ". . . at your word I shall lower the nets," of the normal text displays a willingness by Peter to be obedient to the direction of Jesus. D's alteration, ". . . to your word I shall surely not be disobedient," places this thought in more explicit language. D's use of the double negative⁵³ lends strength to the contrast between Peter's willingness to obey and the rejection experienced by Jesus at Nazareth.

Carrying through his editorial scheme for this pericope, D takes advantage of another opportunity to intensify Peter's response to Jesus:

Luke 5:8,9

Codex B

Codex D

⁵³Cf. Robertson, pp. 1174-75.

8. ἰδων δε σιμων πετρος
προσεπεσεν τοις γονασιν
ἰϋ λεγων
εξελθε απ εμου οτι
ανηρ αμαρτωλος ειμι
κ̅ε

9. θαμβος γαρ περιεσχεν
αυτον και παντας τους
συν αυτω επι τη αγρα
των ιχθυων ων συνελαβον

"8. And when Simon Peter
saw, he fell at the
knees of Jesus saying,
Depart
from me, for I am a
sinful man, Lord.

"9. For amazement had
gripped him and all
those with him at the
catch of fish which
they had taken."

8. ο δε σιμων
προσεπεσεν αυτου τοις
ποσιν λεγων παρακαλω
εξελθε απ εμου οτι
ανηρ αμαρτωλος ειμι
κ̅ε

9. θαμβος γαρ περιεσχεν
αυτον
επι τη αγρα
των ιχθυων ων συνελαβον

"8. And Simon
fell at his
feet saying,
I beseech you, depart
from me, for I am a
sinful man, Lord.

"9. For amazement had
gripped him
at the
catch of fish which
they had taken."

v. 8 ἰδων δε σιμων πετρος] ο δε σιμων, D W 13 it sy^S
τοις γονασιν ἰϋ] αυτου τοις ποσιν, D λ 579 e sy
+ παρακαλω post λεγων, D it sy^P Tatian
v. 9 om. και παντας τους συν αυτω, D

Again in v. 8, D intensifies the demonstration of Peter's feelings. By prostrating Peter at Jesus' feet, instead of falling at his knees, and by adding, "I beseech you," D paints a vivid picture of Peter being under the conviction of Jesus' authority. It appears that D uses prostration at Jesus' feet as an expression of awe and a recognition of authority approaching that of worship.

In the account of the ten lepers, the one who returned to Jesus was a Samaritan. In Luke's normal tradition (17:16) this cleansed leper fell at Jesus' feet "thanking him." D omits the phrase "thanking him," simply saying

the man threw himself at Jesus' feet. The question is, What did D understand this gesture to mean? Because Jesus assured the leper that his faith had "saved" him, it is possible that D conceived of this gesture as an act of worship, an act that reveals a recognition of Jesus' Lordship. We will deal with the pericope of the ten lepers later, but in our present pericope the sight of Peter on his face at Jesus' feet is certainly a more vivid picture of Peter's recognition of Jesus' authority than falling at Jesus' knees.

By omitting the phrase, "and all those with him," and by altering the following verse, Peter is made the central figure in this experience of awe and expression of unworthiness. There is the possibility that D wished to set Peter forth as a type of all the others who were to become disciples with him, his reactions to Jesus and his relationship with him typifying the feelings and thinking of his partners, James and John. This seems to be the intent of the alteration of v. 10:⁵⁴

Luke 5:10,11

Codex B

Codex D

10. ομοιωσ δε και
ιακωβον και ιωανην υιους
ζεβεδαιου οι ησαν κοινωνοι
τω σιμωνι και ειπεν προς
τον σιμωνα τς μη φοβου

10. ησαν δε κοινωνοι αυτου
ιακωβος και ιωανης υιοι
ζεβεδαιου
ο δε ειπεν αυτοις
δευτε και μη γελνεσθε

⁵⁴Cf. a similar position taken by Mees, p. 107.

απο του νυν ανθρωπους
 εση ζωγων
 11. και καταγαγοντες τα
 πλοια επι την γην
 αφεντες παντα
 ηκολουθησαν αυτω

"10. And likewise
 James and John, sons
 of Zebedee, were partners
 with Simon; and Jesus
 said to Simon, Fear not,
 from now on you will be
 a catcher of men.

"11. And when they had
 beached the ships upon
 the land, forsaking
 everything, they fol-
 lowed him."

αλιεις ιχθυων ποιησω γαρ
 υμας αλιεις ανθρωπων
 11. οι δε ακουσαντες
 παντα κατελειψαν επι της γης
 και
 ηκολουθησαν αυτω

"10. And his partners
 were James and John, sons
 of Zebedee

and he said to
 them, Come and you shall
 not be fishers of fish,
 for I shall make you fishers
 of men.

"11. And those who heard
 left behind everything
 upon the land,
 and they fol-
 lowed him."

vv. 10, 11 ομοιως δε και ιακωβον και ιωαννης υιους
 ζεβεδαιου οι ησαν κοινωι τῷ σιμωνι και ειπεν προς
 τον σιμωνα τῷ μη φοβου απο του νυν ανθρωπους εση
 ζωγων και καταγαγοντες τα πλοια επι την γην
 αφεντες παντα] ησαν δε κοινωι αυτου ιακωβος και
 ιωαννης υιοι ζεβεδαιου ο δε ειπεν αυτοις δευτε και
 μη γεινεσθε αλιεις ιχθυων ποιησω γαρ υμας αλιεις
 ανθρωπων οι δε ακουσαντες παντα κατελειψαν επι της
 γης και, D

In the normal text of Luke, James and John share
 in Peter's astonishment at the catch of fish (5:9); in
 D's alteration they do not. Yet, in D Jesus extends the
 call to become fishers of men to James and John as well as
 to Peter, whereas in the normal text the call is given to
 Peter alone. It would seem that the expression of Peter's
 feelings is taken by D as an expression of the feelings of
 the other two men, thus putting Peter forward in a place
 of prominence. In the normal text, the element of fear is

attributed to Peter in the words of Jesus. In altering the text and making Jesus address James and John, as well as Peter, this element of fear is removed by D; thus establishing an attitude of respect and awe on the part of these future disciples, and not one of fear.

Peter is later shown to be the leader and spokesman of this favored group of three apostles by a harmonization that is made in D. The setting is the transfiguration and the alteration occurs in Peter's reaction to the scene:

Luke 9:33

Codex B

. . . ειπεν ο πετρος προς
τον ιν επιστατα καλον
εστιν ημας ωδε ειναι και
ποιησωμεν σκηνας τρις
. . . .

". . . Peter said to Jesus,
Master, it is good for
us to be here, let us
also build
three booths. . . ."

Codex D

. . . ειπεν ο πετρος
τω ιηυ επιστατα καλον
εστιν ημας ωδε ειναι θελεις
ποιησω ωδε τρεις σκηνας
. . . .

". . . Peter said to Jesus,
Master, it is good for
us to be here, if you
wish, I shall build here
three booths. . . ."

προς τον ιν] τω ιηυ, D
και ποιησωμεν σκηνας τρις] θελεις ποιησω ωδε τρις σκηνας,
D cop^b Tatian

Both alterations are harmonizations with Matthew 17:4, the second being lifted intact except for the omission of εἰ ("if"), which must be understood when translating D's alteration. The three parallel passages in D (Matthew 17:4; Mark 9:5; Luke 9:33) present an interesting puzzle. In the normal text of each passage, Luke follows

Mark and they both read "let us make" as opposed to Peter's self-assertion in Matthew, "if you are willing, I shall make." D alters Matthew to the reading of Mark and Luke while retaining the condition, "if you are willing, let us make." On the other hand, D alters the reading in Mark and Luke to the self-assertiveness of Matthew, "if you are willing, I shall make." Interestingly, in both Mark and Luke D omits the particle εἰ ("if") that is found in Matthew's normal text.

The reason for the change in Luke emerges clearly from D's editorial design, i.e. the desire to picture Peter as the leader of the apostolic group. D's similar alteration in Mark may arise from the same desire; if so, D is being consistent in his editorial scheme. The puzzling question is, Why did he alter Matthew's "if you wish, I will make, . . ." which pictures Peter as the leader, to read as the normal text of Mark and Luke "let us make . . .?"⁵⁵

By D's alteration in Luke Peter is set forth as the leader and the dominant personality of the three apostles. This is underscored by the change from the

⁵⁵This question is only illustrative of the need for a comparative study of the variants in Matthew and Mark to see if there is an editorial scheme behind their appearances that is similar to the one found in Luke, or whether variants appear in these two books stemming from conflicting interests.

hortatory subjunctive to first class conditional.

We have noted in Chapter One that one of the characteristics of Luke's gospel is the way in which he handled the apostles with gentle hands.⁵⁶ D, by his editorial changes, tends to go one step beyond Luke and to protect them from some of the negative aspects that Luke was willing to recognize. In the two variants of the following verses, D appears to make omissions in order to preserve the reputation of the disciples. Jesus had just remarked that the Son of Man was to be delivered into the hands of men. The disciples were at a loss to understand his words. Luke's account will be picked up at this point:

Luke 9:45,46

Codex B

45. οι δε ηγνοουν το ρημα
τουτο και ην παρακεκαλυμμενον
απ αυτων ινα μη αισθωνται
αυτο και εφοβουντο ερωτησαι
αυτον περι του ρηματος τουτου.
46. εισηλθεν δε διαλογισμος
εν αυτοις το τις αν ειη
μειζων αυτων.

"45. And they did not understand this saying and it was concealed from them in order that they might not perceive it, and they were afraid to ask him concerning this saying.
"46. And a dispute entered in among them as to which of them was the greatest."

Codex D

45. οι δε ηγνοουν το ρημα
τουτο και ην κεκαλυμμενον
απ αυτων ινα μη αισθωνται
αυτο και εφοβουντο επερωτησαι
περι του ρηματος τουτου.
46.
το τις αν ειη
μειζων αυτων.

"45. And they did not understand this saying and it was concealed from them in order that they might not perceive it, and they were afraid to ask concerning this saying.
"46.
as to which of them was the greatest."

⁵⁶Cf. Brown, p. 72 for an opposing view.

v. 45 om. αυτον, D

v. 46 om. εισηλθεν δε διαλογισμος εν αυτοις, D

The omission of εισηλθεν δε διαλογισμος εν αυτοις ("And a dispute entered in among them") makes the transition between v. 44 and v. 46 very awkward and the thought sequence in vv. 44 through 46 confusing. One possible explanation of the omission is that it is a homoeoteleuton, the αυτοις ("them") at the end of the omitted phrase being confused by the eye of the copyist with τουτου ("this") just prior to the omission. However, the confusion of these two words does not seem too likely, especially if the copyist was reading what he was copying. It would seem that the copyist omitted this phrase to protect the apostles against the slander of allowing disputes to exist among them.⁵⁷

The awkwardness of the thought transition from v. 44 to v. 46 can be partially eliminated by dividing the thought content of v. 45. The meaning of the Son of Man being handed over to men (v. 44) would remain hidden to the apostles in v. 45. The fear they felt about asking "concerning this word" would be connected with "who was to be the greatest" in v. 46. This is the way F. H. A.

⁵⁷Although 22:24-27 is altered by D, he does not attempt to protect the apostles from the charge of having contentions among them in this passage.

Luke they began to discuss among themselves which one of them it would be. D's alteration causes the disciples to look beyond themselves for the betrayer, thus endeavoring to turn the eye of suspicion away from this favored group.

D also endeavors to place the general body of disciples, as well as the twelve, in a more favorable light. That his death caught all completely unprepared, in spite of the number of times Jesus referred to his coming passion, is a fundamental element in the gospel tradition. D tries to soften the reproach that this unpreparedness was the result of unbelief:

Luke 24:25

Codex B

και αυτος ειπεν προς αυτους
ω ανοητοι και βραδεις τη
καρδια του πιστευειν επι
πασιν οις ελαλησαν οι
προφηται

"And he said to them, Oh foolish and slow in heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken."

Codex D

ο δε ειπεν προς αυτους
ω ανοητοι και βραδεις τη
καρδια επι
πασιν οις ελαλησαν οι
προφηται

"And he said to them, Oh foolish and slow in heart with respect to all that the prophets have spoken."

om. του πιστευειν, D

D is content to allow Jesus to reproach these two doubting disciples for being dull and slow in understanding the Old Testament prophecies that point to the events that caught everyone unprepared, but he endeavors to protect the disciples from the charge of unbelief. Omitting τοῦ

There are three things that must be noticed here:

(1) in the B text the definite article τῶν serves the two nouns τελωνῶν ("publicans") and ἀμαρτωλῶν ("sinners"), thus equating the two.⁵⁹ Levi being a publican (5:27) is thus identified as a sinner in the B text. (2) The phrase "publicans and sinners" appears twice more in Luke (7:34; 15:1) and D makes no attempt to alter these passages, because these phrases are not identified with the disciples. (3) D does not alter the parallel passages to Luke 5:30, but allows "publicans and sinners" to stand together.⁶⁰ Therefore it becomes apparent that D was concerned with the image of the disciples in Luke and does what he can to minimize their faults and to picture them as men who deserve the respect of later generations.

It appears that D may have wanted to keep the privilege and rewards of discipleship exclusively for the twelve and 72. Yet he is somewhat freer than the normal text of Luke in allowing others to share in the benefits of Jesus' instruction.

In Chapter Six is found the pericope in which Jesus sets aside the twelve for their special work. After their

⁵⁹Robertson, pp. 785-88. Cf. Plummer, p. 160.

⁶⁰This again points out the necessity of a careful study of D in Matthew and Mark to determine if there are similar editorial concerns present that explain such apparent inconsistencies.

selection Jesus and the newly chosen apostles, with the larger group of disciples from which the apostles had been taken, went down off the mountain, where Jesus had spent the night praying, and met a large number of people on a level place. In the presence of the multitude Jesus instructed the disciples. D is careful to limit the number of disciples who were present to a group comparable in size to those who were conceivably with Jesus on the mountain, and from whom he selected the twelve:

Luke 6:17

και καταβας μετ αυτων εστη
επι τοπου πεδινου και οχλος
πολυς μαθητων αυτου και
πληθος πολυ του λαου. . . .

"And when he had descended
with them, he stood upon
a flat place with a great
crowd of his disciples and
a great multitude of people
. . . ."

και καταβας μετ αυτων εστη
επει τοπου πεδεινου και οχλος
μαθητων αυτου και
πληθος πολυ του λαου. . . .

"And when he had descended
with them, he stood upon
a flat place with a
crowd of his disciples and
a great multitude of people
. . . ."

om. πολυς, D

The "crowd" of disciples in D, from whom Jesus had just chosen the twelve, could conceivably have been, in D's thinking, the larger group that now numbered 72. The assembling of the 72, plus the twelve just selected, could be ὄχλος μαθητῶν ("a crowd of disciples"), but hardly ὄχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν ("a great crowd of disciples") when they are placed beside πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ("a great multitude of people").

D shows his tendency to think of the disciples as an exclusive group in another way. On one occasion, when the multitude that had gathered to hear Jesus was so large that they trod on one another, Jesus spoke of the rewards of discipleship. In 12:37 the faithful disciple is pictured as having a place at a banquet at which the Lord personally serves him. Inspired by the thought, Peter spoke for the assembled disciples:

Luke 12:41

Codes B

Codex D

ειπεν δε ο πετρος $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$
 προς ημας την παραβολην
 ταυτην λεγεις η και προς
 παντας

και ειπεν ο πετρος $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$
 προς ημας λεγεις την
 παραβολην ταυτην

"And Peter said, Lord,
 do you speak this parable
 to us or to all men also?"

"And Peter said, Lord,
 do you speak this parable
 to us?"

om. η και προς παντας, D

One could conclude that the omitted phrase, "or to all men also," is implied by the shortened form of Peter's question. However, because the phrase is present in the normal text and is omitted by D alone, and homoeoteleuton does not seem to be a possibility, the reader is left with the impression that D favored the disciples as an exclusive group. Peter addresses his inquiry to the issue of whether the disciples ought not to have exclusive right to being served by "the Lord" at the banquet, since they will play

the chief part in his kingdom.⁶¹

Jesus' answer to Peter's question is a parable about faithful and unfaithful stewards. In the normal text Jesus' parable would imply that Jesus is addressing all his hearers, and that the rewards of the marriage supper are available to all men. But D's alteration of Peter's question changes the meaning of Jesus' answer. It would appear that in the context of Peter's question in D, Jesus' parable applies only to his immediate disciples.

Luke also presents a number of other occasions when Jesus gave specific instruction to his disciples in the presence of a multitude of people,⁶² thus allowing all his hearers to benefit from the instruction. There were other occasions when Jesus communed with the disciples in

⁶¹As to whether Peter's question in v. 41 refers to the banquet in v. 37 or to the coming of the Son of Man at an unexpected hour in vv. 39,40, see Godet, p. 349; Creed, p. 177; Plummer, p. 331; J. J. van Oosterzee, The Gospel According to Luke, Vol. XVII of Lange's Commentary, trans. from 2nd German edition by Philip Schaff and Charles C. Starbuck (25 vols.: New York: Charles Scribner's Sons), p. 204; and Tinsley, p. 142, who favor the banquet; and Geldenhuys, p. 363, who favors the coming of the Son of Man.

⁶²Cf. 6:20-49; 8:9-16; 9:23-27, 43-45; 12:1-59, etc. There are several long passages of instruction addressed to the disciples, in which no mention is made of the multitude; however, this instruction is interrupted by questions from and remarks by Jesus to non-disciples; therefore, it is assumed that this instruction was also given in the presence of the multitude. Cf. 16-17:10; 17:22-18:14.

private.⁶³ D opens one of these intimate occasions to the public ear:

Luke 10:23,24

Codex B

23. και στραφεις προς τους μαθητας κατ ιδιαν ειπεν
μακαριοι οι οφθαλμοι
οι βλεποντες α βλεπετε

24. λεγω γαρ υμιν οτι πολλοι προφηται και βασιλεις ηθελησεν ιδειν α υμεις βλεπετε και ουκ ειδαν και ακουσαι μου α ακουετε και ουκ ηκουσαν

"23. And turning to the disciples he said privately, Blessed are the eyes that see what you see.

"24. For I say to you that many prophets and kings desired to see what you see and they saw not, and to hear what you hear, and they heard not."

Codex D

23. στραφεις δε προς τους μαθητας ειπεν αυτοις μακαριοι οι οφθαλμοι οι βλεποντες α βλεπετε και ακουοντες α ακουετε.

24. λεγω γαρ υμειν οτι πολλοι προφηται ηθελησαν ειδειν α υμεις βλεπετε και ουκ ειδον και ακουσαι α υμεις ακουετε και ουκ ηκουσαν

"23. And turning to the disciples he said to them, Blessed are the eyes that see what you see and hear what you hear.

"24. For I say to you that many prophets desired to see what you see and they saw not, and to hear what you hear, and they heard not."

-
- v. 23 om. κατ ιδιαν, D 157 1424 lat sy^{sc}
+ αυτοις post ειπεν, D 1 131 209 e cop^{sa,bo}
+ και ακουοντες α ακουετε post βλεπετε, D
- v. 24 om. και βασιλεις, D it Marcion
om. μου, rell, p⁷⁵ B 0124
+ υμεις ante ακουετε, D it

Although D is somewhat exclusive in wanting to keep some aspects of the Messianic banquet for the disciples only, in the first variant in the above verses he shows a universalism. The blessing that Jesus pronounced upon

⁶³Cf. 9:18-22; 18:31-34; 22:14-38.

those who heard his words and saw his deeds should be shared by all who were eyewitnesses, according to D. Therefore, he omits κατ' ἰδίαν ("privately") and includes the multitude as Jesus speaks to the disciples.

Among the gospel writers it is Luke who informs us that there was a group of women who joined the company of disciples and played a significant supporting role in Jesus' life and ministry.⁶⁴ In a society where women were not emancipated, the role that they play in the Gospel of Luke is quite significant. On one occasion Martha invited Jesus to stay at her home. Her busy activity and much serving indicate that at least the twelve apostles were also present. However, Jesus gently rebukes her for turning her attention to mundane things instead of taking advantage of the spiritual instruction as her sister Mary was doing. The copyist of D was evidently touched by Martha's ministry and softens Jesus' gentle rebuke:

Luke 10:41,42

Codex B

Codex D

41. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν
αὐτῇ ὁ ἰησοῦς μαρθα μαρθα
μεριμνας καὶ θορυβαζῆ
περὶ πολλὰ
42. ὀλιγῶν δὲ χρεῖα
ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνὸς μαριαμ

41. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἰησοῦς
εἶπεν αὐτῇ μαρθα μαρθα
θορυβαζῆ
42.
μαρια

⁶⁴Cf. 8:13; 10:38-41; 23:55,56; 24:23. For the role of women in Luke's gospel see Charles M. Laymon, Luke's Portrait of Christ (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), pp. 106-09.

γαρ την αγαθην μεριδα
εξελεξατο ητις ουκ
αφαιρεθησεται αυτης.

"41. And answering, the
Lord said to her,
Martha, Martha, you are
anxious and troubled
over many things,

"42. But only one thing
is needful. For Mary has
chosen the good portion
which shall not be taken
away from her."

την αγαθην μεριδα
εξελεξατο η ουκ
αφαιρεθησεται αυτης.

"41. And answering, Jesus
said to her,
Martha, Martha, you are
troubled,

"42. Mary has
chosen the good portion
which shall not be taken
away from her."

v. 41 ο κς] ο της, R D cop^{sa,bo} sy^{CS}

vv. 41,42 μεριμνας και θορυβαζη περι πολλα ολιγων δε χρεια
εστιν η ενος] θορυβαζη, D

v. 42 om. γαρ, D 262 270 372 lat sy^{CS}

Metzger feels these two clauses were omitted from it and sy^S because they were incomprehensible, or an accident, or because of homoeoarcton (μαρθα . . . μαριάμ).⁶⁵ The fact that D uses θορυβάζη ("troubled") indicates his source contained the normal text. Metzger says that θορυβάζεσθαι ("to be troubled") is rare and troublesome and is frequently replaced by τυρβάζειν ("to trouble").⁶⁶ By retaining θορυβάζη of the normal text while omitting the remainder of the clauses, D shows that he wished Jesus to deal gently with Martha.

This gentleness would seem to grow out of D's alteration in v. 42. The normal text points out that Martha is lacking something that Jesus considers very important, i.e. the spiritual instruction that Mary is

⁶⁵Metzger, p. 154. ⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 153-54.

receiving. In D's text the statement of this need by Jesus is omitted, thus implying that Martha was not lacking in this important area and again softening Jesus' dealing with this woman.

Although D shows evidence of being touched by Martha's ministry to Jesus and the apostles,⁶⁷ he proves to be more of a male chauvinist than Luke. Where Luke is willing to include these dedicated women within the privileged circle of Jesus' chosen disciples,⁶⁸ D is not. As Jesus walked with two of his disciples to Emmaus after his resurrection, the disciples spoke of what these women had witnessed at the tomb that very morning:

Luke 24:22

Codex B

αλλα και γυναικες τινες
εξ ημων εξεστησαν ημας
γεναμεναι ορθριναι επι
το μνημειον

"But certain women also
from among us amazed us,
being at the tomb early
in the morning."

Codex D

αλλα και γυναικες τινες
εξεστησαν ημας
γενομεναι ορθριναι επει
το μνημειον

"But certain women also
amazed us,
being at the tomb early
in the morning."

⁶⁷Michael Mees, "Sinn und Bedeutung literarischer Formen für die Textgestalt des Codex Bezae in Lukas 10-11," *Vetera Christianorum*, VII,1(1970), 66,67.

⁶⁸"The Emmaus disciples refer to the women, who were also distinct from the apostles, as 'some women of our company' . . . but they designate the apostles as 'some of those who were with us' . . . , not 'some of our company.' . . . This differentiation points to their awareness of their status as 'associate members' in the circle of Jesus' disciples." Brown, p. 76.

om. ἐξ ἡμῶν, D 157

By the omission of ἐξ ἡμῶν ("from among us") D indicates that he is not willing to number these women among the disciples; however their role as close followers of Jesus is firmly established in Luke's tradition,⁶⁹ as has already been pointed out.

In the normal text of Luke, discipleship is treated as a serious matter.⁷⁰ Luke alone records the admonition of Jesus that if anyone is to follow him, he is to deny himself, taking up his cross daily (9:23). It is Luke also who reports the reaction of Jesus to a man who expressed a desire to follow him but felt obligated to take care of personal business before he joined the disciples:

Luke 9:62

Codex B

ειπεν δε ο $\overline{\tau\varsigma}$ ουδεις
 επιβαλων την χειρα επ
 αροτρον και βλεπων εις
 τα οπισω ευθετος εστιν
 τη βασιλεια του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$

"And Jesus said,
 No one, when he has
 placed his hand upon the
 plow and looking back,

Codex D

ο δε $\overline{\tau\eta\varsigma}$ ειπεν αυτω ουδεις
 εις τα οπισω βλεπων και
 επιβαλων την χειρα αυτου
 επ' αροτρον ευθετος εστιν
 εις την βασιλειαν του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$

"And Jesus said to him,
 No one, while looking
 back and placing his hand
 on the plow,

⁶⁹Cf. Creed, pp. 293-94.

⁷⁰For a detailed discussion of Luke's view of discipleship, cf. Brown, pp. 53-148.

is fit for the kingdom
of God."

is fit for the kingdom
of God."

+ αυτω post ειπεν, D e
επιβαλων . . . οπισω] εις τα οπισω βλεπων και επιβαλλον
την χειρα αυτου επ' αροτρον, P⁴⁵ D it Cl
τη βασιλεια εις την βασιλειαν, C R D Θ pl

Concerning the change in word order of the longest variant
in this verse, Metzger says:

The curious variation in the order of the participles
(εις τα οπισω βλεπων και επιβαλλον την χειρα αυτου επ'
αροτρον) in several witnesses (P⁷⁵vid D ita,b,c,d,e,
(1),q al) is probably due to scribal inadvertance; in
any case, the reading scarcely makes sense.⁷¹

L. Cerfaux, however, disagrees with Metzger and
accepts the reading of D as the best of three possibili-
ties.⁷² He sees the normal text of Luke as picturing the
man, with the plow handle in hand, looking behind him; as
a result the worker has taken his eye off of his fixed
target ahead of him and the result will be sloppy, infer-
ior work, i.e. crooked furrows. The man in D's variant
is seen by Cerfaux as looking behind him while he gropes

⁷¹Metzger, p. 149.

⁷²L. Cerfaux, "Variantes de Lc. IX, 62," Ephemerides
Theologicae Lovanienses, XII(1935), 326-328. The three pos-
sibilities are as follows:

a. επιβαλων
I. ουδεις b. επιβαλλον την χειρα
επ' αροτρον και βλεπων εις τα οπισω a. having placed
("No one b. placing

the hand upon the plow and looking back"), and II. ουδεις
εις τα οπισω βλεπων και επιβαλλον την χειρα επ' αροτρον ("No
one looking back and placing the hand upon the plow"). Ac-
cording to Cerfaux, reading Ia is supported by S, B, C, Origen,
fams. 1, 13, and T. R. Reading Ib is supported by L, A, W, Θ;
and reading II by D, a, b, c, e, q, and Cyprian.

for the plow handle with his hand, ". . . the second has not even begun."⁷³

Commenting on the idea of discipleship contained in the normal text, Brown says:

Discipleship requires an immediate, total, and undiverted commitment to Jesus and the gospel. Not even a temporary abandonment of Jesus in order to perform an act of filial piety is permitted (Lk. 9:59-60).⁷⁴

The variant in D underscores the unfitness for work in God's kingdom of one who is not totally committed to the task by making Jesus' statement in the normal text apply more directly to the man he was addressing; for this man had not, as yet, laid his hand to the plow and already was asking leave of Jesus for personal reasons.

Conclusion

That D shows special interest in the New Testament characters that are close to Jesus can be pointed out by editorial alterations made by D in connection with Mary, Jesus' mother, John the Baptist, and the disciples. The following points have been noted in connection with Mary:

1. Mary's significance is heightened by the angel's proclamation, "Blessed art thou among women," and by an alteration that places Mary in the Davidic descent.

2. Because Mary was chosen to be the earthly mother of Jesus, D apparently regarded her as fully worthy

⁷³Ibid., pp. 327-28. ⁷⁴Brown, p. 82.

of the honor; therefore he removes her from the stigma that is borne by the name Nazareth. However, Jesus' connection with Nazareth is not eliminated because it fulfills Old Testament prophecy and supports the Christian belief that Jesus was the promised Messiah.

Concerning John we have noted the following:

1. D makes the angel's statement on the naming of John a sacred formula, thus emphasizing the divine commissioning of John.

2. The loosening of Zacharias's tongue is reported in such a way that the supernatural is emphasized in connection with John.

3. D heightens the reaction of the people to these strange events and centers this reaction in John, not in Zacharias and Elizabeth as Luke does in his normal text.

4. D guards John's calling by not following Luke in saying that Zacharias "prophesied." The position of prophet is reserved for John.

5. The prophecy of Isaiah 40:3 is altered by D so that it ties in more directly with the preaching and ministry of John.

6. Luke's normal tradition is followed to its logical conclusion by D putting into the mouth of John's audience the question, "What shall we do that we might be saved?" By so doing, D again ties John into the prophecy

of Isaiah 40:3 and endeavors to show that John and his ministry have a direct connection with God's plan of offering salvation to all mankind.

7. By altering John's method of baptism and making him read the unspoken thoughts of the crowds who came to hear him, D ties the ministry of the forerunner closer to the Messiah than Luke does. This results in making both John and his ministry of more significance than we find in Luke's normal tradition.

From what has been presented with respect to the disciples, we may conclude the following:

1. Peter is identified as the "first" of the twelve apostles and made the spokesman and leader of the three who were favored above the other nine.

2. D endeavors to preserve the image of Jesus' close followers in four ways by: (1) eliminating, at least once, the fact that there was a spirit of contention among the apostles over who was to be the greatest, (2) temporarily removing suspicion from the twelve as the group from which Jesus' betrayer would appear, (3) allowing Jesus to rebuke the two disciples on the road to Emmaus for their slowness in grasping the prophecies that pointed to his passion, but eliminating Jesus' rebuke that they were also slow to believe, and (4) omitting the word that would identify Levi as a sinner.

3. The immediate followers of Jesus are viewed as an exclusive group. Although D shows evidence of being moved by Martha's ministry, he does not allow the women who followed Jesus and ministered to him and the apostles to be numbered as a part of this group.

4. D emphasizes the seriousness and the sacredness of the call to discipleship.

CHAPTER III

THE GLORIFIED JESUS

As we have seen in the previous chapter, there is a tendency in D to magnify the significance of prominent characters who are closely associated with Jesus and have a prominent role to play in the narrative. As we shall see in this present chapter, D also tends to magnify and glorify the major personality in Luke's tradition, Jesus Christ.

The variants within this chapter will be divided according to their subject content. This division will not be absolute, for the nature of some of the variants requires some flexibility in the subdivisions in order to allow their evidence to make a contribution.

The Child Jesus

The first variant in this present series seems to be the result of confusion caused by Luke's normal text. We shall consider it here because of the amount of interest it has created:

Luke 2:22

Codex B

Codex D

και οτε επλησθησαν αι
ημεραι καθαρισμου

και οτε επλησθησαν αι
ημεραι του καθαρισμου

αυτων κατα τον νομον
 μωυσεως ανηγαγον αυτον εις
 ιεροσολυμα παραστησαι
 τῷ ἡϙ̄

"And when the days of
 their purification
 were completed accord-
 ing to the law of Moses,
 they brought him to
 Jerusalem to present
 him to the Lord."

αυτου κατα τον νομον
 μωυσεως ανηγαγον αυτον εις
 ιεροσολυμα παραστησαι
 ἡϙ̄

"And when the days of
 his purification
 were completed accord-
 ing to the law of Moses,
 they brought him to
 Jerusalem to present
 him to the Lord."

αυτων] αυτου, D 2174 cop^{sa} sy^s

According to the Mosaic law, only the mother was to undergo a period of purification. After 40 days (in the case of the birth of a male child) the mother was to present an offering at the temple to complete the rite of purification (Leviticus 12:1-18). The problem presented by the normal text is this: whom does αὐτῶν ("their") refer to? Some commentators feel it refers to Mary and the child.¹ Others believe it refers to Joseph and Mary.²

The question of the necessity of Mary's purification has been raised by some scholars. Williams says that Luke may well have written this verse somewhat loosely. Therefore, the pronoun αὐτῶν ("their") was altered to αὐτοῦ ("his") intentionally to indicate a belief in the

¹Cf. Geldenhuys, pp. 117-18; Creed, p. 39.

²Gilmour, p. 60; William F. Arndt, The Gospel According to St. Luke (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), p. 89; van Oosterzee, p. 44; and Plummer, p. 63.

virgin conception,³ i.e. Mary was not defiled by a man; therefore, she would need no purification; and the αὐτοῦ ("his") would apply to Jesus.

This position, of course, raises a question about the proper understanding of the original Mosaic instruction in Leviticus 12:4-6. Is the purification required because of the act of conception or because of giving birth? Also, one might add, the law does not require the purification of the child.

Arndt tells us that there are some writers such as Hauck who believe that originally "her" purification was spoken of, but "her" was changed to "their" because it seemed offensive to speak of the purification of the Mother of God.⁴ However, Plummer points out that no uncial and perhaps only one cursive (76) supports αὐτῆς ("her"), and that "her" probably spread from the Complutensian Polyglott to a number of editions.⁵

W. H. P. Hatch believes the first two chapters of Luke are based on a Semitic source.⁶ The source of Luke

³Williams, Alterations, p. 29.

⁴Arndt, p. 90. ⁵Plummer, p. 63.

⁶W. H. P. Hatch, "The Text of Luke II,22," Harvard Theological Review, XIV(1921), 379. The question of Semitisms in D, and the 'Western' text in general, has been a hotly debated issue. The literature on this question is voluminous; only a representative listing is given here. Matthew Black; S. P. Brock, "A Note on Luke IX.16 (D)," Journal of Theological Studies, XIV(1963), 391-93; C. C.

probably had ירטיכרוחה. The suffix כרוחה was intended to read feminine, meaning "her purification"; however, Luke, or whoever translated the source into Greek, took it as a masculine and wrote αὐτοῦ ("his"), no doubt being influenced by the account of the circumcision and the naming of Jesus in the preceding verse.⁷

Paul Glaue has offered a solution similar to that of Hatch, without appealing to Semitisms. He suggests that many variants in the New Testament arose from an abbreviation of αὐτός, which was written αὐτ', thus a copyist was left to write the pronoun to fit his understanding of the verse, either αὐτοῦ, αὐτῆς, or αὐτῶν. Glaue feels that 76 is correct in reading αὐτῆς ("her").⁸

If the basic theory of Hatch and Glaue is correct, i.e. the gender of the pronoun was misunderstood, what led D to write αὐτοῦ ("his")? In this passage two regulations

Torrey, Documents of the Primitive Church (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941); A. J. Wensinck, "The Semitisms of Codex Bezae and their Relation to the non-Western Text of the Gospel of Luke," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, XII(1937), 11-48; Paul Winters, "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," New Testament Studies, I(1954/55), 110-21; James D. Yoder, "Semitisms in Codex Bezae," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVIII(1959), 317-21; idem., "The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae," Novum Testamentum (reprint), Vol. III, Fasc. 4, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959), 241-48.

⁷Hatch, p. 379.

⁸Paul Glaue, "Einige Stellen, die die Bedeutung des Codex D charakterisieren," Novum Testamentum, II(1958), 311.

of the Mosaic law are being dealt with, the purification rites of the mother (Leviticus 12:1-18) and the redemption of the firstborn male child (Exodus 13:1-2; Numbers 18:15, 16). Gilmour suggests that Luke may have confused the two.⁹ If Luke did confuse the two, thinking that the purification of the mother and the redemption of the infant son was one rite, this would account for αὐτῶν ("their").

The central theme of this pericope is the finding of the infant in the temple by Simeon and Anna, and the subsequent presentation of the infant. D must have taken the phrase ἀνήγαγον αὐτόν ("they took him") in v. 22 as the key, and thus that "the purification" was "his" purification, and was the one thing that prevented his parents from taking him to the temple earlier. Therefore, D wrote "his" to coincide with his understanding of the import of the passage.

The following variant involves a very minor change in the normal text, but the alteration produces an interesting reading and is included here to show that D, even by minor grammatical alterations, can produce a significant reading that will maintain his editorial designs:

⁹Gilmour, p. 60. Cf. Creed, p. 39, Easton, p. 26, and Mees, "Lukas 1-9," p. 97, who agree with Gilmour that both the purification and redemption rites are combined in αὐτῶν ("their"), but who also after mentioning the separation into the two personal pronouns αὐτῆς ("her") and αὐτοῦ ("his"), offer no possible solution as to why D ties αὐτοῦ with the purification.

Luke 2:40

Codex B

το δε παιδιον
 ηυξανεν και εκραταιουτο
 πληρουμενον σοφια και
 χαρις $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ ην επ αυτο

"And the child
 grew and increased in
 strength being filled
 with wisdom and the
 favor of God was upon
 him."

Codex D

το δε παιδιον $\overline{\tau\eta\varsigma}$
 εκραταιουτο και ηυξανετο
 πληρουμενον σοφιας και
 χαρις $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ ην εν αυτω

"And the child Jesus
 increased in strength
 and grew being filled
 with wisdom, and
 divine loveliness was in
 him."

+ $\overline{\tau\eta\varsigma}$ post παιδιον, D
 επ αυτο] εν αυτω, D

The first thing that should be noted is the absence of the definite article before $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ ("God") in the normal text. This takes on significance when we realize that θεός ("God") appears 120 times in the normal text of Luke and of these 120 appearances it has the definite article 108 times. It appears only 12 times without the article.¹⁰

Moreover, the usual English translation of the verse supplies the definite article ("the favor") which is absent in the Greek text. The significance of the omission of this article seems to have led D to alter the preposition from ἐπί ("upon") to ἐν ("in").

Dana and Mantey are quite positive about the importance of the use of the definite article: "Scholars have

¹⁰Cf. The New Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament (Wilmington: Associated Publishers & Authors, 1972), pp. 364-65.

not accorded it sufficient attention, nor sought with proper diligence to apprehend the real genius underlying its various uses."¹¹ Our major concern here is that the absence of the article quite frequently indicates the qualitative aspect of the noun.¹²

In our present verse we have an anarthrous noun modified by a second anarthrous noun in the genitive case. This is one construction identified by grammarians in which the genitive noun may express quality (θεοῦ = deity or divine). Since Luke uses the article with θεός ("God") 90% of the time, the use of θεός ("God") without the article might very well prove to be significant.

Χάρις in 2:40 is generally translated "favor" or "grace" because it fits nicely with the sense of ἐπ'αὐτό ("upon him"). Arndt and Gingrich, however, give "favor" and "grace" as a second possibility for the translation of this word. The first possibility is "graciousness, attractiveness."¹³ Moulton and Milligan also give "favor" as a

¹¹H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957), p. 136.

¹²Cf. Blass and DeBrunner, p. 132; Dana and Mantey, p. 149; Philip B. Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1," Journal of Biblical Literature, XCII(1973), 75-87; J. H. Moulton, Prolegomena to the Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. I (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906), p. 83; Robertson, p. 794.

¹³Arndt and Gingrich, p. 885.

second possibility, with "grace, graciousness" as their first listing.¹⁴ Liddell and Scott give "outward grace or favor . . . loveliness" as the first possibility.¹⁵ Thayer agrees with Arndt and Gingrich by listing "grace" and "favor" as a second possibility. For the first possibility Thayer says, "Prop. that which affords joy, pleasure, delight, sweetness, charm, loveliness."¹⁶

Understanding that one of the basic meanings of χάρις is attractiveness or loveliness, and knowing that a noun without an article can express quality, D instituted a simple change in the preposition, from ἐπί ("upon") to ἐν ("in"), and changed Luke's normal tradition from, "And the grace (or favor) of God was upon him," to a reading that magnifies the personality and character of the child, "And divine loveliness (graciousness, sweetness, or charm) was in him."

The Messianic King

Two of the most fascinating variants to be found in D's text of St. Luke stand side by side in 3:22--the

¹⁴James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952), p. 684.

¹⁵An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon Founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), p. 882.

¹⁶Thayer, p. 665.

heavenly voice that was heard at Jesus' baptism, and in 3:23-38--the genealogy of Jesus.

The alteration made in the words of the heavenly voice has occasioned a lively discussion by almost every commentator and scholar interested in the textual problems of the New Testament, while the differences between the genealogies found in Matthew and Luke in the normal text have raised a seemingly endless debate. D's alterations add still another dimension to this discussion.

The three synoptics present an almost identical account of the words spoken by the heavenly voice at Jesus' baptism. D makes the following alteration in Luke's account:

Luke 3:22

Codex B

και φωνη εξ ουρανου
γενεσθαι συ ει ο υιος μου
ο αγαπητος εν σοι ευδοκησα

"And a voice came from
heaven, You are my be-
loved son, in you I am
pleased."

Codex D

και φωνην εκ του ουρανου
γενεσθαι υιος μου ει συ
εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε

"And a voice came from
heaven, You are my
son, Today I have
begotten you."

ο αγαπητος εν σοι ευδοκησα] εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε, D
it Justin Origen

There are various opinions as to the import of the words in this alteration. B. H. Streeter considered the

reading of D as the original,¹⁷ as did A. Harnack,¹⁸ who thought that the B reading in Luke was assimilated from the reading of Matthew and Mark because D's reading was open to doctrinal objections.¹⁹ Easton says that this reading may ". . . represent the original (pre-Markan) form of the words, transmitted by oral or non-canonical written tradition."²⁰ Blass favors the idea that D's reading is original because it fits in logically with the genealogy that immediately follows.²¹ Montefiore concludes:

If this, as some think, is the true original reading, it would show that Luke, in its original form, knew nothing of the miraculous birth. To the divine Son the baptism could bring no new, special relation to God.²²

However, there are those such as Easton, who disagree with Montefiore's conclusion:

The theological difficulty caused by this reading is quite needless; Messiahship (= 'sonship,' here) was an

¹⁷Burnett Hillman Streeter, The Four Gospels (London: Macmillan and Company, 1961), p. 143.

¹⁸Adolf Harnack, The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke, trans. by J. R. Wilkinson (London: Williams and Norgate, 1908), pp. 310-14.

¹⁹It is of interest to note that D makes this alteration in Luke's text alone, the normal readings in Matthew and Mark remain unchanged. Once again this points up the need of an investigation of D in Matthew and Mark.

²⁰Easton, pp. 43-44. ²¹Blass, pp. 169-70.

²²See Montefiore, p. 143 for discussions against the originality of this variant. Cf. Godet, p. 126; Hatch, Western Text, pp. 24-25; and Williams, pp. 45-46.

office of Christ's humanity and was by no means necessarily involved in the Incarnation.²³

Mees thinks that D's reading grew out of the catechism instruction of the early church. Luke applies Psalms 2:7 (from which "You are my son, today I have begotten you" is taken) to the resurrection (Acts 13:33), and because the heavenly voice at the baptism suggested Psalms 2:7, the church saw ". . . the redemption as a powerful Epiphany of God upon earth, which manifested itself by the baptism for the first time and has been surpassed in the resurrection."²⁴

The normal reaction is to view "You are my son, today I have begotten you" as an Adoptionist reading. Streeter, for example, suggests that the Western text gave an original Adoptionist account of the baptism.²⁵ K. Lake favored this theory of a primitive Adoptionism.²⁶ Such a reaction to D's reading can be readily understood, for it appears in the Gospel of the Ebionites: καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα· σὺ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ ηὐδόκησα, καὶ πάλιν· ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε²⁷ ("And a

²³Easton, pp. 43-44. ²⁴Mees, pp. 106-07.

²⁵Streeter, p. 143.

²⁶Kirsopp Lake, Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity (London: Macmillan and Company, 1920), p. 102.

²⁷Kurt Aland, Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum (4th ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1968), p. 27.

voice from heaven saying, You are my beloved son, in you I am pleased, and again, today I have begotten you").

In discussing the significance of the D reading, Montefiore refers to the conclusion of Burkitt, that it is doubtful that the D reading is the original, much less an older form of the story; the supposed glaringly Adoptionist view of the baptism can hardly be more Adoptionistic than the way the story of the baptism is told by Mark.²⁸

Justin Martyr uses this reading in his Dialogue with Trypho (88:8). However, Williams says that when Justin used it he knew that he was quoting Psalms 2:7 and that he loved to combine the Old with the New Testament. Williams then concludes, following Lagrange, that Justin may have originated this reading and that Tatian borrowed it from Justin.²⁹

If so Justin and possibly Tatian could have popularized the variant, so that it passed on to Clement of Alexandria and to Origen: from them Methodius of Olympus, Hilary and Augustine may have derived their knowledge of it.³⁰

The main points of this discussion that revolves around D's variant do not, however, answer the immediate question that we are concerned with, What was the thinking behind D's use of this variant? To settle this question

²⁸Montefiore, p. 389.

²⁹Williams, pp. 46-47. Cf. Creed, p. 58.

³⁰Williams, pp. 46-47.

properly we must first look at the variant presented in the next several verses.

Beginning with verse 23, Luke presents his version of Jesus' genealogy. There has been a great deal of debate over whether the genealogy belongs to Joseph or Mary. It is possible, as we shall see, that D saw a convenient vehicle for his editorial scheme in the genealogy.

It is not possible to present the texts of B and D; the length of the variant prohibits this. All that needs to be said is that D sets aside the genealogy of the normal tradition between Joseph and David and incorporates Matthew's kingly line with some corrections: Matthew says that Uzziah was the son of Joram; D corrects this by adding three names, Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah, making the list agree with Old Testament accounts. (The first chapter of Matthew in D is lost, so we do not know if D made these corrections there as well.) Other than noting what D has done to Luke's genealogy, very little is said by scholars as to possible reasons for this change.³¹

The key to solving the problem of these two variants can be found in the comment made by Blass, that the

³¹Torrey does propose, however, that D is a Greek translation of an Aramaic version in which the genealogical corrections were made for the benefit of Aramaic speaking Jews, pp. 129-31.

variant in the words of the heavenly voice is connected with the genealogy in the normal text of Luke.³² (Of course, Blass made this observation in an attempt to show this variant as the original reading of Luke 3:22; he was in no way trying to explain this variant in relationship with the alteration in the genealogy made by D.) However, it is probable that D made these two alterations as a single unit of thought.

D had received this variant from a Western source which had altered Luke 3:22 (the heavenly voice) so that it was a direct quote of Psalms 2:7, "You are my son, I have begotten you today." Since this Psalm was the royal Psalm of a king of Judah, it was appropriate for D to supply Jesus with the royal line (borrowed from Matthew) in the next few verses.

Concerning Psalm 2, E. W. Heaton says:

The Psalm was composed, like Psalm 110, for the coronation of a Davidic king in Jerusalem. It probably continued to be used on the official anniversary of the king's accession throughout the period of the monarchy and subsequently it was reinterpreted as a prophecy of the coming Messiah.³³

At the anointing of the king, he was admitted to a unique relationship with God, which is described as an adoption.³⁴

³²Blass, pp. 169-70.

³³E. W. Heaton, The Hebrew Kingdoms (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 151.

³⁴Cf. Heaton, p. 152; Charles Augustus and Emilie

The Jewish Encyclopedia tells us that,

. . . the anointing of the king made him Meshiah YHWH, placed him in a special relationship to God, and established him as the one chosen by God to represent His rulership in Israel and to bear witness to His glory before the nations.³⁵

Christians, of course, saw in this Psalm a prophecy pointing to Jesus, and used it as such in their discussion with Jews (Justin Martyr being a case in point). Although Jews themselves once saw Messianic implications in this Psalm, their views changed, probably as a reaction to the Christian use of this Psalm:

'Meshiah' (anointed one of God) in Psalms ii.7, which was formerly thought to have Messianic reference, is now taken as referring either to a Hasmonean king or to Israel. The latter interpretation is that prevailing in the Midrash.³⁶

In speaking of the creation of Psalm 2 for the coronation of a Davidic king, Heaton said that eventually it was re-interpreted as a prophecy of the coming Messiah. He then makes the following observation: "This later development, in view of the contents of the poem, was altogether lamentable and thoroughly misleading."³⁷

Grace Briggs, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms, Vol. I (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927), pp. 15-16; and H. C. Leupold, Exposition of the Psalms (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1959), pp. 50-51.

³⁵Isidore Singer (ed.), The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VIII (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1904), p. 505.

³⁶Ibid., p. 506. ³⁷Heaton, p. 151.

In summary then, the process which led to D's distinctive use of these variant readings was probably as follows: D received the variant reading in Luke 3:22 (the heavenly voice) from his Western source. Because of the royal significance of Psalm 2, and because the Church saw in this Psalm a prophecy of the Messiah, D quite naturally applied it to Jesus. Because this variant appears in connection with the baptism of Jesus, D views this baptism as the anointing of Jesus as the Messianic King.

Thus Psalms 2:7, which implies that the newly-anointed king of Judah now becomes God's son in a unique way, which he was not previous to the anointing, is applied to God's Son as he takes upon himself a phase of this sonship which he had not previously occupied, i.e. the role of the "Messiah" King. D now logically alters the adjoining genealogy to support his position and ascribes to the newly-anointed King the royal line of David. Thus once again, D has supported his editorial scheme of magnifying the role and position of Jesus.

Directly connected with this whole discussion is an interesting variant found in 9:20:

Luke 9:20

Codex B

ειπεν δε αυτοις υμεις δε
τινα με λεγετε ειναι
πετρος δε αποκριθεις
ειπεν τον χυ του θυ

Codex D

ειπεν δε αυτοις υμεις δε
τινα με λεγετε ειναι
αποκριθεις δε ο πετρος
ειπεν τον χον υιον του θυ

"And he said to them,
And who do you say that
I am? And Peter answered
and said, The Christ
of God."

"And he said to them,
And who do you say that
I am? And Peter answered
and said, The anointed
Son of God."

+ υιοσ post $\overline{\chi\nu}$, D 28 213 1675 e r

It does not appear at first that the addition in D makes a significant change in Luke's normal text. It would seem that whether one reads "the Christ [Anointed] of God" or "the anointed Son of God" the thought is the same. However, considered in light of the alteration in the heavenly voice and the genealogy, the change in Peter's confession takes on significance. The alterations in chapter three were designed to portray Jesus in a new phase of sonship as the Messiah king. D now sustains this concept of Jesus by soliciting support from Peter's confession.

At first glance, one is tempted to say that D's alteration in Luke says no more than the parallel in Matthew, where Peter's confession reads $\sigma\upsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota} \delta\acute{o} \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \delta\epsilon \upsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \zeta\omega\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ("You are the Christ, the son of the living God"--Matthew 16:16). In Matthew's construction, $\delta\acute{o} \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \delta\epsilon \upsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$ ("the Christ, the son"), it is possible to take $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ ("Christ") as an attributive adjective and arrive at the same reading as in D's text in Luke, "the anointed son." Arndt and Gingrich, however, say that $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ ("Christ") occurs in our literature only as a

noun.³⁸ Thus Peter's confession in Matthew is consistently translated, "the Christ, the son."

However, in D's text in Luke *χριστόν* definitely functions as an attributive adjective, thus supporting the alterations in chapter three and holding forth Jesus as occupying a phase of sonship which he previously did not occupy, "the anointed son of God," i.e. the "Messiah" king.

Jesus' Relation to the Father

Whenever possible, D avoids any reference on the part of Jesus to the Father as being "my Father." Jesus is allowed to address the first Person of the Godhead as "Father," but it seems to take on the characteristic of a title and does not show a relationship between the Father and Jesus that would necessarily indicate rank or position of authority. As Jesus talks to the people about their relationship with the first Person in the Godhead and uses such descriptive terms as "your Father," "say, our Father," and "your heavenly Father," the omission of "my Father" in the words of Jesus becomes noticeable.

In the normal text of Luke, the phrase, "my Father," is used four times by Jesus. The first usage is retained by D:

Luke 2:48,49

³⁸Arndt and Gingrich, p. 895.

Codex B

48. και ιδοντες αυτον
εξεπλαγησαν και ειπεν
προς αυτον η μητηρ αυτου
τεκνον τι εποιησας ημιν
ουτως ιδου ο πατηρ σου
καγω οδυνωμενοι

ζητουμεν σε

49. και ειπεν προς
αυτους τι οτι εζητειτε
με ουκ ηδειτε οτι εν
τοις του πατρος μου
δει ειναι με

"48. And when they saw
him, they were astonished
and his mother said to
him, child, why have you
done thus with us? Behold,
your father and I
sought you anxiously.

"49. And he said to
them, why did you seek
me? Did you not know
that I must attend to
the things of my Father?"

Codex D

48. και ιδοντες αυτον
εξεπλαγησαν και ειπεν
προς αυτον η μητηρ αυτου
τεκνον τι εποιησας ημειν
ουτως ιδου ο πατηρ σου
καγω οδυνωμενοι και
λυπουμενοι εζητουμεν σε

49. και ειπεν προς
αυτους τι οτι εζητειτε
με ουκ οιδατε οτι εν
τοις του πατρ μου
δει με ειναι

"48. And when they saw
him, they were astonished
and his mother said to
him, child why have you
done thus with us? Behold
your father and I were
seeking you anxiously
and grieving.

"49. And he said to
them, why did you seek
me? Did you not know
that I must attend to
the things of my Father?"

v. 48 +και λυπουμενοι post οδυνωμενοι, D it sy^S
ζητουμεν] εζητουμεν, C ^Ω D Θ pl

v. 49 ηδειτε] οιδατε, D W 225 282 660 1424 it sy^C cop^{sa}

The retention of μου ("my") in v. 49 is a safeguard against misunderstanding Mary's remark in the previous verse. Mary refers to Joseph as Jesus' father in v. 48; Jesus in v. 49 immediately disclaims any human origin. The preservation of "my Father" in this account does not touch on the issue of authority, as do the two following examples, but upon the issue of origin. Therefore, D retains "my Father" and thus preserves Luke's tradition of Jesus'

supernatural birth. In the next two passages, however, D can omit μου ("my") safely, without raising questions about his divine nature:

Luke 10:22

Codex B

παντα μοι παρεδοθη υπο
του πατρος μου και ουδεις
γεινωσκει τις εστιν ο
υιος ει μη ο πατηρ

"All things have been
given to me by my Father
and no one knows who the
Son is except the Father."

Codex D

παντα μοι παρεδοθη απο
του πατρος και ουδεις
γεινωσκει τις εστιν ο
υιος ει μη ο πατηρ

"All things have been
given to me by the Father
and no one knows who the
Son is except the Father."

υπο] απο, D
om. μου, D a c l vg^{Codd} sy^S Marcion Justin

Luke 22:29

Codex B

καγω διατιθεμαι υμιν καθως
διεθετο μοι ο πατηρ μου
βασιλειαν

"As my Father appointed a
kingdom for me, I also
appoint one for you."

Codex D

καγω διατιθεμε υμειν καθως
διεθετο μοι ο πατηρ
βασιλειαν

"As the Father appointed a
kingdom for me, I also
appoint one for you."

om. μου, D pc e

In the last passage, D retains μου ("my") but omits του πατρος ("Father"). This omission is significant:

Luke 24:49

Codex B

και ιδου εγω εξαποστελλω
την επαγγελειαν του πατρος
μου εφ υμας

Codex D

και εγω αποστελλω
την επαγγελειαν
μου εφ υμας

"And behold I send the
promise of my Father upon
you."

"And I send
my promise upon
you."

om. ἰδοῦ, D
om. τοῦ πατρὸς, D e

We may find in this variant the clue as to why D omitted μου ("my") in 10:22 and 22:29. D appears to look upon Jesus as equal to the first Person in the Godhead. He may have understood the passages with "my Father" as tending to assign a position of subordination to Jesus.³⁹

The omission of "Father" in 24:49 would seem to indicate this feeling. "The promise of my Father" of the normal text tends to indicate that Jesus is not of sufficient authority to communicate blessings to his followers and must depend upon the Father for them; therefore, "Father" is omitted and the blessings become those of Jesus, to be dispensed by him. D also wishes to emphasize the equality of Jesus with the Father; therefore, he alters Luke's normal text, as far as possible, without causing

³⁹Mark did not use the phrase, "my Father"; Matthew uses it 15 times. Of these 15 usages, one is a lacuna in D. However, D omits μου ("my") once in Matthew (24:36), but this omission brings Matthew into harmony with Mark. Luke does not contain a parallel of this verse. Therefore, we can examine 14 out of 15 occurrences of "my Father" in Matthew; in 13 of the 14 occurrences D retains "my" with "father." There is a very good possibility that if we had the lacuna (7:21) it would be retained there too. The motivation that caused D to omit "my" before "Father" tends to eliminate any suggestion that Jesus is inferior to the Father in authority, position, etc. in D's text in Luke.

the rise of undue misunderstandings, so that Jesus will not appear in an inferior position to the Father.

The Miracles of Jesus

D also uses the miracles of Jesus as a medium to exalt him. The first miracle recorded by Luke is an exorcism, and it was performed by Jesus on the Sabbath in the synagogue at Capernaum. In Luke's tradition this miraculous healing on the Sabbath immediately follows Jesus' rejection by his fellow Nazarenes. This pericope is introduced by Luke in the following words:

Luke 4:31

Codex B

και κατηλθεν εις καφαρ-
ναουμ πολιν της γαλιλαιας

και ην διδασκων
αυτους εν τοις σαββασιν

"And he went down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee

and he was
teaching them on the
Sabbath."

Codex D

και κατηλθεν εις καφαρ-
ναουμ πολιν της γαλιλαιας
την παραθαλασσιον εν
οριοις ζαβουλων και
νεφθαλειμ και ην διδασκων
αυτους εν τοις σαββασιν

"And he went down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee situated beside the sea in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali, and he was teaching them on the Sabbath."

+ την παραθαλασσιον εν οριοις ζαβουλων και νεφθαλειμ post γαλιλαιας, D

The variant of this verse is a harmonization with Matthew 4:13, "And leaving Nazareth he went and dwelt in Capernaum situated by the sea in the territory of Zebulun

and Naphtali." Conzelmann's interest in this variant is grounded in his position that Luke was unfamiliar with the geographical setting of Jesus' ministry:

Most remarkable of all, however, is the fact that we are not told anywhere in Luke that Capernaum is situated by the lake. Yet the fact that it is situated here is part and parcel of many of the traditions. Simon the fisherman has his home here (iv,38). It cannot be an accidental omission, as it occurs all the way through. Manuscript D is aware of the omission and supplements from Matthew.⁴⁰

Again, speaking of D's variants which contain geographical alterations (mainly 4:31; 5:27), Conzelmann says:

It must be admitted that Codex D with its tendency to make corrections makes us suspicious rather than favorably inclined towards it. It is the geographical references in particular that make us suspect its special readings.⁴¹

It may not have been D's purpose to clear up Luke's geographical misconceptions in 4:31 when he borrowed from Matthew 4:13. If we reconstruct Luke's tradition we find Jesus going to Galilee in the power of the Spirit (4:14) immediately after his success over the temptations in the wilderness. Filled with power he taught in Galilee, with no specific city being mentioned; his fame spread through the surrounding countryside, and he was being glorified by all men (4:15). In v. 16, Luke has Jesus going to Nazareth, his home town. Here he teaches, and he and his message are rebuffed quite violently by the Nazarenes.

⁴⁰Conzelmann, p. 39. ⁴¹Ibid., p. 40, n.3.

Leaving the city that has rejected him, Jesus comes to Capernaum and teaches.

Conzelmann would have us believe that the addition in D was to clear up a geographical confusion by pointing out that Capernaum was situated by the sea. It seems more accurate to say that D wished to salvage Jesus' ministry by contrasting the reception given him in Nazareth with his reception in Capernaum. By harmonizing this verse in Luke with Matthew 4:13 and by employing the term Zebulun and Naphtali, D directs the minds of his readers to a prophecy in Isaiah 9:1,2.⁴² Matthew quotes this prophecy and attaches Messianic significance to it:

And leaving Nazareth he went and dwelt in Capernaum situated by the sea, in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali, that what was spoken by Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled: 'The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, toward the sea, across the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles, the people who sat in darkness have seen a great light, and for those who sat in the region and shadow of death light has dawn (Matthew 4:13-16).

Through this variant D underscores the fact that the Nazarenes, in their rejection of Jesus, have also

⁴²Outside the Pentateuch and the historical books of the Old Testament Zebulun and Naphtali are only mentioned five times. Of these five only Psalms 68:27 and Isaiah 9:1 mention them together. Within the Pentateuch and the historical books, only Judges 4:10; 5:18 place these two names together when the remainder of Jacob's children are not being referred to. Judges 4:10 refers to the assembling of Naphtali and Zebulun to follow Barak and Deborah to war; in Judges 5:18, Naphtali and Zebulun are mentioned in Deborah's Song of victory. D's use of these two names is an obvious reference to the prophecy of Isaiah.

rejected a message from God that would have brought light and joy. Also, he directs the minds of his readers to an Old Testament prophecy that was considered by the early church as a Messianic prophecy and applies it to Jesus' ministry, even though he does not quote the words of this prophecy in detail as does Matthew.

To insert the words of this lengthy quotation from Isaiah's prophecy at this point in Luke appears to be too much of an alteration of the normal text even for D. The implication contained in the variant is sufficient for insertion into the text. That this harmonization with Matthew contains a geographic reference to the sea is of secondary importance. The Messianic overtones that D applies to Jesus' ministry are the thought of major interest.

Returning to the account of Jesus' first miracle in Luke's tradition, we find another variant in 4:34. While teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum, Jesus was interrupted by a man who was demon possessed. The demon in control of the man recognized Jesus, even though the people were unaware of his true identity, and it "cried out with a great voice:"

Luke 4:34

Codex B

εα τι ημιν και σοι τῷ
ναζαρηνε ηλθες απολεσαι
ημας οίδα σε τις ει ο
αγιος του θυ

Codex D

τι ημειν και σοι τῷ
ναζορηναι ηλθες ημας ωδε
απολεσαι οίδα σε τις ει ο
αγιος του θυ

"Ah! What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know you who you are, the Holy One of God."

" What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come here to destroy us? I know you who you are, the Holy One of God."

om. εα, D 33 56 58 61 it cop^{sa,bo} sy^S Marcion
 απολεσαι ημας] ημας ωδε απολεσαι, D 68

Luke indicated earlier (vv. 14,15) that Jesus, in the power of the Spirit, had been working in Galilee, although no specific city was identified at that time. 4:23 indicates that Jesus had been in Capernaum prior to his visit to Nazareth and had worked miracles in the city, but the miracles are not enumerated. The addition of ὧδε ("here") by D would seem to indicate the following: (1) although Jesus had ministered in Capernaum earlier, no exorcism had been performed prior to this in this city; (2) sometime during Jesus' ministry in Galilee (cf. vv. 14,15), prior to this encounter in the synagogue, Jesus had performed exorcisms and this demon was aware of it.

This addition supports the earlier statement of Luke that the "fame" of Jesus had spread among the people throughout Galilee, vv. 14,15. More than this, however, D indicates that Jesus' "fame" was well known among Satanic forces and that wherever the two met a conflict ensued.

In describing this conflict, D makes two additions that magnify the power of Jesus:

Luke 4:35,36

Codex B

35. και επειτιμησεν αυτω
 ο ις λεγων φειμωθητι και
 εξελθε απ αυτου και ρειψαν
 αυτον το δαιμονιον εις το
 μεσον εξηλθεν απ
 αυτου μηδεν βλαψαν αυτον
 36. και εγενετο θαμβος
 επι παντας. . . .

"35. And Jesus rebuked him
 saying, 'Be still, and come
 out of him!' And when the
 demon had thrown him down in
 the midst he
 came out of him, doing him
 no harm.

"36. And there was
 fear upon all. . . ."

Codex D

35. και επειτιμησεν αυτω
 ο ιης λεγων φειμωθητι και
 εξελθε απ αυτου και ρειψασ
 αυτον το δαιμονιον εις μεσον
 ανακραυγασαν τε εξηλθεν απ
 αυτου μηδεν βλαψας αυτον
 36. και εγενετο θαμβος μαγας
 επι παντας. . . .

"35. And Jesus rebuked him
 saying, 'Be still, and come
 out of him!' And when the
 demon had thrown him down in
 the midst crying out, he
 came out of him, doing him
 no harm.

"36. And there was great
 fear upon all. . . ."

v. 35 + ανακραυγασαν τε post μεσον, D

v. 36 + μαγας post θαμβος, D 253 b r cop^{bo} Tatian syP

The addition of ἀνακράυγασαν ("crying out") intensifies the drama of the confrontation, making the victory over the demon more dramatic. The addition to Luke appears to have been influenced by Mark, who also has the account, for at the point where the demon was expelled, Mark's account reads, "And when he had cried (φωνῆσαν) with a loud voice, he came out of him" (Mark 1:26). If the alteration in Luke's tradition was influenced by Mark, D was consistent at this point, for he altered Mark's "When he had cried (φωνῆσαν) with a loud voice" to "He cried out (ἀνακράυγασαν) with a loud voice." In D's alteration of both Luke's and Mark's tradition, the intensification of

the drama can be felt when ἀνακράζω, ("cry out . . . of the cry of demoniacs . . . of the cries of frightened men")⁴³ replaces φωνέω ("produce a sound or tone . . . call someone").⁴⁴

The addition of μέγας ("great") to Luke's tradition intensifies the reaction of the spectators to the miracle performed by Jesus. This intensified reaction can also be seen in the final variant of this pericope:

Luke 4:37

Codex B

και εξεπορευετο ηχος περι
αυτου εις παντα τοπον της
περιχωρου

"And a report began going
out concerning him into every
place of the surrounding
countryside."

Codex D

και εξηλθεν η ακοη περι
αυτου εις παντα τοπον της
περιχωρου

"And the report went
out concerning him into every
place of the surrounding
countryside."

εξεπορευετο ηχος] εξηλθεν η ακοη, D a

Ἐξηλθεν ἡ ἀκοή ("The report went out") is a harmonization with Mark's account (1:28). As we have seen so often, D uses harmonization as a tool to develop his understanding of Luke's tradition and to strengthen his biases. With the alterations already viewed in this pericope that tend to magnify Jesus and his ministry, it is only following this trend to a logical conclusion to say that the

⁴³Arndt and Gingrich, pp. 55-56.

⁴⁴Ibid.; Thayer, p. 878.

final alteration of the pericope endeavors to add weight to the general view already being developed by D.

The addition of the definite article changes Luke's general statement, "a word" or "a report" to "the report" or "the account," thus making Luke's account of what followed the miracle more precise, for the report that was spread throughout the neighboring region would now be an account of the healing of the demoniac.

A similar alteration by D produces a similar effect. The pericope tells of a man full of leprosy coming to Jesus and asking for healing. Jesus responds by stretching forth his hand and touching the man. The healing is immediate. Jesus now instructs the man to say nothing to anyone and to go and show himself to the priest:

Luke 5:14

Codex B

και αυτος παρηγγειλεν αυτω
μηδενι ειπειν αλλα απελθων
δειξον σεαυτον τω ιερει και
προσενεγκε περι του καθαρισ-
μου σου καθως προσεταξεν
μουσης εις μαρτυριον
αυτοις

"And he charged him to
speak to no one, but go,
show yourself to the priest
and present an offering for
your cleansing as Moses com-
manded

for a testimony to
them."

Codex D

και αυτος παρηγγειλεν αυτω
μηδενι ειπειν απελθε δε και
δειξον σεαυτον τω ιερει και
προσενεγκε περι του καθαρισ-
μου σου καθως προσεταξεν
μουσης ινα εις μαρτυριον ην
υμειν τουτο

"And he charged him to
speak to no one, but go and
show yourself to the priest
and present an offering for
your cleansing as Moses com-
manded in order that this
might be a testimony to
you [plural]."

αλλα απελθων] απελθε δε και, D a e
 εις μαρτυριον αυτοις] ινα εις μαρτυριον ην υμειν τουτο,
 D it Marcion

All three synoptics record this miracle and all three close the instruction given to the healed man with the same words, εις μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς ("for a testimony to them"). Therefore, we must look elsewhere for the origin of this reading in D. There is little doubt in Williams's mind but that Marcion was the originator of it, ". . . to avoid the implication that Jesus enjoined a witness to the Jews."⁴⁵ Williams also tells us that Sanday and C. H. Turner, on the other hand, took this reading to be original.⁴⁶ If Marcion was the originator of this reading, and if he wished to avoid any endorsement of the official Jewish view by Jesus, why did he use ὑμῖν ("you," plural) instead of σοι ("you," singular)?

Plummer suggests four possible ways of understanding αὐτοῖς ("to them"):

- (1) the priests may be convinced of My Divine power;
- (2) the priests may see that I do not disregard the Law;
- (3) the people may be convinced that the cure is complete, and that the leper may be readmitted to society;
- (4) the people may see that I do not disregard the law.⁴⁷

He feels that there is a good possibility that both numbers two and four are the correct interpretations. Creed,

⁴⁵Williams, p. 13. Cf. Creed, p. 77; Arndt, p. 159.

⁴⁶Williams, p. 13. ⁴⁷Plummer, p. 150.

however, believes that αὐτοῖς ("to them") means people in general and not the priests. His argument is based upon the statement of Jesus that the man was to show himself τῷ ἱερεῖ ("the officiating priest," singular).⁴⁸ E. J. Tinsley translates εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς ("as a witness to them") in the text of his work as ". . . that will certify the cure." Then in his commentary he writes:

The Greek phrase translated that will certify the cure (literally in the Greek 'as a witness to them') might be intended to mean 'as a sign that a mighty power is in your midst.'⁴⁹

In this case it would not matter to whom the sign is given; it is the evidence of Jesus' power that is of importance.

If D adopted this "Marcionite reading" to avoid showing any indication on Jesus' part that he was willing to comply with Jewish ritualistic regulations, which may very well be the reason for this reading in D, then we might say that D had Creed's viewpoint in mind. αὐτοῖς ("to them"; Creed) or ὑμῖν ("to you"; D) refers to the people in general. Τοῦτο ("this thing") could then refer to the cleansing as being the witness of Jesus' power (agreement with Tinsley) and not to the offering as being a witness that he was willing to comply with Jewish ritual.

⁴⁸Creed, p. 77.

⁴⁹E. J. Tinsley, The Gospel According to Luke (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), p. 59.

And if we take the miracle as the witness to Jesus' power, and understand ὑμῖν ("to you") to refer to the people in general, instead of the much smaller group of priests, then we find this variant in harmony with D's over-all purpose of magnifying Jesus and his ministry.

The second significant variant found in this pericope is an addition to v. 14, present in D alone. It reads as follows:

ὁ δὲ ἐξέλθων ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν καὶ διαφημεῖζειν τὸν λόγον ὥστε μηκέτι δύνασθαι αὐτὸν φανερώς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν ἀλλὰ ἔξω ἦν ἐν ἐρήμοις τόποις καὶ συνήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἦλθεν πάλιν εἰς καφαρναοῦμ.

But when he went out he began to proclaim and spread abroad the word so that he was no longer able to enter into the city openly, but he was without in a desert place and they were coming together to him and he came again to Capernaum.

This is an obvious harmonization with Mark 1:45; the two read identically except for the last statement about Jesus' return to Capernaum. Again D's literary purpose is clear. By this harmonization, Jesus' popularity is intensified and Jesus himself is magnified beyond Luke's tradition in the normal text.

In Luke 9:11 we have a summary statement concerning a day's work among the people by Jesus, which serves as a backdrop for the miraculous feeding of the five thousand. D makes an addition to this general statement that tends to magnify Jesus as a healer and emphasizes his compassion for the multitudes:

Luke 9:11

Codex B

οι δε οχλοι γνοντες ηκο-
λουθησαν αυτω και απο-
δεξαμενος αυτους ελαλει
αυτοις περι της βασιλειας
του θ̅υ και τους χρειαν
εχοντας θεραπειας
ιατο

"And when the crowds
learned it they
followed him, and when
he had received them
he spoke to them con-
cerning the kingdom
of God, and those
having need of
healing he healed."

Codex D

οι δε οχλοι γνοντες ηκο-
λουθησαν αυτω και απο-
δεξαμενος αυτους ελαλει
αυτοις περι της βασιλειας
του θ̅υ και τους χρειαν
εχοντας θεραπειας αυτου
παντας ιατο

"And when the crowds
learned it they
followed him, and when
he had received them
he spoke to them con-
cerning the kingdom
of God, and those
having need of his
healing he healed
them all."

+ αυτου παντας post θεραπειας, D

The normal text of Luke would indicate that those who were in need of healing were the general population of those suffering physical ailments, regardless of whether the physical problem could be cured by normal medical practices or not. The addition of "his" lays stress upon the condition of the people who came to him on this occasion, i.e. those who were present were physically afflicted by diseases that could not be remedied by normal means; they were in "need of his healing."

Thus D tends to look upon these people who needed Jesus' healing in much the same light as the woman with the issue of blood. When all other means failed she turned

to Jesus for healing and found it (Luke 8:42-48). So D glorifies Jesus as a divine healer, placing him above the normal practitioners of the healing arts.

By adding "all," D now magnifies Jesus' compassion for the physically afflicted. Not only was he capable of healing the most difficult cases, but D emphasizes that none was turned away without having his needs met.

Conclusion

Thus we have seen that through major alterations, and at times slight changes, D has altered the text for the magnification of Jesus. The variants in this chapter show that he accomplishes his editorial design by the following methods:

1. By understanding that an anarthrous noun points out quality and by changing a preposition, we discover how D is enabled to magnify the personality and character of the child Jesus.

2. By quoting Psalms 2:7 intact, D changes the words of the heavenly voice. Because this is a royal Psalm of coronation, D alters Luke's genealogy between Joseph and David by inserting the royal line of kings found in Matthew's genealogy, thus portraying Jesus as the Messianic king.

3. By removing $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ ("my") as a modifier of "Father," D emphasizes the equality of Jesus with the

Father; therefore, he alters Luke's normal text, as far as possible, without causing the rise of undue misunderstanding, so that Jesus will not appear in an inferior position to the Father.

4. By harmonizing Luke's tradition with that of Matthew, D is able to use a prophecy in Isaiah, understood by the early church as a Messianic prophecy, to introduce Jesus' use of miracles.

5. By intensifying the action within the account of a miracle and intensifying the reactions of the people to the miracles, D achieves a magnification of Jesus.

6. By emphasizing that physically afflicted people who needed his healing came to him and he healed them all, D glorifies Jesus as a compassionate, divine healer.

CHAPTER IV

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE SON OF MAN

The Kingdom of God

The question of Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom of God and its relationship to his preaching and ministry has been discussed and debated in great detail. In this chapter it is not our purpose to review this literature, but rather to discover Luke's understanding of the relationship between Jesus' ministry and the Kingdom of God, and to see how the variant readings in D alter or support Luke's concept of the kingdom.

In comparing the statements about the kingdom as they appear in the three synoptics, one can see possible reason for the conclusion of Conzelmann, that Luke's material on the kingdom tends to deal with its nature rather than with its immediate appearance.¹ This tendency in St. Luke has led some, like Conzelmann, to take the position that we can see in this synoptic gospel a changing attitude toward eschatology. The arrival of the kingdom is seen as being postponed until sometime in the future.² This position is supported by pointing to the

¹Conzelmann, p. 114. ²Ibid., p. 117.

notable omissions in Luke of the word ἤγγικεν in statements concerning the appearance of the kingdom ("the kingdom of heaven is at hand").³

Before looking at these omissions it would be well to review the significance of the grammatical construction of ἤγγικεν ("is at hand," perfect, indicative of ἐγγίζω). This construction is what Dana and Mantey call the intensive perfect:

The Intensive Perfect. It is most in keeping with the basal significance of the tense to place emphasis upon the existing results, for it is distinctively the tense of the "finished product." When special attention is thus directed to the results of the action, stress upon the existing fact is intensified. This is the emphatic method in Greek of presenting a fact or condition. It is the way of saying that a thing is. There is no exact equivalent of this idiom in English, consequently there is no way to give it an exact translation. Usually its closest approximation is the English present, but it is important to bear in mind that it is not a mere duplicate of the Greek present. It presents an existing fact more forcibly than either the Greek or English present could possibly do.⁴

³However, if ἤγγικεν is taken as an intensive perfect and if Luke's delay in using this word is understood as an attempt to direct his readers' understanding of the kingdom into a position similar to his own, then Conzelmann failed to understand what Luke was attempting to do.

⁴Dana and Mantey, p. 202. Concerning the intensive perfect, A. T. Robertson says, "In reality they are perfects where the punctiliar force is dropped and only the durative remains. . . . Giles (Man., p. 481) thinks that originally the perf. was either intensive or iterative like ἔστηκα, and that the notion of recently completed action (extensive) is a development" (pp. 894-95). Blass and DeBrunner say, "The perfect with certain verbs has wholly the sense of a present (as in classical)" (p. 176). Herbert Preisker says, "In the older writings the distinctive feature of both ἐγγύς and ἐγγίζειν is that they express the

When we see the sentence, ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ("For the kingdom of heaven is at hand"--Matthew 3:2), we are to understand that Matthew is putting into the strongest terms possible the belief that the kingdom is breaking in upon men--now!⁵

Let us notice how the normal tradition in Luke temporarily avoids the use of this term. Matthew's record of John the Baptist's message, μετανοεῖτε ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ("Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"--Matthew 3:2) is changed by Luke to καὶ ἦλθεν . . . κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν

characteristic aspect of the early Christian situation, being used of the eschatological fulfillment, of the great turning point in world history, of the coming of the kingdom of God directly into the present as the miracle of God [emphasis supplied]. E.g. Mt. 3:2: ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, cf. Mk. 1:15 and par.; Mt. 10:7; Lk. 10:9,11; 21:8." Kittel, Vol. II, p. 331.

⁵It is upon the understanding that ἤγγικεν in Mark 1:15 is an intensive perfect that Dodd speaks of realized eschatology: C. H. Dodd, Parables of the Kingdom (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), pp. 29-30. Cf. idem, "The Kingdom of God Has Come," Expository Times, XLVIII(1936/37), 138-42. In defense of Dodd's translation of ἤγγικεν as an intensive perfect, W. R. Hutton, "The Kingdom of God Has Come," Expository Times, LXV(1952/53), 91, agrees that of the 42 appearances of ἤγγικεν in the synoptic gospels and Acts, 28 can reasonably be translated by some form of "come to" or "arrive" instead of "draw near." On this point cf. Robert F. Berkey, "Ἐγγίξειν, φθάνειν and Realized Eschatology," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII(1963), 177-87; J. Y. Campbell, "The Kingdom of God Has Come," Expository Times, XLVIII(1936/37), 91-94; C. T. Craig, "Realized Eschatology," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI(1937), 17-26; John F. Walvoord, "Realized Eschatology," Bibliotheca Sacra, CXXVII(1970), 313-23; Arndt, p. 282; Creed, p. 146.

("And he came proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins"--Luke 3:3).

The statement of Jesus found in Matthew and Mark, μετανοεῖτε ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ("Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"--Matthew 4:17) and πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ("The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand"--Mark 1:15), is eliminated by Luke, and Jesus is presented as talking to the people about the kingdom, rather than its imminence: καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ ("And when he had received them he spoke to them about the kingdom of God"--Luke 9:11).

Matthew's account of the preparations for sending the twelve disciples on their missionary tour, two by two, πορευόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε λέγοντες ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ("And as you go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand"--Matthew 10:7), is simply rendered by Luke as καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι ("And he sent them forth to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal"--Luke 9:2).

One is led to ask, Why did Luke not wish to speak of the kingdom of heaven in terms used by Mark and Matthew? The answer supplied by Conzelmann and others is that Luke was one of the first to see that the kingdom was not to be established immediately and that the church had to adjust

its thinking to the long haul of future history. There is little that can be said against this argument. However, we may not have the complete picture if we let the issue rest at this point. It may very well be that Luke also avoided the ἤγγικεν statements found in Matthew and Mark because:

1. The statement, "For the kingdom of God is at hand," may not have meant too much to "Theophilus" with his Gentile background.

2. If these statements were included and Theophilus sought to understand their import, he might have been in danger of arriving at a wrong conclusion about the kingdom.

3. Luke wanted to lead Theophilus into an understanding of the kingdom that was similar to his own. This would not be accomplished by making a statement, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," totally separated from a context that would help one to understand the nature of the kingdom. Therefore, Luke was careful that statements concerning the kingdom were placed in a context that would help Theophilus to understand the nature of the kingdom.

This brings us to two occasions where Luke did use ἤγγικεν in connection with the kingdom (Luke 10:9,11), occasions that are exclusive to Luke. However, these two occurrences do not stand as broad generalizations, as do the earlier statements concerning the kingdom made by John the

Baptist and Jesus in the accounts of Mark and Matthew. Rather they are qualified by the context in which they are placed, the context of miraculous healing. This may provide the key to the understanding of Luke's conception of the relationship between the kingdom of God and Jesus' ministry, especially if we consider these two statements in the light of others made by Luke concerning the kingdom and their context of deeds of healing.

Before looking at these two texts, we shall investigate the statements concerning the kingdom as they are set into the context of miraculous healings by Luke. In Matthew we find two occasions where the preaching of the kingdom is mentioned together with healing:

And he went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and healing all manner of disease and illness among the people (Matthew 4:23).

And Jesus went about all the cities and villages teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and healing all manner of disease and illness (Matthew 9:35).

Both statements read almost identically and appear to be a summary report on the nature of the work and preaching of Jesus. Proclaiming the kingdom of God was one aspect of his preaching, and healing was another aspect of his ministry.

It would not seem that in either of these statements the presence of the kingdom could be equated with the

performance of miraculous healings. In fact, in parallel passages in Mark and Luke, "kingdom" is omitted by Mark and "healing" is omitted by Luke:

Mark 1:39 (Matt. 4:23)

και ηλθεν κηρυσσων εις τας
 συναγωγας αυτων εις ολην
 την γαλιλαιαν και τα δαιμονια
 εκβαλλων.

"And he came into all of
 Galilee, preaching in their
 synagogues and casting out
 demons."

Mark 6:6

(Matt. 9:35)

Luke 8:1

και περιηγεν τας κωμας
 κυκλω διδασκων

και εγενετο εν τω καθεξης
 και αυτος διωδευεν κατα
 πολιν και κωμην κηρυσσων
 και ευαγγελιζομενος την
 βασιλειαν του θεου και οι
 δωδεκα συν αυτω

"And he went round about
 the villages teaching."

"And it came to pass after-
 wards, that he systematically
 passed through cities and
 villages preaching and pre-
 senting the good news of the
 kingdom of God and the twelve
 were with him."

In Mark's gospel there is no trace of tying miracles to the kingdom. In Matthew, however, we see a single instance of this (excluding the two summary reports just considered):

"And if I cast out demons by the Spirit of God, indeed, the kingdom of God has come upon you"--Matthew 12:28). The first class conditional sentence affirms the reality of the presence of God's kingdom. In this case the presence of the kingdom is verified by an exorcism.

Luke ties the ability of Jesus to work miraculous healings more closely to the kingdom than Matthew, so that one can say that miracles testify to the presence of the kingdom. In turn, the term "kingdom" can then be equated to the activity of God's power and His reign on earth.⁶

Various scholars have concluded the same thing but have expressed it in different ways. Rudolf Bultmann equates "kingdom of God" with "reign of God," which is breaking in upon men. Jesus' power to work miracles, and especially to cast out demons, can be interpreted as the beginning of the overthrow of Satan.⁷

C. H. Dodd, in developing his defense for realized eschatology says:

But Jesus says, 'If I, by the finger of God, cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you.' . . . It is not a matter of having God for your King in the sense that you obey His commandments: it is a matter of being confronted with the power of God at work in the world.⁸

And also:

⁶Geldenhuis, p. 330 and Arndt, pp. 282,300.

⁷Rudolf Bultmann, Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting, trans. by R. H. Fuller (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1956), pp. 86-93.

⁸Dodd, p. 29. Cf. George Ladd, "The Kingdom of God--Reign or Realm?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII(1962), 237, who says: "The exorcism of demons is indeed a sign of the kingdom, but it is not a sign of an imminent approaching kingdom; rather it is a sign of a present kingdom. In the coming of Jesus God has entered into history in his kingly activity to accomplish his redemptive purpose."

We have seen that in apocalypse the final victory over 'the kingdom of the enemy' is the coming of the Kingdom of God; and that in the Synoptic Gospels the exorcisms of Jesus are treated as signs of this victory and so of the coming of the Kingdom.⁹

However, it must be emphasized again that it is in Luke that the motif of miracle = presence of the kingdom or reign of God is developed more fully. We first see a loose construction of this equation (miracle = presence of the kingdom) in chapter four.

Jesus arrived in Capernaum after his rejection in Nazareth. On the Sabbath day he went to the synagogue where he healed a man possessed of a demon. After the services concluded, he went to Simon's house where he healed Simon Peter's mother-in-law. At sunset, when the Sabbath was past, people flocked to Jesus, either to be healed themselves or to bring someone with them that needed healing. The next morning the crowds from Capernaum again sought out Jesus and asked him not to leave their area. Luke records Jesus' reply as follows: ". . . it is necessary for me to present the good news concerning the kingdom of God to other cities also, for this cause I was sent" (Luke 4:43). Luke thus ties the preaching or the presenting of the good news of the kingdom of God directly with the miracles of healing (i.e. release from the powers of evil) that were performed the day before.

⁹Dodd, pp. 57-58.

The parallel to Matthew 12:28 develops the point more clearly, "But if I cast out demons by the finger of God, indeed, the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Luke 11:20).

At this point we can return to the two passages in Luke that use ἡγγικεν when speaking of the kingdom. The setting is the commissioning of the seventy. After they were advised on how to relate to those who accepted their presence, Jesus instructed them as to their work: καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθενεῖς, καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς ἡγγικεν ἑφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ("Heal the sick in it and say to them, the kingdom of God is come upon you"--Luke 10:9). He then instructed the seventy as to how they should behave if they were repulsed: καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν πλὴν τοῦτο γινώσκετε ὅτι ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ("And the dust of your city clinging to our feet we wipe off against you; but understand this, the kingdom of God is come upon you"--Luke 10:11).

The inhabitants of the city that received the ambassadors of Jesus were to be blessed by the healing power that passed from Jesus' representatives to the populace. Without a doubt, this healing power would bring relief and joy. Amid their rejoicing the people were to be told that the kingdom is come upon them. Those who spurned the

ambassadors would not know the joy of the healing power, but they too were to be told that the kingdom is come upon them; but they were not to share in it because they had rejected it by rejecting those who were empowered to bring it to them.

However, it does not seem that everyone who was healed entered into the full joy of the kingdom, although, as just seen, the kingdom was present to all men through the power of God whether they shared in the workings of that power or not. As will be seen below, some men did share in the workings of the power of God, rejoiced in release from physical suffering, yet did not enter into the fullest joy of the presence of the kingdom of God.

Luke presents the theme of the kingdom in the context that would leave no question as to the kingdom's nature. Therefore, he omits the general statements about the kingdom's arrival made by John the Baptist (Matthew 3:2) and Jesus (Matthew 4:17; Mark 1:15), statements which leave the reader free to view the nature of the kingdom according to his own personal thinking.

This context gives evidence of God's power to rule and authority over evil (= illness), so "kingdom" becomes "power to reign."¹⁰ It is when Luke has established his concept of the "kingdom of God" that he uses for the first

¹⁰Cf. Ladd, pp. 236-37.

time the phraseology employed by Matthew and Mark when speaking of the kingdom, ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ("For the kingdom of heaven is come"--Luke 10:9,11).

If ἤγγικεν is to be taken as intensive perfect, Conzelmann's position that the passage of Luke 10:9,11 refers to the future arrival of the kingdom cannot be accepted.¹¹

Luke's understanding of the connection between miracles of healing and the kingdom reaches its clearest presentation in chapter 17. Beginning with verse 11 we have the account of the ten lepers who requested healing and were sent by Jesus to the priests. On their way they discovered the leprosy fading and the glow of health returning to their body tissue. One of the ten forgot where he was going and in his joy returned, praising God, to find Jesus. When the benefactor was found by the cleansed man, "He fell upon his face at his feet thanking him" (Luke 17:16). After further conversation, Jesus said to the prostrated man, "Arise, Go! Your faith has saved you" (Luke 17:19).

What is here meant by "saved"? If it is seen as release from leprosy, this man's condition was no different from the nine who did not return to express gratitude, for they too were cleansed. However, if "saved" is understood

¹¹Conzelmann, pp. 114-15.

to refer to a spiritual relationship between man and God, then this man was seen by Jesus to be in a different condition than were the nine who did not express their gratitude.¹²

It appears that D understood these words of Jesus as applying to a spiritual experience. To strengthen this understanding of the passage, D makes the following omission:

Luke 17:16

Codex B

και επεσεν επι προσωπον
 παρα τους ποδας αυτου
 ευχαριστων αυτω και αυτος
 ην σαμαρειτης

"And he fell upon his
 face at his feet thank-
 ing him, and he was a
 Samaritan."

Codex D

και επεσεν επι προσωπον
 προς τους ποδας αυτου
 ην δε σαμαριτης

"And he fell upon his
 face at his feet,
 and he was a
 Samaritan."

om. ευχαριστων αυτω, D

It is possible that the omission is a homoeoteleuton. On the other hand, in view of D's free handling of the text of Luke, the omission could be intentional. If it is intentional, it fits into two editorial themes seen in D: (1) the glorification of Jesus (as we have already seen), for the omission of "thanking him" leaves the

¹²Cf. Arndt, p. 372; Geldenhuys, pp. 436-38; Hans Dieter Betz, "The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers," Journal of Biblical Literature, XC(1971), 314-28; Brown, pp. 38-39.

Samaritan prostrated at Jesus' feet with no qualifying explanation. This can be taken as an act of homage, as well as thanks; thus Jesus is glorified by the worship rendered him by a foreigner. (2) The revelation of an anti-Judaic bias (which is yet to be investigated); that this stranger would return to give thanks to Jesus, or yet, to worship him, shows the nine Jewish lepers as being unresponsive to the ministry of Jesus.

However, these two points are not our immediate interest. We are interested in the omission in the light of Jesus' statement to the Samaritan, "Your faith has saved you." In the light of this statement D's omission portrays the Samaritan as rendering worship to Jesus, as an expression of submission to Jesus' authority and power that could heal a disease of the nature of leprosy. Thus it is probable that D viewed the prostrated Samaritan as expressing his belief in Jesus as a Saviour, not only from physical maladies but from sin as well.

Jesus was then asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God was to come, whereupon Jesus replied: οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἢ ἐκεῖ ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν ("The kingdom of God does not come with observation, neither will they say behold here or there, for behold, the

kingdom of God is within you"¹³--Luke 17:20,21).

Luke ties the healing of the ten lepers to Jesus' answer to the question of the Pharisees because the cleansing illustrates perfectly what Jesus meant in his answer to the Pharisees' question. Ten men were physically healed, but only one found the kingdom. When the one healed man

¹³The following defend "among you": Arndt, pp. 373-74; Plummer, p. 406; Paul M. Bretcher, "Luke 17:21," Concordia Theological Monthly, XV(1944), 730-36; idem, "Luke 17:20-21 in Recent Investigations," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXII(1951), 895-908; Burton Scott Easton, "Luke 17:20-21," American Journal of Theology, XVI(1912), 275-83; F. Warburton Lewis, "Luke xvii.21," Expository Times, XXXVIII(1926/27), 187-88; Alexander Rüstow, "ἐντός ὑμῶν ἐστίν, Zur Deutung von Lukas 17.20-21," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XVII(1960), 197-224. Creed defends "within you," as a spiritual kingdom, "By the time that Luke's Gospel was written the term 'the kingdom of God' had lost its earlier definition and could be used with the new context and associations which the teaching, death, and resurrection of Jesus had imparted to the term (cf. Ac. i.3, xxviii.31). The Spirit--the first installment of the inheritance--was already bestowed, and St. Paul could write to the Romans (xiv.17) οὐκ γάρ ἐστίν ἡ β. τ. θ. βρώσις καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Whatever actual saying of Jesus may lie behind these words, it may be that Luke believed that Jesus set the spiritual presence of the kingdom in men's hearts in antithesis to the expectation of its appearance 'here' or 'there.' But even if this is so, the eschatological conception is by no means superseded in the mind of the evangelist, or eliminated from his gospel" (p. 219). The pericope of the ten lepers would indicate that Otto Betz's statement may need qualification. Betz says, "The miracles of Jesus cannot be separated from obedience to his message and acceptance of his messianic claim. Luke makes this unmistakably clear from the very beginning": "The Kerygma of Luke," Interpretation, XXII(1968), 137. From Luke's point of view it might be more accurate to say that the miracles of Jesus may provide an entrance into a deeper experience of sharing the joys of the kingdom of God and salvation.

returned to Jesus praising God, falling on his face at Jesus' feet and thanking him, he was expressing the joy of a discovery that far exceeded the joy of finding his physical body cleansed of a dread disease. Through this healing he found a relationship with God that enabled Jesus to assure this man of something more than physical healing.¹⁴

For Jesus could say to the man, "Go! Your faith has saved you," and to the Pharisees, "The kingdom does not come by observation, but it is within you." It is interesting to note that of all the parables recorded by Matthew which are prefixed with "The kingdom is like . . . ," Luke has only two, the Mustard Seed (13:18,19) and the Leaven (13:20,21). Both parables deal with inner spiritual growth.

So it would seem that Luke conceives of miracles

¹⁴Cf. Arndt, p. 372. Cf. the following for further discussion on the spiritual nature of God's kingdom: Edward A. McDowell, "The Kingdom of God and the Day of the Son of Man," Review and Expositor, XXXIX(1942), 54-65; George E. Ladd, "The Kingdom of God--Reign or Realm?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXI(1962), 230-38; Robert F. Berkey, "Ἐγγίξειν, φθάνειν and Realized Eschatology," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII(1963), 177-87; John F. Walwood, "The Kingdom of Heaven," Bibliotheca Sacra, CXXIV(1967), 195-205. Cf. the following who take the position that the kingdom is "within" and not "among": P. M. S. Allen, "Luke xvii.21: ἰδοὺ γάρ, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν," Expository Times, XLIX(1937/38), 476-77; idem, Expository Times, L(1938/39), 233-35; Frank Ballard, "Luke xvii.21," Expository Times, XXXVIII(1926/27), 331; Edward A. McDowell, "The Kingdom of God and the Day of the Son of Man," Review and Expositor, XXXIX(1942), 54-65. Andrew Shedd believes that ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν ("is within you") refers to a kingdom group within the you-group: "The Interpretation of Luke xvii.21," Expository Times, L(1938/39), 235-37. Cf. Geldenhuys, pp. 443-44.

of physical healing as evidence of the presence of the power of God to reign, not only in gaining victory over the powers of evil which have control over human bodies, but also evidence of the power of God to establish his reign over the lives of men who are willing to accept this reign.

Let us summarize what has been said to this point:

1. Luke avoids applying the term ἡγγικεν to the kingdom as Matthew and Mark apply it in the ministry of John the Baptist and Jesus until he can develop his thesis concerning the kingdom.

2. Luke does seem to foresee a delay in the immediate establishment of God's kingdom on earth which terminates the power of the nations.

3. He sees instead the reign of God being established in men's lives through the ministry of Jesus.

4. The working of miraculous physical healings, which terminates the end of the reign of evil over physical bodies, is evidence of God's power to establish his reign over men's spiritual lives. The alteration by D makes this viewpoint more explicit.

Luke has not altogether forsaken an eschatological end to secular history. In chapter 21, he still foresees "the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory" (Luke 21:27). Those who are able to read the signs of the times will see in secular events omens of the

approaching end: "So also you, when you see these things happen, you know that the kingdom of God is near" (Luke 21:31). That Luke foresees an eschatological end in the future which involves the judgment of those who have rejected the rule of God is borne out in such parables as the Great Banquet (14:15-24), the Ten Pounds (19:11-27), and the Vineyard and the Tenants (20:9-19).

So Luke sees an immediate kingdom or reign of God that is established within the hearts of men, and he sees also the future end of secular history when God will establish his undisputed rule, permanently, upon the earth.

Turning now to D, we will examine what his understanding was of Luke's theology of the kingdom. First, it should be noted that D supports Luke's attempt to equate miracles with the presence of the kingdom. We have already referred to Jesus' statement concerning the kingdom in Luke 4:43 ("It is necessary for me to present the good news concerning the kingdom . . . to other cities also . . ."), but to understand D's alteration here it may be necessary to summarize again the background of this statement.

Jesus had performed two miracles on the Sabbath: a man possessed with a demon was healed in the synagogue, and Peter's mother-in-law was relieved of a burning fever. After sunset, a multitude of people sought him out for healing, or the healing of someone else they had brought with

them. The next morning the crowds again sought him and requested that he not leave their city, whereupon Jesus said that he had to go to other cities also in order to complete his mission:

Luke 4:43

Codex B

ο δε ειπεν προς αυτους
 οτι και ταις
 ετεραις πολεσιν ευαγγελι-
 σασθαι δει με την
 βασιλειαν του θυ
 οτι επι τουτο
 απεσταλην

"And he said to them,
 'it is necessary for me
 to present the good
 news concerning the
 kingdom of God to other
 cities also, for this
 cause I was sent.'"

Codex D

ο δε ειπεν προς αυτους
 οτι δει με και εις τας
 αλλας πολεις ευαγγελι-
 σασθαι αυτην
 βασιλειαν του θυ
 εις τουτο γαρ
 απεσταλην.

"And he said to them,
 'it is necessary for me
 to present the good
 news concerning this
 kingdom of God to other
 cities also, for this
 cause I was sent.'"

δει με post οτι, D e
 ταις ετεραις πολεσιν] εις τας αλλας πολεις, D
 την] αυτην, D
 οτι επι τουτο] εις τουτο γαρ, D e

The variant that we are interested in is αὐτήν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ("this kingdom of God"). There are grammatical constructions where it is permissible for αὐτήν ("her") to function as ταύτην ("this"). Robertson identifies this construction as a semi-demonstrative use of αὐτός. "Αὐτός is beginning to have a semi-demonstrative sense (common in modern Greek) in the New Testament, as in Lu. 13:1, ἐν

αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ."15 Also:

In Luke αὐτὸς ὁ is sometimes almost a pure demonstrative as it comes to be in later Greek. The sense of "very" or "self" is strengthened to "that very." Thus αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ (Lu. 2:28), ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ (13:1), ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (23:12). The modern Greek freely employs this demonstrative sense . . . Moulton (Prol., p. 91) finds this demonstrative use of αὐτὸς ὁ in the papyri.16

If the variant reading, αὐτήν, were to be taken as a demonstrative pronoun, D then would be strengthening Luke's apparent equation of miracles = presence of the kingdom, for "this" would then connect "kingdom of God" directly to the miraculous power for healing that Jesus possessed. The request of the citizens of Capernaum that Jesus not leave their city stems from the healings Jesus performed on the previous Sabbath and the mass healings he performed that evening after sunset.

If D understood Luke as saying that the kingdom of God (i.e. God's reign) is present, evidenced by Jesus' power to heal, then the next two variants might be explained in this context. The first is an omission in Luke's version of the beatitudes, and the second is an addition in Luke's version of the Lord's prayer:

Luke 6:21

Codex B

Codex D

μακαριοι οι πεινωντες νυν
 οτι χορτασθησεσθε μακαριοι
 οι κλαιοντες νυν οτι γελασετε

μακαριοι οι πεινωντες νυν
 οτι χορτασθησεσθε

15Robertson, p. 290.

16Ibid., p. 686.

"Blessed are those who
hunger now, for they shall
be filled; blessed are
those who weep now, for
they shall laugh."

"Blessed are those who
hunger now, for they shall
be filled."

om. μακαριοι οι κλαιοντες νυν οτι γελασετε, D

Practically no comments by scholars can be found on the missing beatitude in D. Homoeoteleuton seems unlikely. It appears that D omitted this beatitude deliberately. If this omission is considered in the context of Luke's view of the kingdom of God, we might find a possible explanation for its omission. Weeping has no place among those who have experienced the presence of God's kingdom. The statement, "Blessed are those who weep now, for they shall laugh," is for those who live before the establishment of God's rule. Now, however, God's power to rule, his kingdom, is present and evidenced by Jesus' authority over the powers of evil. The time to comfort those who weep is past and the time to laugh is here. Now we shall notice the addition:

Luke 11:2

Codex B

ειπεν δε αυτοις οταν
προσευχησθε

λεγετε πατερ
αγιασθητω το ονομα σου
ελθετω η βασιλεια

Codex D

ο δε ειπεν οταν
προσευχησθε μη βαττολογειτε
ως οι λοιποι δοκουσιν γαρ
τινες οτι εν τη πολυλογεια
αυτων εισακουσθησονται αλλα
προσευχομενοι λεγετε πατερ
ημων ο εν τοις ουρανοις
αγιασθητω ονομα σου εφ
ημας ελθετω σου η βασιλεια

σου.

γενηθητω το θελημα σου ως
εν ουρανῳ και επι γης.

"And he said to them,

"And he said, when you
pray, do not be repetitious
as the rest, for certain ones
think that by their many
words they shall be heard,
but when you pray, say, our
Father who is in heaven,
hallowed be your name, your
kingdom come upon us, your
will be done upon earth as
it is in heaven."

when you pray, say,
Father,
hallowed be your name, your
kingdom come."

-
- + ο ante δε, D
 - + μη βαττολογειτε ως οι λοιποι δοκουσιν γαρ τινες οτι εν τη πολυλογεια αυτων εισακουσθησονται αλλα προσευχομενοι ante λεγετε, D
 - + ημων ο εν τοις ουρανοις post πατερ, C Ω D Θ pm cop^{sa} syc^{ph}
 - + εφ ημας ante ελθετω, D
 - + γενηθητω το θελημα σου ως εν ουρανῳ και επι γης post βασιλεια, X C Ω D Θ pm it vg^s cop^{bd}

Variants 2, 3, and 5 are obvious harmonizations with the text of Matthew; they are interesting but are of no significance for the present study. Our main concern is with the addition of ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ("upon us") before "let your kingdom come." It is believed that this variant originated from an interesting reading for which there is evidence from Tertullian (Adv. Marc. iv.26), Gregory of Nyssa, and 604 (a cursive edited by Hoskier in 1890).¹⁷ The reading is Ἐλθέτω τὸ πνεῦμά σου (τὸ ἅγιον) ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω

¹⁷Plummer, p. 295. Cf. Metzger, pp. 154-55. R. Leaney, "The Lucan Text of the Lord's Prayer," Novum Testamentum, I(1956), 103-11, sees Gregory's text at Luke 11:2 as being authentic and thus is consistent with the view that this form may be derived from Jesus himself.

ἡμῶς,¹⁸ ("Let your [Holy] Spirit come upon us and cleanse us").

Plummer suggests that this variant could be read with either "Thy kingdom come" or "Hallowed be Thy name."¹⁹ Creed informs us that Harnack proposed to substitute it for the first two petitions, but Creed concludes there is no positive evidence for such a position.²⁰ However, he points out that "the words" of this variant "or their equivalent were a substitute for the first, not for the second petition" in Marcion, i.e. for "Hallowed be Thy name."²¹

Metzger indicates that no one can be certain that "upon you" in D should be taken as evidence of an earlier petition for the Holy Spirit: "To pray that God's name may be hallowed upon us is entirely congruent with Old Testament references to causing the divine name to dwell there. . . ." Therefore, Metzger believes that the variant reading is a liturgical adaptation of the original form of the Lord's Prayer. This adaptation was possibly used during the rite of baptism or the laying on of hands.²²

Any reason advanced for the presence of this variant

¹⁸Nestle-Aland, p. 181. ¹⁹Plummer, p. 295.

²⁰Creed, p. 156.

²¹Ibid. Cf. Ernst von Dobschutz, "The Lord's Prayer," Harvard Theological Review, VII(1914), 293-321.

²²Metzger, pp. 155-56.

in D's text of Luke can only be suggestive. It would appear that D was acquainted with the variant reading that petitions the presence of the Holy Spirit; but D does not appear to be sufficiently under the influence of Tertullian and Gregory of Nyssa as to change the normal text of Luke to include this petition. However, it seems that D does see in the words, "upon us," something that may be used in his editorial scheme.

Because of its position in the Greek text, this addition can be read with what precedes it, "Hallowed be Thy name," or with what follows, "Thy kingdom come." There does not seem to be sufficient evidence in D's editorial scheme to warrant the variant reading to be taken with what precedes it, thus producing what Metzger sees as "a liturgical adaptation of the original form of the Lord's Prayer." However, it is apparent that D has an editorial interest in Luke's theology of the kingdom. To petition the coming of God's kingdom upon the believer is in harmony with D's understanding of God's kingdom in Luke's normal text.

Thus in essence, the prayer is no longer asking God in a general way to send his kingdom, but rather asking God to make the petitioner ready to receive it; this petition in the context of Luke's view of the kingdom, i.e. that Jesus' miracles indicate its presence, now becomes an expression of eager realization that the kingdom can be

experienced now. This concept of the kingdom is supported by the following variant in D.

Earlier we discussed the significance in the normal tradition of the healing of the ten lepers and its bearing on Jesus' answer to the question posed by the Pharisees, "When is the kingdom of God coming?" D perhaps senses the original significance of what Luke was saying about the kingdom and alters Jesus' reply in the following manner:

Luke 17:20,21

Codex B

Codex D

20. επερωτηθεις δε υπο των φαρισαιων ποτε ερχεται η βασιλεια του ϑυ απεκριθη αυτοις και ειπεν ουκ ερχεται η βασιλεια του ϑυ μετα παρατηρησεως

21. ουδε ερουσιν ιδου ωδε η εκει ιδου γαρ η βασιλεια του ϑυ εντος υμων εστιν.

"20. And having been asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God would come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God comes not with observation
21. Nor will they say, behold here or there; for behold the kingdom of God is within you."

20. επερωτηθεις δε υπο των φαρισαιων ποτε ερχετε η βασιλεια του ϑυ απεκριθη αυτοις και ειπεν ουκ ερχεται η βασιλεια του ϑυ μετα παρατηρησεως

21. ουδε ερουσιν ιδου ωδε η ιδου εκει μη πιστευσητε ιδου γαρ η βασιλεια του ϑυ εντος υμων εστιν.

"20. And having been asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God would come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God comes not with observation
21. Nor will they say, behold here or behold there; Believe it not, for behold the kingdom of God is within you."

v. 21 + ιδου, Ω D lat sy^P Tatian
+ μη πιστευσητε post εκει, D
+ ιδου ante εκει, D

There is little question but what μή πιστεύετε ("believe it not") is a harmonization with Matthew 24:23 and Mark 13:21, where Jesus warns against false christs. Although Luke lifts v. 21a out of the eschatological context of Matthew 24 and Mark 13 and places it into a non-eschatological setting here, D's harmonization of Luke's normal text does not necessarily imply that eschaton is to be equated with the kingdom "within," for D does not alter Luke's eschatological chapter (21) in a manner that would do away with the future eschaton. As used by D in this context the addition of μή πιστεύετε leaves little question that the present kingdom is established internally; it is a spiritual kingdom. One cannot point out its geographic location by saying "Lo here or there."

Coming immediately after the cleansing of the ten lepers, this addition serves as a commentary on how D understood the significance of the story in the normal text; i.e. ten men were cleansed, but only one found the true joy of what the cleansing power was a representative. To him Jesus said, "Your faith has saved you."

Although D endeavors to present more explicitly Luke's concept of an internal, spiritual kingdom, he does not stress this aspect of the kingdom to the elimination of the eschaton in the normal text.²³ Thus we can say

²³Cf. Creed, pp. 218-19.

that D recognized two kingdoms in the theology of St. Luke: the spiritual kingdom we have already spoken of and the second kingdom, which is to be established at the parousia of the Lord. We see this understanding on the part of D in two additional alterations.

The first alteration is found in connection with Jesus' statement that there would be some who would not taste death until they saw the coming of the kingdom. Because the alteration of D is tied closely to an observation made by Conzelmann about Luke's normal text as it contrasts with the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark, we shall look at the statement as it appears in the three synoptics before we investigate D's alteration:

Matthew 16:28

αμην λεγω υμιν οτι
εισιν τινες των ωδε
εστωτων οιτινες ου
μη γευσωνται θανα-
του εως αν ιδωσιν
τον υιον του ανθρω-
που ερχομενον εν τη
βασιλεια αυτου

"Truly I say to
you that there
are certain ones
who are standing
here who will not
taste death until
they see the
son of man coming
in his kingdom."

Mark 9:1

και ελεγεν αυτοις
αμην λεγω υμιν
οτι εισιν τινες
ωδε των εστηκοτων
οιτινες ου μη
γευσωνται θανατου
εως αν ιδωσιν την
βασιλειαν του θ̅υ̅
εληλυθυιαν εν
δυναμει

"And he said to
them, truly I
say to you, there
are certain ones
who are standing
here who will not
taste death until
they see the
kingdom of God
come in power."

Luke 9:27

λεγω δε υμιν
αληθως εισιν
τινες των αυτου
εστηκοτων οι ου
μη γευσωνται
θανατου εως αν
ιδωσιν την βασι-
λειαν του θ̅υ̅

"And I say to
you, truly there
are certain ones
who are standing
here who will not
taste death until
they see the
kingdom of God."

Now we will see how D alters Luke's statement of this event:

Luke 9:27

Codex B

λεγω δε υμιν αληθως
εισιν τινες των αυτου
εστηκοτων οι ου μη
γευσωνται θανατου εως αν
ιδωσιν την βασιλειαν του
ϑυ

"And I say to you,
truly there are certain
ones who are standing
here who will not taste
death until they see
the kingdom of God."

Codex D

λεγω δε υμειν οτι αληθως
εισιν τινες των ωδε
εστωτων οι ου μη
γευσωνται θανατου εως αν
ειδωσιν τον υιον του
ανθρωπου ερχομενον εν
τη δοξη αυτου

"And I say to you,
truly there are certain
ones who are standing
here who will not taste
death until they see
the son of man coming in
his glory."

+ οτι ante αληθως, D P
την βασιλειαν του ϑυ] τον υιον του ανθρωπου ερχομενον
εν τη δοξη αυτου, D Origen Tatian

Jesus' statement that there were some present with him who would not taste death until they had seen the kingdom has caused a great deal of discussion. Plummer sums up the various interpretations; the kingdom here could be understood as referring to one of the following:

1. The transfiguration
2. The resurrection and ascension
3. Pentecost
4. The spread of Christianity
5. The internal development of the gospel
6. The destruction of Jerusalem
7. The second advent²⁴

We need not go into the reasoning connected with each

²⁴Plummer, p. 249.

position represented here. We are primarily concerned with D's alteration and how it bears witness to his understanding of the kingdom.

Conzelmann points to the absence of any reference to the "coming" of the kingdom in Luke's presentation of this scene as evidence that the church was accepting a further delay in the parousia. Therefore, "the idea of the coming of the Kingdom is replaced by a timeless conception of it."²⁵ D, evidently, was also sensitive to the omission of ἐληλυθυῖαν ("come"--Mark 9:1) and ἐν δυνάμει ("in power"--Mark 9:1) by Luke, terms which Conzelmann speaks of ". . . as a realistic description of the Parousia."²⁶ But D must have felt also that the omission of these terms was inconsistent with Luke's theology of the kingdom.

It would appear that D borrows τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον . . . αὐτοῦ ("the Son of Man coming . . . his") from Matthew, and the idea of Mark's ἐν δυνάμει ("in power") is expressed by ἐν δόξῃ ("in glory"). However, it is much more likely that D carries on the motif of v. 26 substituting "the Son of Man coming in his glory" for "the kingdom of God" in v. 27; thus the "idea of the coming of the Kingdom" is brought back into time by D.²⁷

²⁵Conzelmann, p. 104. ²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Cf. Mees, pp. 104-05.

We must now ask, if D understood the kingdom of God to be a spiritual kingdom, and if he strengthens this idea by adding "believe it not" in Luke 17:21, then how did he conceive of "the Son of Man coming in his glory," and why did he put it into the time period of those who were with Jesus? There is only one possible answer: D sees Jesus as the Son of Man; the "coming in his glory," which is referred to in this variant, is the glorification of Jesus at his transfiguration, which immediately follows the passage we are presently considering.

We must note at this point that D understands references to the future establishment of the kingdom as referring to the second advent. Therefore, he can substitute "the Son of Man coming in his glory" for Luke's "the kingdom of God." The transfiguration, which occurred about a week after Jesus' statement that some standing there would see "the kingdom of God" (or "his coming in glory"), would be considered by D as a miniature enactment of the glorious event that was to occur at the climax of world history.

That D could equate "the kingdom" and the second advent as a yet future event is borne out again in our next variant:

Luke 23:42

Codex B

και ελεγεν $\overline{\tau\upsilon}$ μνησθητι μου
 οταν ελθης εις την βασιλειαν
 σου

"And
 he said, Jesus, remember
 me when you come into
 your kingly power."

Codex D

και στραφεις προς τον $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$
 ειπεν αυτω μνησθητι μου
 εν τη ημερα της ελευσεως
 σου

"And turning to the Lord,
 he said to him, Remember
 me in the day of your
 coming."

και ελεγεν etc.] και στραφεις etc., D

D presents the statement of the thief as another indication that Luke is presenting two kingdoms in his tradition. One is "within you," concerning which men cannot say "Lo here or lo there." The second is to be seen in the words of the thief, "when you come in your kingly power." D understands this statement to refer to the parousia; therefore, without changing the essential meaning of the words that are before him, as far as he was concerned, he expresses his understanding of this passage by substituting "in the day of your coming" for "kingly power." The "kingly power" in Luke's normal tradition is evidenced by Jesus' power to heal which is already present. D's alteration makes it explicit that the thief was referring not to Jesus' present power but to his future appearance.

The Son of Man

We have just noted above that D seems to consider Jesus as the Son of Man.²⁸ By his variant in 9:27, D puts the promise that some would "see the Son of Man coming in his glory" into the present lifespan of his listeners by tying it to the transfiguration. We shall now consider two more passages in which D was able to express his belief that Jesus was the Son of Man:

Luke 17:22

Codex B

ειπεν δε προς τους μαθη-
τας ελευσονται ημεραι
οτε επιθυμησητε
μιαν των ημερων
του υιου του ανθρωπου
ιδειν και ουκ οψεσθε

"And he said to the dis-
ciples, the days shall
come when you will de-
sire to see one of the
days of the Son of Man
and you will not see it."

Codex D

ειπεν ουν προς τους μαθη-
τας ελευσονται ημεραι
του επιθυμησαι υμας
μιαν των ημερων τουτων
του υιου του ανθρωπου
και ουκ οψεσθαι

"And he said to the dis-
ciples, the days shall
come when you will de-
sire one of these
days of the Son of Man
and you will not see it."

δε] ουν, D 157

οτε επιθυμησητε] του επιθυμησαι υμας, D 13 39 69 157 230
346

+ τουτων post ημερων, D

om. ιδειν, D it

If the reader is not inclined to see Jesus as the

²⁸The literature on the problem that is presented by the use of the term "Son of Man" in the gospels abounds. For an up-to-date listing of the most important works in this area see the footnotes in Wm. O. Walker, Jr., "The Origin of the Son of Man Concept as Applied to Jesus," Journal of Biblical Literature, XCI(1972), 482-90.

present Son of Man, the normal text of Luke allows him to view the days of the Son of Man as being yet future, thus eliminating Jesus as the Son of Man. However, this is not possible with the text of D. By omitting ἰδεῖν ("to see") and adding τούτων ("these") after ἡμέρων ("days"), the "desire" of the disciples will be for something that they have already experienced, i.e. the days that they have spent associated with Jesus.²⁹ Thus D presents clearly his understanding that when Jesus referred to the "Son of Man," he was referring to himself.

The second Son of Man passage is in connection with the sign of Jonah:

Luke 11:30

Codex B

καθως γαρ εγενετο ο
 ιωνας τοις νινευιταις
 σημειον ουτως εσται
 και ο υιος του ανθρωπου
 τη γενεα ταυτη

Codex D

καθως γαρ εγενετο
 ιωνας σημιον τοις
 νινευταις ουτως εσται
 και ο υιος του ανθρωπου
 τη γενεα ταυτη και
 καθως ιωνας εν τη κοιλια
 του κητους εγενετο τρις
 ημερας και τρεις νυκτας
 ουτως και ο υιος του
 ανθρωπου εν τη γη

²⁹Cf. Arndt, p. 374. For a further discussion of "the days of the Son of Man," with varying points of view, cf. E. Sanby, "The Days of the Son of Man," Expository Times, LXVII(1955/56), 124-25; Edward A. McDowell, 54-65; Geldenhuys, p. 444; Robert Leaney, "The Days of the Son of Man," Expository Times, LXVII(1955/56), 28-29; Plummer, p. 407; W. Powell, "The Days of the Son of Man," Expository Times LX(1955/56), 219.

"For just as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites so the Son of Man also shall be to this generation."

"For just as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites so the Son of Man also shall be to this generation and as Jonah was in the belly of the whale three days and three nights so the Son of Man also shall be in the earth."

+ και καθως ιωνας εν τη κοιλια του κητους εγενετο τρις ημερας και τρεις νυκτας ουτως και ο υιος του ανθρωπου τη γη post ταυτη, D a ff r (e i)

The normal text of Luke says that the Son of Man will be a sign to "this generation." Luke does not specifically identify what it is about the Son of Man that will be the sign, nor does he give any indication as to who the Son of Man is. By harmonizing Luke's tradition with Matthew 12:40, D supplies the two elements that are lacking in the normal tradition. First, he identifies the sign of Jonah with the burial and resurrection of Jesus (this will be discussed in detail later); secondly, he identifies the Son of Man as Jesus, who was to be in the earth three days and three nights.

Conclusion

We conclude with a summary of the various points we have investigated in this chapter. First, the main points concerning Luke's understanding of the kingdom:

1. Luke saw the presence of the kingdom as evidenced by Jesus' power to work miracles of healing (Luke

4:43; 10:9,11; 11:20; 17:11-19).

2. Matthew only once equates kingdom with miracles and that was an exorcism (Matthew 12:28); Mark sees no relationship at all.

3. Through miracles Luke sees "kingdom" as God's power to reign.

4. Connecting the Pharisees' question, as to when the kingdom was to come, to the statement of salvation addressed to the grateful leper, Luke understands the nature of God's "present" kingdom to be spiritual (Luke 17:20-21).

5. Luke does not forsake an eschatological end of the world for the "present" spiritual kingdom (Luke 21; 14:15-24; 19:11-27; 20:9-19).

Now let us look at D's understanding of Luke's position as seen through D's variants:

1. D strengthens Luke's position that Jesus' power to heal is evidence of the presence of the kingdom, by adding αὐτήν ("this") before βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ("kingdom of God"--Luke 4:43), when the citizens of Capernaum asked him to stay with them so they might benefit from Jesus' healings.

2. In answering the Pharisees' question as to when the kingdom would come, D adds μὴ πιστεύητε ("believe it not") to the comment by Jesus, "they say behold here or

behold there." In so doing D emphasizes the spiritual nature of the kingdom.

3. D envisions the coming of the Son of Man in glory; it is therefore possible to say that he recognized in St. Luke the presence of two kingdoms, the spiritual kingdom that rules in submissive hearts and the kingdom of glory at the eschaton.

4. Concerning the Son of Man, D sees Jesus as being the present Son of Man and makes alterations in Luke 17:22; 11:30; 9:27 to make his understanding clear.

CHAPTER V

IN DEFENSE OF THE GENTILES

Luke's interest in the whole of mankind as well as in insignificant individuals stands as a generally acknowledged contrast to the relative exclusiveness of Matthew and Mark.¹ This universalism of Luke is supported and expanded by D.

Earlier, in dealing with the ministry of John the Baptist (chapter two), it was pointed out that three groups came to receive his baptism, the crowds (3:10), publicans (v. 12), and soldiers (v. 14). In the normal text of Luke the three groups requested ethical advice, "What shall we do?" By the addition of "in order that we might be saved," D changes their question on ethical behavior into a far more important question concerning salvation.

Beginning with the inquiry, "What shall we do in order that we might be saved," D reveals a desire to place the soldiers in a more favorable light, especially in

¹Cf. Reicke, pp. 63-74; Geldenhuys, pp. 43-45; Arndt, pp. 30-31; Plummer, pp. xxxiii-xxxvi; Gilmour, p. 7.

connection with the crucifixion.² It is generally conceded that it is difficult to determine whether the soldiers requesting baptism were Jewish or Roman. However, on the basis of καὶ ἡμεῖς ("we also") in v. 14, it is concluded by some that these soldiers were Jewish support-units for the tax-collectors.³ Their inquiry of John is based upon a desire to know if the baptism of repentance extended to the tax-collectors was extended to them also.

However, there seems to be a tendency in D to regard all the military in Luke as Roman; the foundation upon which commentators regard the soldiers in v. 14 as Jewish is removed by D:

Luke 3:14

Codex B

επηρωτων δε αυτον και
στρατευομενοι λεγοντες
τι ποιησωμεν και ημεις
. . . .

"And the soldiers also
asked him saying, what
must we also do?

Codex D

επηρωτησαν δε και
στρατευομενοι λεγοντες
τι ποιησωμεν
ινα σωθωμεν

"And the soldiers also
asked saying, what
must we do in order that
we might be saved?

επηρωτων] επηρωτησαν, C D it
om. αυτον, D c

²Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 85-93. Epp concludes that D in Acts treats the Roman officials with reserve and on the basis of their ignorance frees them from blame in their treatment of the apostles, pp. 147-54.

³Cf. Plummer, p. 92; Creed, p. 53; Godet, p. 114; Geldenhuys, p. 139; Farrar, p. 88.

om. και ημεις, D 7
 + ινα σωθωμεν post ποιησωμεν, D

There is no way to arrive at a definite conclusion as to the nationality of these troops in the present context of D's text. However, this is not to say that a conclusion cannot be reached by investigating other variants in connection with soldiers. If it can be shown that D regards all military as Roman, the requests of the soldiers for baptism becomes significant, the refusal of John's baptism by the religious leaders becomes more striking, and D's universalism is extended a step beyond that of Luke.

The following variant helps to clarify D's thinking with regard to the soldiers, but what D says here is implicit and not explicit:

Luke 22:4

Codex B

και απελθων συνελαλησεν
 τοις αρχιερευσιν και
 στρατηγοις. . . .

"And when he had departed
 he spoke with the chief
 priests and captains.
 . . ."

Codex D

και απελθων συνελαλησεν
 τοις αρχιερευσιν. . . .

"And when he had departed
 he spoke with the chief
 priests. . . ."

om. και στρατηγοις, D 31 it sy^{SC}

That the στρατηγοί ("captains") in v. 4 are the captains of the temple guards is deduced from 22:52, εἶπεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ

στρατηγούς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους . . . ("And Jesus said to the chief priests, captains of the temple and elders who were approaching him . . ."). Most commentators conclude that the captains in v. 52 are those that are mentioned in v. 4, and thus would be Jewish.⁴

Creed suggests that the omission in v. 4 resulted from harmonization with Matthew and Mark.⁵ This is entirely possible, for we have already seen that harmonization is one of D's favorite editorial tools. Easton's suggestion that the omission was made because the copyist did not know who the "captains" were is not too convincing since they are eventually identified in v. 52.⁶ Plummer makes an interesting observation concerning the allied witnesses of this omission: although D it sy^{SC} omit καὶ στρατηγοῖς ("and captains"), a b c e ff² i l q sy^{SC} substitute καὶ γραμματεῦσιν ("and scribes"). D d alone have a complete omission with no substituting group.⁷

Because στρατηγοί ("captains") is used with no qualifying phrase in v. 4, D may have omitted it, thinking it would be confused with the Roman military command. In v. 52, where the word "captains" is qualified by the phrase

⁴Cf. Arndt, p. 430; van Oosterzee, p. 331; Gilmour, p. 372; Geldenhuys, p. 548; Godet, p. 459; Creed, p. 260; Plummer, p. 491; Farrar, p. 323; Montefiore, p. 584; Easton, p. 316.

⁵Creed, p. 260. ⁶Easton, p. 316. ⁷Plummer, p. 491

"of the temple," D allows the word to stand, for there is no danger of confusing them with the Roman military. Thus D removes any possibility of connecting the Romans with the betrayal of Jesus, which is the subject of Luke 22.

But more than this, D implies that "soldiers" in Luke are Roman military, unless they are explicitly identified otherwise. Therefore, the omission of "we also" in 3:14 would seem to indicate that D interpreted the soldiers who came to John the Baptist to be Roman.⁸

There is very little said by commentators on the next omission, yet it is significant:

Luke 24:7

Codex B

. . . λεγων τον υιον του
ανθρωπου οτι δει
παραδοθηναι εις χειρας
ανθρωπων αμαρτωλων και
σταυρωθηναι και τη
τριτη ημερα αναστηναι

". . . saying concerning
the Son of Man
that he must be
betrayed into the
hands of sinful men
and be crucified and
raised the third day."

Codex D

. . . οτι δει τον υιον του
ανθρωπου
παραδοθηναι εις χειρας
ανθρωπων και
σταυρωθηναι και τη
τριτη ημερα αναστηναι

". . . that it was neces-
sary for the Son of Man
to be
betrayed into the
hands of men
and be crucified and
raised the third day."

⁸Conzelmann observes that in Luke's sources the soldiers that are involved with the crucifixion are Roman, whereas in Luke soldiers are still present, but their nationality is not certain (p. 88). Montefiore observes that the mocking of Jesus at his trial before Herod (23:6-16) is transferred by Luke from the Roman soldiers (Matthew 27:27-31; Mark 15:16-20) to a Jewish chief and his guards (pp. 619, 622).

om. λεγων, D c
om. αμαρτωλων, D it

Conzelmann takes ἀμαρτωλῶν ("sinners, sinful") as a term applied to the Jews in Luke's normal text. He bases his position upon the use of νόμος ("law") and ἄνομος ("lawless") in the speeches of Stephen and Peter in Acts. He sees νόμος ("law") as referring to the moral law in Stephen's speech (Acts 7:53) and ἄνομος ("lawless," or those devoid of the principles of the moral law) as applicable to the Jews at the crucifixion of Jesus in Peter's speech (Acts 2:23) and not applicable to the Romans, which is the Jewish use of the term. In Luke 24:7, Conzelmann sees ἀμαρτωλῶν ("sinful") as an interpretation of ἀνομία ("lawlessness"), which Luke applied here to the Jews and not to the Romans.⁹

D apparently sees the case differently. If he saw ἀμαρτωλῶν ("sinful") as applying to the Jews, as Conzelmann suggests, he might have allowed the word to stand, for this is a strong anti-Judaic reading. The position of Conzelmann places the emphasis in verse 7 upon the betrayal, for it was into the hands of the Jews that Jesus was delivered, with the resulting crucifixion stemming from their pressure tactics (23:18-23) in the face of Pilate's declaration of innocence (23:13-15). Therefore, Conzelmann sees Luke

⁹Conzelmann, p. 92.

holding the Jewish people responsible for Jesus' death.¹⁰

On the other hand, D seems to read v. 7 with the emphasis on σταυρωθῆναι ("to be crucified"). The actual mechanics of the crucifixion were carried out by the Roman soldiers, although the presence of the military is not noted by Luke until 23:36; after the crucifixion had already taken place.¹¹ D regards the men in v. 7 as Roman soldiers. Jesus was handed over to them to be crucified. The omission of "sinful" thus indicates that D does not hold the Roman soldiers directly responsible for the crucifixion.

It would seem that the omission of the prayer for forgiveness in Luke 23:34 is closely tied to the omission in 24:7. In the normal text of Luke this prayer is as follows, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν πᾶτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν ("And Jesus said, Father forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing"--Luke 23:34).

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 90-93.

¹¹The involvement of the Roman soldiers in the crucifixion is very clear in the other two synoptics, cf. Matthew 27:27-31 and Mark 15:16-20. The earlier observation noted in Conzelmann stands here: Luke removes all identification of where the military comes from; thus in Luke's normal text these soldiers are not identified. D, however, sees all the military as Roman; therefore, these soldiers are Roman. Upon this premise D alters their mockery of Jesus; we will deal with this alteration in the next chapter.

D, however, omits the prayer.¹²

Opinion is divided over for whom the prayer was offered. Some commentators believe it was for the Roman soldiers who were simply carrying out the order of their superiors.¹³ Others feel the prayer was spoken for the Jews.¹⁴ A third group believes it was for both the soldiers and the Jews.¹⁵ Opinion is also divided as to whether this reading was part of the original text.¹⁶ The majority of those who feel that the prayer was offered on behalf of the Jews believe that it was omitted by copyists because they thought it incredible that God should forgive them.¹⁷

¹²The following are witnesses for the reading: X * C R pl lat syP Marcion Origen. The following witnesses omit the reading: P⁷⁵ B D* W Θ pc sy^S copsa.

¹³Arndt, pp. 468-69; Creed, p. 286; Blass, Philology, pp. 93-94.

¹⁴George Bradford Caird, The Gospel of St. Luke (Baltimore: Penguin Book, 1963), p. 251; Tinsley, p. 201; Plummer, pp. 531-32; Godet, p. 492; Geldenhuys, pp. 608-09; J. R. Harris, "New Points of View," Expositor, VIII, 7(1914), 324-34.

¹⁵Farrar, p. 348; Gilmour, p. 408; van Oosterzee, p. 372; Williams, Alterations, pp. 8-9.

¹⁶Those who feel the reading was original include: Caird, p. 251; Godet, p. 482; Plummer, p. 545; Arndt, pp. 468-69. Those who feel the saying is genuine, but was inserted into the original text include: Gilmour, p. 408; Metzger, p. 180; Creed, p. 286.

¹⁷Caird, p. 251; Tinsley, p. 201; Creed, p. 286; Arndt, pp. 468-69.

However, we are primarily concerned with D's rationale for the omission of this prayer. Geldenhuys's suggestion relating to the normal text of Luke provides a reasonable rationale for D's omission, especially in the light of D's omission of ἀμαρτωλῶν ("sinful") in 24:7:

That Jesus did not pray for the Roman soldiers but for the guilty Jewish people follows from the fact that such a prayer for the soldiers was unnecessary, for they only carried out orders and had no share in His condemnation.¹⁸

In the thinking of D, if these men who were performing the mechanics of the crucifixion were not considered "sinful" by Jesus, the prayer uttered by our Lord for their forgiveness would be meaningless; thus it was omitted.

From the next series of variants we infer that D is reluctant to permit Gentiles to appear with Jews in the eschatological judgment. We have already dealt with the following verse in developing D's understanding of the Son of Man; now, however, we must return to it in order to investigate the sign of Jonah:

Luke 11:30

Codex B

καθως γαρ εγενετο ο
ιωνας τοις νινευιταις
σημειον ουτως εσται
και ο υιος του ανθρωπου
τη γενεα ταυτη

Codex D

καθως γαρ εγενετο
ιωνας σημειον τοις
νινευιταις ουτως εσται
και ο υιος του ανθρωπου
τη γενεα ταυτη και καθως

¹⁸Geldenhuys, p. 614.

Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ
 κητοῦ ἐγένετο τρεῖς
 ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας
 οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
 ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ γῆ

"For just as Jonah was
 a sign to the Ninevites
 so the Son of Man also
 shall be to this gener-
 ation."

"For just as Jonah was
 a sign to the Ninevites
 so the Son of Man also
 shall be to this gener-
 ation and as Jonah was
 in the belly of the whale
 three days and three
 nights, so the Son of Man
 also shall be in the earth."

+ καὶ καθὼς Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κητοῦ ἐγένετο τρεῖς
 ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
 ἐν τῇ γῆ post ταυτη, D a ff r (e i)

The addition is a harmonization with Matthew 12:

40. D perhaps understood "the sign of Jonah" in Luke's
 normal text to be Jonah's message of coming judgment on
 Nineveh¹⁹ (a conclusion arrived at from the immediate

¹⁹Compare this position on "the sign of Jonah" with
 Tinsley, pp. 131-32; Gilmour, p. 211; and Mees, "Sinn und
 Bedeutung," pp. 76-78. R. B. Y. Scott, "Sign of Jonah,"
Interpretation, XIX(1965), 24, sees the sign of Jonah as be-
 ing his attitude, ". . . rigid, self-centered, self-right-
 eous, individualistic, arrogant and unforgiving, given to
 anger which he miscalls moral indignation, with no room for
 pity in his heart." Cavendish Moxon, 'τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ',"
Expository Times, XXII(1910/11), 566-67, believes "the sign
 of Jonah" should read "the sign of John"; some copyist mis-
 taking Ἰωνᾶν ("Jonah") for Ἰωάναν ("John"), thus John the
 Baptist becomes the sign in fulfilling the prophecy of the
 coming Elijah. R. Thibaut, "Le Signe de Jonas," Nouvelle
 Revue Théologique, LX(1933), 532-36, presents an interest-
 ing view of the sign of Jonah. The sign is the manifesta-
 tion of God's miraculous power that ends Jesus stay of three
 days and three nights in the earth, just as the same miracu-
 lous power ended Jonah's stay in the belly of the fish. How-
 ever, that miraculous event in the experience of Jesus, which
 was to be the precursor of the glorious deliverance of all of

context of this whole passage). Thus this harmonization with Matthew becomes another variant that can be added to a list of variants in which D avoids a direct reference to Gentile involvement in the future eschatological judgment.

If D understood the judgment message of Jonah to be analogous to the warnings of Jesus concerning a coming eschatological judgment, his harmonization with Matthew would be an attempt to change Luke's tradition by identifying the sign as Jonah's experience in the belly of the whale instead of Jonah's judgment message. This alteration would then fit the pattern of four other alterations which follow:

Luke 11:31

Codex B

βασιλισσα νοτου εγερθη-
σεται εν τη κρισει μετα
των ανδρων της γενεας
ταυτης και κατακρινει
αυτους. . . .

"The queen of the south
shall rise up in the
judgment with the men
of this generation and
will condemn them. . . ."

Codex D

βασιλισσα νοτου εγερθη-
σεται μετα
των ανδρων της γενεας
ταυτης και κατακρινει
αυτους. . . .

"The queen of the south
shall rise up
with the men
of this generation and
will condemn them. . . ."

om. εν τη κρισει, P⁴⁵ D ff²

Luke 11:32, in the normal text, contains a similar statement about the men of Nineveh: "The men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn

God's people, became a source of condemnation to the Jews because of their unbelief.

it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here." However, the entire verse is omitted by D; it is possibly due to homoeoteleuton for both v. 31 and v. 32 end with ὧδε ("here"). Because D alters the thought of judgment in connection with the city of Nineveh in v. 30 to Jonah's experience of being in the belly of the fish, it is a piece of consistent editorial work to omit this statement in v. 32, where Nineveh is pictured as standing in judgment, especially when only one verse separates the two statements.

The third and fourth omissions of judgment are as follows:

Luke 10:12

Codex B

Codex D

λεγω υμιν οτι σοδομοις
εν τη ημερα εκεινη
ανεκτοτερον εσται
η τη
πολει εκεινη

λεγω δε υμειν οτι σοδομοις
ανεκτοτερον εσται εν τη
βασιλεια του θ̄ου η τη
πολει εκεινη

" I say to you that
it shall be more
tolerable for Sodom
in that day
than for that city."

"But I say to you that
it shall be more
tolerable for Sodom
in the kingdom of God
than for that city."

εν τη ημερα εκεινη] εν τη βασιλεια του θ̄ου, D a b e

Luke 10:14

Codex B

Codex D

πλην τυρω και σειδωνι
ανεκτοτερον εσται εν
τη κρισει η υμιν

πλην τυρω και σιδωνι
ανεκτοτερον εσται
η υμειν

"Moreover, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the judgment than for you."

"Moreover, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon than for you."

om. εν τη κρισει, P⁴⁵ D pc e l

The third of this series of variants may very well provide the key for understanding the thinking behind these alterations. Luke 10:12f. is an appendage to Jesus' instructions given to the seventy disciples who were sent out two by two. As a part of the instructions, Jesus told them to proclaim that the kingdom of God was at hand (v. 10). If a city refused to receive their message, they were to shake off the dust of that city as a testimony against its citizens (v. 11). At this point Jesus concludes his instructions and begins a denunciation of the cities that had rejected his ministry (vv. 13ff.).

D's alteration in v. 12 from the words "in that day" to "in the kingdom of God" seems to depend on and reflect the announcement at the end of v. 11 that the disciples were to make to the cities that rejected their ministry: "Therefore, know this, that the kingdom of God is at hand." By altering "in that day" of v. 12 immediately following the concluding remark about the kingdom in v. 11, D changes the thought from future judgment to God's kingdom, which every Jew expected to enter. However, D's alteration now indicates that it will be more tolerable for Gentiles in this kingdom

than for the Jewish cities that reject the summons of the Gospel.

Likewise, the omission of "in the judgment" in v. 14 would be based on the same reasoning, for v. 14 is still in the context of Jesus' denunciation of the Jewish cities that did not respond to his ministry. The words, "in the judgment" in v. 14, were omitted by D because the words "in the kingdom of God" were naturally still understood from v. 12.

The repeated omission of the judgment seems to indicate that there may have been a reservation on the part of D to have the Jewish people and the Gentiles stand together in judgment. For Jesus did say that if the mighty works that had been done in Chorazin and Bethsaida had been done in Tyre and Sidon, these Gentile cities would have repented in sackcloth and ashes (v. 13). But the mighty works of Jesus were not performed in these Gentile cities. They did not have the opportunities to repent that were offered to the Jewish cities. Therefore, D may not have been able to envision these two groups standing side by side under divine judgment when the opportunities were unequal.

The apparent refusal of D to accept the concept of Jews and Gentiles standing together under divine judgment appears to lie at the foundation of his alteration of the sign of Jonah, for it seems that D understood the sign of

Jonah in v. 30 to be the judgment message he delivered to the Ninevites. The next two verses again deal with the Jews and Gentiles standing in judgment together. D harmonizes Luke's tradition with that of Matthew, making Jonah's experience in the belly of the whale the "sign," and thus a type of Jesus' burial and resurrection. This results in a diversion of the minds of his readers away from the element of judgment. He then eliminated the words, "in the judgment," in v. 31 and omitted completely the next verse which deals with the Ninevites standing in judgment with the men of Jesus' generation.

By this series of variants, D removes the Gentiles from being involved in a divine judgment that places them side by side with the Jewish nation, which has had superior spiritual advantages.

From the preceding variants we are able to conclude the following:

1. D indicates implicitly that he views all references to soldiers as being to Roman soldiers.
2. D goes beyond the normal Lucan tradition in freeing the Roman soldiers from the guilt of the crucifixion.
3. D is reluctant to allow Jews and Gentiles to stand together under divine judgment. Therefore, he eliminates this thought, wherever possible, from Luke's normal text.

CHAPTER VI

ANTI-JUDAIC SENTIMENTS OF D

To this point we have noted two instances where D has revealed an anti-Judaic bias. These instances might be summarized by way of introduction to the present chapter:

1. The refusal of John's baptism by the religious leaders has already been noted. D views John's call to repentance as a call to the salvation to be offered by the coming Messiah, and he puts this thought into the mouths of the crowd, the publicans, and the soldiers by adding "that we might be saved" (3:10,12,14) to their question, "what shall we do?" In the light of D's rendering, the leaders' rejection of John's ministry now becomes more serious, for their rejection of John indicates a rejection of the salvation that will be extended through the one whom John is preparing the people to receive.

2. D displays an apparent reluctance to allow the Gentiles to stand in the judgment with the Jews. By omissions he removes the Gentiles from the context of any forthcoming judgment while allowing the Jews to be rebuked for their lack of response to Jesus' teachings and deeds, and

to stand under the threat of impending judgment.

Further evidence of D's anti-Judaic bias abounds. It will not be necessary to look at every alteration, for an investigation of the major changes should be sufficient to view D's thinking.

The Role of Jerusalem

The city of Jerusalem plays an important role in the tradition of the Gospel of Luke. A glance at a concordance indicates that references to Jerusalem in Luke outnumber those in Matthew more than two to one and those in Mark nearly three to one. Conzelmann sees Jerusalem as forming a connecting-link between the story of Jesus and the life of the Church. As far as Luke's gospel is concerned, Jerusalem is a ". . . necessary place of enmity-- necessary, that is, from the point of view of redemptive history."¹ However, "the fact that it is necessary from the point of view of saving history for the Passion to take place precisely in Jerusalem does not exonerate the Jews."² D intensifies the motif of Jerusalem as "a place of enmity":

Luke 5:17

Codex B

και εγενετο εν μια των
ημερων και αυτος ην
διδασκων και ησαν καθη-
μενοι οι φαρισαιοι και

Codex D

και εγενετο εν μια των
ημερων αυτου διδασκοντος
συνελθειν
τους φαρισαιους και

¹Conzelmann, p. 133. ²Ibid.

οι νομοδιδασκαλοι οι
 ησαν εληλυθοτες εκ
 πασης της κωμης της
 γαλιλαιας και ιουδαιας
 και ιερουσαλημ και
 δυναμικ ην εις το
 ιασθαι αυτον

"And it came to pass
 during one of those days
 that he was teaching and
 the Pharisees and teachers
 of the law were sitting
 who
 had come out of all the
 villages of Galilee and
 Judea and Jerusalem
 and the power of the Lord
 was present for him to
 heal with."

νομοδιδασκαλους
 ησαν δε συνεληλυθοτες εκ
 πασης κωμης της
 γαλιλαιας και ιουδαιας
 του
 ιασθαι αυτους

"And it came to pass
 during one of those days
 while he was teaching that
 the Pharisees and teachers
 of the law came together,
 and [the sick] were coming
 together out of every village
 of Galilee and Judea
 in order that he might
 heal them."

και αυτος ην διδασκων και ησαν καθημενοι οι φαρισαιοι
 και οι νομοδιδασκαλοι] αυτου διδασκοντος συνελθειν τους
 φαρισαιους και νομοδιδασκαλους, A D a c e 1 13 660 983
 οι ησαν εληλυθοτες] ησαν δε συνεληλυθοτες, D (e) sy^s
 om. της¹, D
 om. και ιερουσαλημ, D
 και δυναμικ ην εις το ιασθαι] του ιασθαι, D
 αυτον] αυτους, C R D Θ pl lat sy^{ph} cop^{bo} Tatian

There are a number of things that must be noted in
 this verse. According to the normal tradition it is the
 Pharisees and the teachers of the law who have come out of
 every village of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem. As a re-
 sult of D's alterations, the presence of these men is noted
 in passing, but it is the sick that have come to Jesus.
 Metzger notes that the difficulty of the text caused some
 copyist to omit οἱ ("who") altogether (χ * 33) "and others
 to replace it with δέ (D it^{d,e} syr^s), so that it is the

sick who have come from all parts to be healed."³

Metzger also notes that a failure to see that αὐτόν ("he") is the subject, not the object of τὸ ἰᾶσθαι ("to heal") ". . . led copyists to replace it with a plural form, as αὐτούς (A C D al). . . ." ⁴ In D, it is necessary to understand the αὐτόν of the normal text as subject of the infinitive of purpose for clarity. D's negative appraisal of the religious leaders (see Chapter Six) led D to see ἦσαν ("they were") as referring to the afflicted in Galilee and Judea who were coming to be healed.

It is necessary to stress two points that result from D's alterations: (1) It is those other than the Pharisees and teachers of the law that have come to Jesus, mainly for purposes of healing; and (2) they have come from everywhere but Jerusalem. The absence of people from this city when all of Galilee and Judea are represented by those seeking help indicates an attitude of rejection on the part of the inhabitants of Jerusalem; as Conzelmann has pointed out earlier, Jerusalem is a "necessary place of enmity." Furthermore, in the two instances where Luke lists the areas responding to Jesus and where Jerusalem is included (5:17; 6:17), D omits that city. The fact is, D in no way sees the capital city responding to Jesus' ministry.

³Metzger, p. 138.

⁴Ibid.

This is illustrated again by the next variant:

Luke 6:17,18

Codex B

17. και καταβας μετ
αυτων εστη επι τοπου
πεδινου και οχλος
πολυς μαθητων αυτου
και πληθος πολυ του
λαου απο πασης της
ιουδαιας και ιερουσαλημ
και της παραλιου τυρου
και σειδωνος
18. οι ηλθον ακουσαι
αυτου και ιαθηναι απο
των νοσων αυτων. . . .

"17. And when he had
gone down with them he
stood upon a level place
and a large crowd of his
disciples and a great
multitude of people
from all of Judea and
Jerusalem and the
region around Tyre
and Sidon

"18. Who came to hear
him and to be healed
from their diseases
. . . ."

Codex D

17. και καταβας μετ
αυτων εστη επει τοπου
πεδεινου και οχλος
μαθητων αυτου
και πληθος πολυ του
λαου απο πασης
ιουδαιας και αλλων
πολεων
18. εληλυθοτων ακουσαι
αυτου και ιαθηναι απο
των νοσων αυτων. . . .

"17. And when he had
gone down with them he
stood upon a level place
and a crowd of his
disciples and a great
multitude of people
from all of Judea and
other cities

"18. Having come to hear
him and to be healed
from their diseases
. . . ."

v. 17 om. πολυς, **R** D it
ιερουσαλημ και της παραλιου τυρου και σειδωνος]
αλλων πολεων, D (e c)
v. 18 οι ηλθον] εληλυθοτων, D

The areas from which these people came are expanded in the parallel passages of Matthew and Mark. Matthew includes Galilee, Decapolis, and the other side of the Jordan (4:25), along with Jerusalem and Judea. Mark also includes Galilee and the other side of the Jordan, but adds Idumaea

and Tyre and Sidon along with Jerusalem and Judea (3:7,8).

Creed observes that "all of Judaea" in Luke probably means Galilee, Judea, Idumaea and the country across the Jordan.⁵ In the normal text of Luke this is a possibility. In D, however, it appears that the phrase "and other cities" covers everything outside the province of Judea. That D did not consider Judea as an all-inclusive term is evidenced by the following variant:

Luke 23:5

Codex B

οι δε επισχυον λεγοντες
οτι ανασειει τον λαον
διδασκων καθ ολης της
ιουδαιας και αρξαμενος
απο της γαλιλαιας
εως ωδε

"And they pressed the
issue saying, he stirs
up the people teaching
throughout all Judea,
even beginning from
Galilee till here."

Codex D

οι δε ενισχυον λεγοντες
ανασειει τον λαον
διδασκων καθ ολης της
γης αρξαμενος
απο της γαλιλαιας
εως ωδε

"And they pressed the
issue saying, he stirs
up the people teaching
throughout the whole land,
beginning from
Galilee till here."

om. οτι, D lat sy^C
ιουδαιας] γης, D
om. και, P75^Q D Θ pl vg^{cl}

By substituting "land" for "Judea," D indicates that Judea did not include Galilee as far as he was concerned. The thing that is significant for our interests, however, is that D omits Jerusalem in the two previous

⁵Creed, p. 89.

texts (5:17, 6:17), and thus portrays this city as unresponsive to Jesus' ministry. D's portrayal of this city fits Jesus' lament, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often have I wished to gather your children, as a hen gathers its brood under its wings, and you were not willing" (Luke 13:34).

D's Use of πονηρός ("evil")

D's use of πονηρός ("evil") as an anti-Judaic device in Luke/Acts has already been noted by Epp.⁶ One problem he raises in respect to Luke is that of harmonization with Matthew and Mark, a problem that is not faced in the text of Acts. We will look at the variants presented by Luke:

Luke 5:21,22

Codex B

21. και ηρξαντο διαλογιζεσθαι οι γραμματεις και οι φαρισαιοι
λεγοντες τις εστιν ουτος ος λαλει βλασφημιας τις δυναται αμαρτιας αφειναι ει μη μονος ο θς
22. επιγνους δε ο ις τους διαλογισμους αυτων αποκριθεις ειπεν προς αυτους τι διαλογιζεσθε εν ταις καρδιαις υμων

Codex D

21. και ηρξαντο διαλογιζεσθαι οι γραμματεις και οι φαρισαιοι εν ταις καρδιαις αυτων λεγοντες τι ουτος λαλει βλασφημιας τις δυναται αμαρτιας αφειναι ει μη εις θς
22. επιγνους δε ο ιης τους διαλογισμους αυτων λεγει αυτοις τι διαλογιζεσθαι εν ταις καρδιας υμων πονηρα

⁶Epp, pp. 42-45, 49.

"21. And the Scribes and Pharisees began to reason saying, who is this who speaks blasphemies? Who is able to forgive sin except God alone?"

"22. And Jesus knowing their reasoning, answered and said to them, Why do you reason in your hearts?"

"21. And the Scribes and Pharisees began to reason in their hearts saying, why does this man speak blasphemies? Who is able to forgive sin except one, God?"

"22. And Jesus knowing their reasoning, said also to them, Why do you reason evil in your hearts?"

v. 21 + εν ταϊς καρδιαϊς αυτων post φαρισαιοι, D it τις εστιν ουτος ος] τι ουτος, D μονος] εις, C D

v. 22 αποκριθεις ειπεν προς αυτους] λεγει αυτοις, D + πονηρα post υμων, D (c e l r 828^c sy^pal)

All of the variants in v. 21 and the first variant in v. 22 are harmonizations with Mark 2:6,7. The last variant, which is the one we are interested in, is a harmonization with Matthew 9:4.

We will now look at D's use of πονηρία ("malice"), which again is a harmonization:

Luke 20:23

Codex B

κατανοησας δε αυτων την πανουργιαν ειπεν προς αυτους

"And when he perceived their craftiness, he said to them

Codex D

επιγνους δε αυτων την πονηριαν ειπεν προς αυτους τι με πειραζετε

"And when he knew thoroughly their malice, he said to them, why do you tempt me?"

κατανοησας] επιγνους, D e cop^{sa} Tatian πανουργιαν] πονηριαν, C* D pc it sy^{sc} + τι με πειραζετε post αυτους, Q D lat sy^c

The first variant, ἐπιγνούς ("when he knew thoroughly"), possibly may have resulted from the influence of Luke 5:22, where D inserted πονηρός ("evil") into Luke's text. The word is used in both places to indicate that Jesus knew exactly the working of his opponents' minds.⁷ The second variant in the present passage is a harmonization with Mark, against Matthew who has ὑποκριταί ("hypocrites") as the concluding word. If D were harmonizing his text with Matthew it would seem logical that he would have retained this word because of its anti-Judaic force.

Concerning the problem with harmonization of the Gospels, Epp says:

Whether these additional occurrences of πονηρός in D are sufficient to indicate a preoccupation with this term by the D-text is not clear because of the evidence of harmonization. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the term was found or remembered in the parallels and used consciously according to a prediction for it.⁸

Let us now consider the evidence. Of the five variants in 5:21,22, four are harmonizations with Mark. The only harmonization with Matthew is πονηρός ("evil"), which D prefers to Mark's ταῦτα ("these things"--Mark 2:8). Of the three variants in 20:23, one is the possible result of the influence of an earlier pericope (5:22)

⁷Cf. Arndt and Gingrich, "ἐπιγινώσκω . . . l. with the preposition making its influence felt . . ." (pp. 290-91).

⁸Epp, p. 45.

where D inserted πονηρός ("evil") into the normal text, thus bringing the two passages into harmony concerning Jesus' knowledge of his opponents' thinking. Πονηρία ("malice") is a definite harmonization with Matthew, and again a preference for Matthew's term over Mark's ὑποκρίσιν ("hypocrisy"--Mark 12:15). The third harmonization is again with Mark, "Why do you tempt me?", instead of Matthew's account, "Why do you tempt me, hypocrites?"

Of the eight variants in these two passages five are harmonizations with Mark, two are with Matthew, where D chooses Matthew's terms πονηρός ("evil") and πονηρία ("malice") over Mark's terms, and one variant is possibly taken from Luke's own earlier use of the term in 5:22.

To emphasize further that D seems to have a "pre-occupation" with πονηρός ("evil"), Epp points out that Peter's question to Ananias in Acts 5:4D is patterned after Luke 5:22D, "τί ὅτι ἔθου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ποιῆσαι πονηρὸν τοῦτο; (B om. ποιῆσαι and reads τὸ πρᾶγμα for πονηρὸν). . ."⁹

The final use of πονηρός ("evil") is found in 23:41 where the penitent thief declares Jesus' innocence:

Luke 23:41

Codex B

Codex D

καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δίκαιως

καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δίκαιως

⁹Ibid., p. 44.

αξια γαρ ων επραξαμεν
 απολαμβανομεν ουτος
 δε ουδεν ατοπον επραξεν

"And we justly. For we
 are receiving that which
 is worthy for what we
 have done, but this man
 has done nothing amiss."

αξια γαρ ων επραξαμεν
 απολαμβανομεν ουτος
 δε ουδεν πονηρον επραξεν

"And we justly. For we
 are receiving that which
 is worthy for what we
 have done, but this man
 has done nothing evil."

ατοπον] πονηρον, D lat.

Van Oosterzee says that Luke's use of the term
 ατοπον ("amiss") is a mild expression denoting the inno-
 cence of Jesus.¹⁰ The alteration made by D sets Jesus'
 innocence in stronger contrast with the Jews, whom D re-
 peatedly labels as evil.¹¹ The anti-Judaic sentiment of
 D is perhaps stronger here, in these series of variants,
 than in any other place.

Other Anti-Judaic Statements

Although the anti-Judaic sentiment of D is not as
 strong in the next variant, its presence is equally as
 clear as in the preceding variants:

Luke 5:37-39

Codex B

Codex D

¹⁰Van Oosterzee, p. 376.

¹¹Cf. Epp's study of Luke 23:41 in the light of
 Acts 3:17, where D accuses the rulers of doing evil by
 crucifying Jesus: "As far as the D-text is concerned, the
 Jews had done an evil thing to Jesus, who himself, in fact
 had done nothing evil" (p. 44).

37. και ουδεις βαλλει
οινον νεον εις ασκους
παλαιους ει δε μηγε
ρηξει ο οινος ο νεος
τους ασκους
και αυτος εκχυθησεται
και οι ασκοι απολουνται
38. αλλ οινον νεον εις
ασκους καινους βλητεον

39. ουδεις πιων παλαιον
θελει νεον λεγει γαρ
ο παλαιος χρηστος εστιν

"37. And no one places
new wine into old wine-
skins lest the new
wine will burst the
skins and will be
poured out and the wine-
skins destroyed.

"38. But new wine must
be placed into new wine-
skins.

"39. No one drinking
old wine wishes new,
for he says, the old
is good."

37. και ουδεις βαλλει
οινον νεον εις ασκους
παλαιους ει δε μηγε
ρηξει ο οινος ο νεος
τους ασκους τους παλαιους
και αυτος εκχυθησεται
και οι ασκοι απολουνται
38. αλλα οινον νεον εις
ασκους καινους βαλλουσιν
και αμφοτεροι τηρουνται

"37. And no one places
new wine into old wine-
skins lest the new
wine will burst the
old skins and will be
poured out and the wine-
skins destroyed.

"38. But new wine
is placed into new wine-
skins and both are pre-
served."

v. 37 + τους παλαιους post ασκους, D cop^{sa,bo}
v. 38 βλητεον] βαλλουσιν, X * D sy^p cop^{sa,bo} Marcion
+ και αμφοτεροι τηρουνται post βλητεον, D a e r
v. 39 om. vs., D it Marcion Irenaeus Eusebius

The motif of the wine is found in both Matthew and Mark, as well as in Luke, and all three gospels have practically the same wording. It is generally agreed that the old wine is a symbol of Judaism and the new is a symbol of Christianity.¹² However, neither Matthew nor Mark has

¹²Cf. Gilmour, p. 110; Arndt, p. 172; van Oosterzee, pp. 89-90; Plummer, pp. 163-64; Creed, p. 83; Geldenhuys, pp. 196-97. Cf. Alistair Kee, "The Old Coat and the New

Luke's preference for the old wine (v. 39). Marcion's influence is recognized by some as a possible reason for the omission of this verse, for he would not wish to say that the old Jewish economy is better than the Christian Church.¹³

Whether D made the omission under the influence of Marcion's text or not, the fact remains that D's omission is in keeping with his overall anti-Judaic sentiment, for this verse virtually admits the contentment of the Jewish people with their form of worship and Christianity's lack of appeal for them. It is for this very reason that some commentators believe that v. 39 is ". . . an interpolated apology for the relative failure of Christian missions among Jews."¹⁴ However, if it is an interpolation it is early, because of the number of early witnesses that have this reading.

In chapter 11, Luke presents his parallel to Jesus' scathing denunciation of the religious leaders that Matthew presents in chapter 23. Several changes are made in this discourse as presented by D. It is not necessary to

Wine," *Novum Testamentum*, XII(1970), 13-21, who believes that the original intent of the parable was not to introduce tension between the old and the new, but rather to indicate that the old is still worth patching. The significance of the double parable deals with the danger of loss, not with incompatibility.

¹³Cf. Arndt, p. 172; Creed, p. 83; Metzger, pp. 138-39.

¹⁴Gilmour, p. 110. Cf. Plummer, pp. 164-65 and Farrar, p. 125.

investigate them all; we will look briefly at only a few. The context of Luke's account is a morning meal at the home of a Pharisee. Upon entering, Jesus sat at the meal without washing:

Luke 11:38,39

Codex B

Codex D

38. ο δε φαρισαιος ιδων
εθαυμασεν
οτι ου πρωτον
εβαπτισθη προ του αριστου
39. ειπεν δε ο κς προς
αυτον νυν υμεις οι
φαρισαιοι. . . .

38. ο δε φαρισαιος ηρξατο
διακρεινομενος εν εαυτω
λεγειν δια τι ου πρωτον
εβαπτισθη προ του αριστου
39. ειπεν δε ο κς προς
αυτον νυν υμεις οι
φαρισαιοι υποκριται. . . .

"38. And the Pharisee,
when he saw it,
marveled because
he did not wash first
before taking of the
meal.
"39. And Jesus said to
him, Now you Pharisees,
. . . ."

"38. And the Pharisee,
taking issue within him-
self began to say, why
does he not wash first
before taking of the
meal?
"39. And Jesus said to
him, Now you Pharisees,
hypocrites. . . ."

v. 38 ιδων εθαυμασεν οτι] ηρξατο διακρεινομενος εν εαυτω
λεγειν δια τι, D 251 lat Tatian
v. 39 + υποκριται post φαρισαιοι, D b

In v. 38, D uses a more expressive word, διακρίνομαι ("taking issue, dispute"), than θαυμάζω ("to marvel") of the normal text, thus intensifying the Pharisee's reaction to Jesus' behavior. On the other hand, D intensifies Jesus' castigation of the Pharisee by calling him a hypocrite, which is a harmonization with Matthew 23.

By the following variant in v. 42, D wishes to free Jesus, in his teaching and deeds, from Old Testament

teachings that might be regarded as Jewish customs or restrictions; this motive for introducing variants will again be seen in connection with the Sabbath:

Luke 11:42

Codex B

αλλα ουαι υμιν τοις
φαρισαιοις οτι αποδεκα-
τουτε το ηδυοσμον και
το πηγανον και παν
λαχανον και παρερχεσθε
την κρισιν και την
αγαπην ταυτα
δε εδει ποιησαι κακεινα
μη παρειναι

"But woe to you Pharisees,
because you tithe mint
and rue and every herb,
and you pass by judgment
and love,
but these things one must
do and the others must
not be neglected."

Codex D

αλλα ουαι υμειν τοις
φαρισαιοις οτι αποδεκα-
τουτε το ηδυοσμον και
το πηγανον και παν
λαχανον και παρερχεσθαι
την κρισιν και την
αγαπην του θ̄υ

"But woe to you Pharisees,
because you tithe mint
and rue and every herb,
and you pass by judgment
and the love of God."

+ του θ̄υ, [rell; B]

om. ταυτα δε εδει ποιησαι κακεινα μη παρειναι, D Marcion

The addition of τοῦ θεοῦ ("of God") is witnessed by an overwhelming majority of manuscripts, and appears to be omitted by B alone; hence, it is not significant in our study. The omission of the last clause in D, however, is of significance. Montefiore believes D is justified in the omission of this clause. The principle of these words ("These things one must do, and the others must not be neglected") is opposed to Jesus' behavior as a guest at the Pharisee's morning meal, i.e. his refusal to wash

before eating is a minor matter and washing his hands would have accommodated the conscience of the Pharisee in v. 40.¹⁵ Metzger feels these words were unacceptable to Marcion, who omitted them from his text, and this influenced the omission in D.¹⁶

However, it must be noted that D includes many things that Marcion omitted. It is possible that D used a text that was free from Marcion's influence as the basis of his manuscript. This would not disallow the further possibility, however, that D had in his possession or was acquainted with Marcion's text, or, perhaps, a text that reflected Marcionite readings, and chose from it readings that appealed to his biases. Certainly the omission of this clause is anti-Judaic in nature, for it eliminates from Jesus' teaching instruction that would tend to support what would be thought of as Jewish custom and tradition.

We will now look at one more variant from this discourse:

Luke 11:44

Codex B

ουαι υμιν
 οτι εστε ως
 τα μνημεια τα αδηλα και
 οι ανθρωποι οι περι-
 πατουντες επανω ουκ
 οιδασιν

Codex D

ουαι υμειν γραμματεις και
 φαρισαιοι οτι εστε
 μνημεια αδηλα και
 οι ανθρωποι επανω περι-
 πατουντες ουκ
 οιδασιν

¹⁵Montefiore, p. 482.

¹⁶Metzger, p. 159.

"Woe to you
because you
are as hidden graves;
the men who walk on them
do not know it."

"Woe to you Scribes and
Pharisees because you
are hidden graves;
the men walking on them
do not know it."

+ γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι post ὑμεῖν, D (℞^o Θ pl it)
ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ μνημεῖα, D a c e ff² sysc

In the text of B, Luke draws an analogy between the Pharisee and a hidden grave, with which personal contact would bring defilement. D removes the analogy and makes the Pharisee the hidden grave in actuality.

There is a close affinity between Luke's parable of the pounds and Matthew's parable of the talents. Luke's parable presents the man of noble birth absenting himself from his servants in order to receive a kingdom. Citizens of the kingdom he was about to receive send a delegation protesting his proposed rulership. Upon his return, the new king takes account of the service of his servants and then punishes those citizens who did not wish his rule.

The parable, as it appears in Luke, differs from Matthew in each of the above particulars except for the settlement of accounts with the servants. In Matthew's account the useless servant is punished in two ways: (1) what he has is taken from him and given to another, and (2) he is consigned to outer darkness. In Luke's account, the unfaithful servant loses what he has, but receives no further punishment. It is the citizens who did not want

the king's rule who are consigned to destruction.

D is not content to leave matters there. It may be possible that he saw in the faithful and the unfaithful servants representation of the two dispensations. Those who diligently increased what was entrusted to them by their master are possibly representative of the Christian Church. The man who hid what was entrusted to him by his master is possibly seen as representing Jewish exclusiveness. Let us now notice the alterations made by D:

Luke 19:24,25,27

Codex B

24. και τοις παρεστωσι ειπεν
αρατε απ αυτου την μναν
και δοτε τω τας δεκα
μνας εχοντι
25. και ειπαν αυτω εχει
δεκα μνας
27. πλην τους
εχθρους μου τουτους
τους μη θελησαντας με
βασιλευσαι επ αυτους
αγαγετε ωδε και κατασ-
φαξατε αυτους εμπροσθεν
μου

"24. And he said to those standing by, Take the pound from him and give it to the one who has the ten pounds.
"25. And they said to him, He has ten pounds.
"27. However, these enemies of mine who did not wish me to rule over them,

Codex D

24. ειπεν δε τοις παρεστωσι
αρατε απ αυτου
και απενενκατε τω τας δεκα
μνας εχοντι
25.
27. πλην εκεινος τους
εχθρους μου
τους μη θελοντας με
βασιλευειν επ αυτους
αγαγατε ωδε και κατασ-
φαξατε ενπροσθεν
μου και τον αχρειον δουλον
εκβαλετε εις το σκοτος το
εξωτερων εκει εσται ο
κλαυθμος και ο βρυγμος
των οδοντων

"24. And he said to those standing by, Take from him and carry it to the one who has the ten pounds.
"27. However, those enemies of mine who do not wish me to rule over them,

bring them here and
slaughter them before me."

bring here and
slaughter them before me.
And cast the useless ser-
vant into outer darkness,
there shall be weeping and
gnashing of teeth."

v. 24 om. την μναν, D it
δοτε] απενενκατε, D

v. 25 om., D W 047 69 565 1230 1253 1675 it sy^{sc}

v. 27 τουτους] εκεινους, R D lat sy^c
+ και τον αχειριον δουλον εκβαλετε εις το σκοτος το
εξωτερων εκει εσται ο κλαυθμος και ο βρυγμος των
οδοντων post μου, D

If D sees the faithful servant with ten pounds as representative of the church and the useless servant as the Jewish economy, the alterations made by D would be understandable. In D, when the useless servant is stripped of what he possesses and it is given to the productive servant, the protest raised by those standing by is eliminated. Thus D possibly may see the transferral of the things which are profitable (covenant promises, etc.) from Judaism to Christianity, i.e. those things which Christianity retained of Judaism and incorporated into its system.

The addition in v. 27 is a harmonization with Matthew 25:30. As we have noted, in Luke's normal text the useless servant loses what was committed to him but is not punished further. In D's alteration, the useless servant is consigned to outer darkness, thus not only losing what has been committed to him but receiving a punishment more

severe than the rebellious citizens.¹⁷

The Sabbath Controversies

It is in connection with the Sabbath that D finds one of the most fruitful subjects for the expression of his anti-Judaic sentiments; therefore, we shall be more concerned with details here than in the earlier sections of this chapter.

Of the three synoptics, Luke has the most detailed report of the activities of Jesus and his followers on the Sabbath. For the convenience of this study we shall deal with the block of Sabbath material in two sections: (1) the Sabbath controversies, and (2) miscellaneous material on the Sabbath.

The first block of Sabbath material has to do with the portrayal in the gospels of the behavior of Jesus and his disciples during the hours of the Sabbath, behavior which is of such a nature that it brings them the scorn and severe castigation of the religious leaders. The basic issue of these controversies is this: Is it lawful to relieve human suffering on the Sabbath, when to do so

¹⁷Cf. Montefiore who thinks that Luke 19:27 and Matthew 25:30 stand outside of and have been added to the parable, and that the additions have reference to the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 566); and Easton, who believes that the scene lies in the context of the eschatological future and does not refer to the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 282).

would carry a person beyond the limits of proper Sabbath observance prescribed by the tradition of the elders?

Luke records four miracles performed on the Sabbath (4:31-37; 6:6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6). The first miracle that is recorded is without a confrontation between Jesus and the religious leaders; Luke holds it in common with Mark. The next three lead to a confrontation. Of these three Matthew and Mark record only one, the healing of the man with the withered hand.

All three synoptics give an account of the disciples eating grain while passing through the grain field on the Sabbath, which leads to the first of four confrontations in Luke (6:1-5; 6:6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6). A list of these incidents in their chronological order as the synoptics present them follows:

<u>Pericope</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>
Unclean Spirit	4:31-37	1:21-28	
Grain Field	6:1-5	2:23-28	12:1-8
Withered Hand	6:6-11	3:1-6	12:9-14
Crippled Woman	13:10-17		
Man with Dropsy	14:1-6		

Both Luke and Matthew follow the Markan order in presenting the material they have in common with Mark. However, there are some differences as to when each evangelist works this material into the framework of his gospel.

The pericope of the unclean spirit (Luke 4:31-37;

Mark 1:21-28) is placed in a different context by Luke than by Mark. According to Mark, Jesus appears in Galilee preaching the gospel after John the Baptist's imprisonment. Passing along by the Sea of Galilee, Jesus calls his first disciples, Peter, Andrew, James, and John. Arriving in Capernaum, Jesus and his newly-called disciples enter the synagogue. Here, as Jesus begins to teach, he is interrupted εὐθὺς ("immediately") by a man possessed by an unclean spirit. Jesus orders the spirit to come out of the man. The command is obeyed after a display of demonic fury.

In Luke's tradition we note the following:

1. Jesus goes directly to Galilee after the temptations in the wilderness, while in Mark it appears that Jesus, after the temptations, may have stayed in Judea until John's imprisonment.

2. The first detailed account of Jesus' ministry is his rejection in Nazareth, while in Mark it is the call of his disciples. (Matthew follows Mark's order.)

3. Jesus is alone; the call is not extended to his disciples until sometime later (Luke 5:1-11).

4. After his rejection at Nazareth, Jesus goes to Capernaum, where he encounters the man with the unclean spirit in the synagogue on the Sabbath.

From the pericope itself and the context into which

it is placed we can derive the following concerning the traditions of Luke and Mark:

1. In Mark the amazement of the people in the synagogue appears to be equally as great over the fact that Jesus performed this deed on the Sabbath as over the exorcism itself:

Mark 1:27

Luke 4:36

. . . ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ
διδαχη καινη κατ
εξουσιαν και τοις
πνευμασι τοις ακα-
θαρτοις επιτασσει

. . . ΤΙΣ Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΟΤΙ
εν εξουσια και δυναμει επι-
τασσει τοις ακαθαρτοις
πνευμασιν και εξερχονται

". . . what is this?
New teaching with
authority! He even
commands the unclean
spirits and they
obey him."

". . . what word is this?
For with authority and
power he commands the
unclean spirits and they
come out."

In Mark, it is possible that διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν ("new teaching with authority") has reference to the work of healing performed on the Sabbath, which would be a "new teaching" on what is lawful in Sabbath observance, and this would in turn be contrary to the popular teaching of rabbis at that time. What amazed the synagogue congregation was the fact that Jesus' behavior (healing on the Sabbath in opposition to the popular teaching of his day) was supported by the approval of God, evidenced by the vanquishing of a demon. Thus, in this sense this exorcism on the Sabbath may be considered as "new teaching with power."

That healing on the Sabbath was considered unlawful can be seen from the reaction of the ruler of the synagogue to the healing of the woman who was crippled in Luke 13:14:

And the ruler of the synagogue, answering with indignation because Jesus healed on the Sabbath, said to the crowd, "There are six days in which one ought to work; in them therefore come for healing and not on the Sabbath day."

2. In both the tradition of Mark and Luke Jesus performed the exorcism unchallenged. This may be accounted for if this was the first miracle performed on the Sabbath. The work of healing itself and the fact that the unclean spirit was subject to the authority of one who brashly brushed aside tradition evidently left the leaders of the synagogue without words. However, this was not to be the case again.

3. Luke in no way hints at the doctrinal or traditional overtones of this miracle, as Mark does.

4. In Mark's tradition, the newly-called disciples were witnesses to this miracle, whereas in Luke's tradition Jesus was alone. This is, perhaps, the most significant point for our purposes. For in Mark's tradition, the disciples now have Jesus' precedent, the "new teaching," for their future behavior on the Sabbath, whereas in Luke's tradition they presumably do not.

We might say that the above pericope of the unclean spirit, i.e. the precedent set by Jesus, forms a foundation for the first encounter in Mark's tradition between Jesus and his disciples on the one hand and the religious authorities on the other. For the first Sabbath encounter over what is lawful and what is not lawful on the Sabbath is occasioned by the disciples' behavior in the grain field. In Luke's tradition this foundation is missing, but regardless of this fact, D makes some interesting harmonistic changes, as we shall see below.

The pericope of the grain field is found in all three synoptics; however, we will be concerned only with a comparison between Mark and Luke as we trace the development of Luke's tradition. Matthew will enter the discussion only as he adds something of significance or holds something in common with Luke against Mark.

After recording the fact that Jesus and the disciples were passing through a grain field on the Sabbath, we read:

Mark 2:23,24

23. . . . και οι μαθηται
αυτου ηρξαντο οδοποιειν
τιλλοντες τους σταχυας

24. και οι φαρισαιοι
ελεγον αυτω ιδε τι ποιουσιν
τοις σαββασιν ο ουκ εξεστιν

"23. . . . and his disciples
began, along the way, to

Luke 6:1,2

1. . . . και επιλλον οι
μαθηται αυτου και ησθιον
τους σταχυας ψωχοντες ταις
χερσιν

2. τινες δε των φαρισαιων
ειπον τι ποιειτε ο ουκ
εξεστιν τοις σαββασιν

"1. . . . and his disciples
picked and ate the kernels,

pick the kernels.

"24. And the Pharisees said to him, behold, why do they do on the Sabbath what is not lawful?"

threshing them in their hands.

"2. And certain ones of the Pharisees said, why do you do what is not lawful on the Sabbath?"

Two things are to be noted. First, Luke adds the detailed information that the disciples threshed the kernels of grain by rubbing them in their hands. This harvesting and threshing constituted unlawful work according to the Pharisees.¹⁸

Second, we must notice that when lodging their accusations of Sabbathbreaking the Pharisees addressed themselves to Jesus in Mark's tradition, but in Luke's tradition the Pharisees speak to the disciples directly. Plummer suggests that Matthew and Mark follow a pattern in recording the charges leveled by the religious leaders. "In Mk. ii.24 and Mt. xii.2 the charge against the disciples is addressed to Christ, while in Mk. ii.16 and Mt. ix.11 the charge against Christ is addressed to the disciples."¹⁹ This suggestion makes it appear that the religious leaders wished to discredit the one in the eyes of the other. In the text presently under consideration, there is a precise reason why the Pharisees addressed whom

¹⁸Plummer, p. 167; cf. A. Cohen, Everyman's Talmud (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1949), pp. 154-55.

¹⁹Ibid.

they did in each of the two respective traditions. The reason can be found in the context of the pericope of the unclean spirit. In Mark, by condemning the disciples' unlawful behavior in the grain field, the Pharisees appear to place the blame for their action on Jesus: ". . . [they] said to him, behold, why do they do on the Sabbath what is not lawful?" Their argument was with Jesus' διδαχὴ καινῆ ("new teaching"), and the example that he was setting in disregarding the traditions of the elders by healing on the Sabbath.

In Luke's tradition, the disciples were not present when the man with the unclean spirit was healed on the Sabbath, nor had they been exposed as yet to the "new teaching" in regard to the Sabbath. Therefore, the Pharisees confront the disciples directly: "Why do you do what is not lawful?" In both Mark's and Luke's tradition it was the disciples who plucked the grain and ate, not Jesus. It would not be correct, therefore, to include Jesus in the "you" of the Pharisees' question.²⁰ Jesus' reply in Luke's tradition (vv. 3-5), therefore, becomes a defense of his disciples, while in Mark (vv. 25-28) Jesus' reply is a defense of his own action, which led the disciples to harvest and thresh on the Sabbath, and a defense of his "new teaching."

²⁰Cf. Easton, p. 76.

Jesus' defense is based on the actions of David and his men in eating the bread of the presence when they were hungry, which was not lawful for anyone but the priests only (Luke 6:3,4; Mark 2:25,26).

This pericope concludes with the following:

Mark 2:27,28

Luke 6:5

27. και ελεγεν αυτοις το
σαββατον δια τον ανθρωπον
εγενετο, και ουχ ο ανθρωπος
δια το σαββατον

και ελεγεν αυτοις

28. ωστε κυριος εστιν ο υιος
του ανθρωπου και του
σαββατου.

κυριος εστιν του σαββατου
ο υιος του ανθρωπου.

"27. And he said to them,
the Sabbath exists for the
benefit of man, and not man
for the Sabbath;

"And he said to them,

"28. Wherefore, the Son of
Man is Lord also of the
Sabbath."

the Son of
Man is Lord of the
Sabbath."

Jesus' comments on the purpose of the Sabbath in Mark's tradition, added to the Old Testament authority of David's action, present strong defense for his "new" understanding of what is lawful and what is not lawful in proper Sabbath observance. Luke, in defending only the disciples' behavior in his tradition, evidently feels that the precedent of David's actions and the authority of this Old Testament illustration are sufficient to carry the weight of the argument. Although Matthew also leaves out Jesus' statement of the purpose of the Sabbath that is found in Mark, he adds the illustration of the priests

working on the Sabbath and being blameless, thus strengthening Jesus' position in his gospel.

It is not our intention to take up here the discussion as to who the Son of Man is in Luke's normal text (we have already seen that D considers Jesus to be the Son of Man). We can simply leave this matter by saying that in both traditions Jesus indicates that he and his disciples have the sanction of the Son of Man in their Sabbath behavior despite the traditions of the elders.²¹

D harmonizes the following question posed by the Pharisees in Luke with Matthew and Mark:

Luke 6:2

Codex B

ΤΙΝΕΣ ΔΕ ΤΩΝ ΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΩΝ
ΕΙΠΟΝ ΤΙ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ Ο ΟΥΚ
ΕΞΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΣΑΒΒΑΣΙΝ;

"And certain ones of the
Pharisees said,
 why do you do
 that which is not
lawful on the Sabbath?"

Codex D

ΤΙΝΕΣ ΔΕ ΤΩΝ ΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΩΝ
ΕΛΕΓΟΝ ΑΥΤῷ ΕΙΔΕ ΤΙ
ΠΟΙΟΥΣΙΝ ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΣΟΥ
ΤΟΙΣ ΣΑΒΒΑΣΙΝ Ο ΟΥΚ
ΕΞΕΣΤΙΝ;

"And certain ones of the
Pharisees said to him,
behold, why do your disci-
ples do that which is not
lawful on the Sabbath?"

ΕΙΠΟΝ] ΕΛΕΓΟΝ ΑΥΤῷ, D Tatian
ΤΙ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ] ΤΙ ΠΟΙΟΥΣΙΝ ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΣΟΥ, D

By making two harmonistic changes D alters Luke's

²¹Cf. Plummer, p. 168; Arland J. Hultgren, "The Formation of the Sabbath Pericope in Mark 2:23-28," Journal of Biblical Literature, XCI(1972), 38-43; and Montefiore, pp. 62-64 for a discussion as to whom the Son of Man is and his authority over the Sabbath.

tradition, i.e. from εἶπόν ("said") to ἐλέγον αὐτῷ ("said to him," follows Mark) and from ποιεῖτε ("do you do") to ποιοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταί σου ("do your disciples do," following Matthew, only in the inverted interrogative form). By having the Pharisees address their complaint to Jesus, D now makes Jesus the object of their scorn. The defense that follows is no longer a defense of the disciples' actions on the part of Jesus, but is now a defense of his teachings and position in regard to the Sabbath.

D fails to complete his harmonization of this pericope in Luke by leaving out Mark's account of the purpose of the Sabbath. By placing the statement about the Son of Man (6:5) after v. 10, Jesus' defense ends with his appeal to Old Testament authority and the precedent of David. However, D now adds to the end of 6:4 a unique pericope of a man found working on the Sabbath: τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενος τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββατῷ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπε εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς μακάριος εἶ εἰ δέ μὴ οἶδας ἐπι-καταρατὸς καὶ παραβάτης εἶ τοῦ νομοῦ ("On the same day, seeing a certain man working on the Sabbath, he said to him, 'Man, if you know what you are doing you are blessed; if you do not know, you are cursed and are a transgressor of the law.'")

Because D is the only manuscript with this reading, many conjectures have been offered as to its origin. Williams suggests it may have been a "floating piece of

oral tradition,"²² but Käser believes D found it in written form.²³ Torrey sees it as,

. . . an "apocryphal" anecdote in which Jesus tells a man seen working on the sabbath that he is doing a very dangerous thing in his apparent transgression of the law. The revision here for the benefit of Jewish readers is very evident.²⁴

In 1895, Blass revived the seventeenth century hypothesis of Jean Leclerc that Luke had himself produced two editions of Acts. Blass's theory was that Luke originally wrote his gospel in Palestine, and that when he was in Rome with Paul the Christians there asked him for a copy of his work. Luke wrote out his gospel again with such alterations as he thought necessary. Blass theorized similarly with regard to Acts; one copy was made for Theophilus, to whom it was addressed, and another for the Church at large. D represents the later edition of the gospel and the earlier of Acts, while the Neutral text represents the earlier edition of the gospel and the later of Acts.

²²Williams, p. 4. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, Unknown Sayings of Jesus (2nd. ed.; London: SPCK, 1964), p. 63.

²³Walter Käser, "Exegetische Erwägungen zur Seligpreisung des Sabbatarbeiters Lk 6.5D," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LXV(1968), 418.

²⁴Torrey, pp. 131-32.

Blass believed that the addition to Luke 6:4 would have given "great offence even to Christian Jews," because its spirit is Pauline. Therefore, Luke preferred to leave the saying out of the gospel that was destined for Oriental congregations, a large part of which consisted of Jews, while there was no reason for leaving it out of the gospel prepared for the Romans, which D supposedly represented.²⁵ Blass's theory was received with favor by some scholars; however, investigation revealed some serious difficulties and the two editions of Luke/Acts theory is not accepted today.²⁶

Hatch feels that Westcott and Hort's suggestion that "this utterance and the Pericope de Adultera may possibly have come from the same source" is entirely conjectural. He feels rather, that it must have come from some extraneous source which is now lost.²⁷ Godet also believes that this pericope is an interpolation similar to the woman taken in adultery,

. . . but with this difference, that the latter is probably the record of real fact, while the former can only be an invention or a perversion. Nobody could

²⁵Blass, pp. 153-54.

²⁶For a summary of Blass's theory and a statement of the difficulties it presents, see: Frederic G. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1958), pp. 232-33.

²⁷Hatch, p. 18.

have labored publicly in Israel on the Sabbath day without being instantly punished.²⁸

Montefiore condemns the addition as ungentle on the assumption that Jesus would scarcely "have gone so far in open approval of a direct violation of one of the fundamental injunctions of the Law and of one of the Ten Commandments."²⁹

Käser believes that D sensed Luke's preference for the number three and found this spot in Luke's tradition to be an ideal location for the insertion of this pericope. The μακάριος/ἐπικατάρατος ("blessed/cursed") of 6:5D corresponds to the three occurrences of μακάριοι/οὔαι ("blessed/woe") of the immediate vicinity (6:20ff, 24ff). The insertion of this pericope after the experience in the corn field and the healing of the withered hand (6:6-11) makes a sequence of three Sabbath pericopes. The pericope originated as a defense against the increasing danger which arose within the church coming from its own rank of liberals, Käser believes. The curse of this logion is against unbounded lawlessness.³⁰

With the small amount of information we possess on this addition in the D text of Luke, it would be utterly

²⁸Godet, p. 185.

²⁹Montefiore, p. 409.

³⁰Käser, pp. 417, 424-25.

futile to try to identify its origin.³¹ The only thing we can do with certainty, therefore, is address ourselves to the significance of its presence.

As is already apparent in the pericope of the grain field and as will be further emphasized in the succeeding Sabbath encounters, Luke uses the Sabbath controversies to develop his tradition concerning the Sabbath. The issue in Luke is over what is lawful and what is not lawful in Sabbath observance. However, the full significance of this addition cannot be seen until the rest of the Sabbath controversies are examined. We will, therefore, return to this addition shortly.

The second Sabbath controversy immediately follows the pericope of the corn field, and Luke holds it in common with Matthew and Mark. We will again be concerned only with a comparison between Luke and Mark in order to isolate Luke's tradition, since the account in Matthew holds nothing in common with Luke where it diverges from Mark and hence makes no significant contribution:

Mark 3:1-3

1. και εισηλθεν παλις εις συναγωγην και ην εκει ανθρωπος εξηραμμενην εχων την χειρα

Luke 6:6-8

6. εγενετο δε εν ετερω σαββατω εισελθειν αυτον εις την συναγωγην και διδασκειν και ην ανθρωπος εκει και η χειρ αυτου η δεξια ην ξηρα

³¹Metzger (p. 140) notes its presence in the text of D but makes no attempt to identify its origin or to comment on its meaning.

2. και παρετηρουν αυτον ει
τοις σαββασιν θεραπευσει
αυτον ινα κατηγορησωσιν
αυτου

3. και λεγει τω ανθρωπω τω
την χειραν εχοντι ξηραν
εγειρε εις το μεσον

"1. And he entered again
into the synagogue. And
there was there a man which
had a withered hand.

"2. And they watched him,
whether he would heal him
on the Sabbath, so that
they might accuse him.

"3. And he said to the man
with the withered hand,
stand in the midst."

7. παρετηρουντο δε αυτον οι
γραμματεις και οι φαρισαιοι
ει εν τω σαββατω θεραπευσει
ινα ευρωσιν κατηγορειν αυτου

8. αυτος δε ηδει τους δια-
λογισμους αυτων ειπεν δε τω
ανδρι τω ξηραν εχοντι την
χειρα εγειρε και στηθι εις
το μεσον και αναστας εστη

"6. And it came to pass on
another Sabbath that he en-
tered into the synagogue and
taught. And there was a man
there and his right hand was
withered.

"7. And the Scribes and
Pharisees watched whether
he would heal on the Sabbath,
that they might find an accu-
sation against him.

"8. And he knew their
thoughts, and said to the
man which had the withered
hand, Arise and stand in
the midst. And rising up
he stood forth."

Let us notice the details added by Luke: (1) Jesus entered the synagogue on another Sabbath and taught; (2) those who were watching him closely were Scribes and Pharisees; (3) Jesus knew their intent.

The whole issue of the confrontation is again Jesus' understanding of Sabbath observance as opposed to the traditions of the elders:

Mark 3:4

και λεγει αυτοις εξεστιν
τοις σαββασιν αγαθοποιησαι
η κακοποιησαι ψυχην σωσαι η
αποκτειναι οι δε εσιωπων

Luke 6:9

ειπεν δε $\overline{\iota\sigma}$ προς αυτους
επερωτω υμας ει εξεστι τω
σαββατω αγαθοποιησαι η κακο-
ποιησαι ψυχην σωσαι η
απολεσαι

"And he said to them, Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath or to do evil, to save life or to destroy? And they were silent."

"And Jesus said to them, I will ask you if it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath or to do evil, to save life or destroy?"

But now we note that in Luke's tradition both Jesus' attitude toward the religious leaders and their reaction to his behavior are softened:

Mark 3:5,6

5. και περιβλεψαμενος αυτους μετ οργης συνλυπουμενος επι τη πωρωσει της καρδιας αυτων λεγει τῷ ανθρωπῳ εκτεινον την χειρα και εξετεινεν και απεκατεσταθη η χειρ αυτου

6. και εξελθοντες οι φαρισαιοι ευθυς μετα των ηρωδιανων συμβουλιον εδιδουν κατ αυτου οπως αυτον απολεσωσιν

"5. And when he had looked around upon them with anger, being grieved because of the hardness of their hearts, he said to the man, Stretch out your hand, and he stretched it out and his hand was restored.

"6. And the Pharisees went out and took counsel immediately with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him."

In Luke's tradition: (1) Jesus did not get angry with the leaders because of the hardness of their hearts,³² nor (2)

Luke 6:10,11

10. και περιβλεψαμενος παντας αυτους ειπεν αυτῳ εκτεινον την χειρα σου ο δε εποιησεν και αποκατεσταθη η χειρ αυτου

11. αυτοι δε επλησθησαν ανοιας και διελαλουν προς αλληλους τι αν ποιησαιεν τῷ τῷ

"10. And when he had looked around upon them all he said to him, Stretch out your hand. And he did so

and his hand was restored.

"11. And they were filled with anger, and discussed with one another what they might do with Jesus."

³²D in Mark makes an interesting substitution here; he replaces πωρώσει ("hardness" or "callousness") with νέκρωσει ("deadness"), which would certainly contain an anti-Judaic flavor.

did the Pharisees take counsel with the Herodians (as in Mark only) as to how they might destroy Jesus (in both Matthew and Mark).

Let us now note how D changes Luke's tradition by a series of harmonizations:

Luke 6:6

Codex B

εΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΝ ΕΤΕΡΩ ΣΑΒ-
ΒΑΤΩ ΕΙΣΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΙΣ
ΤΗΝ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΕΙΝ
ΚΑΙ ΗΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΕΚΕΙ ΚΑΙ Η
ΧΕΙΡ ΑΥΤΟΥ Η ΔΕΞΙΑ ΗΝ ΞΗΡΑ.

"And it came to pass on
another Sabbath that he
entered into the synagogue
and taught. And there was
a man there and his right
hand was withered."

Codex D

ΚΑΙ ΕΙΣΕΛΘΟΝΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΠΑΛΙΝ
ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗΝ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩ
ΕΝ Η ΗΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΞΗΡΑΝ ΕΧΩΝ
ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ.

"And he
entered again into the syna-
gogue on the Sabbath where
there was a man having a
withered hand."

D completely rewrites this verse; and is the only witness to this alteration; however, the noteworthy thing here is that B has Jesus entering the synagogue in order to teach and D omits this:

Luke 6:9-11

Codex B

9. ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ ΤΩ ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ
ΕΠΕΡΩΤΩ ΥΜΑΣ ΕΙ ΕΞΕΣΤΙ ΤΩ
ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩ ΑΓΑΘΟΠΟΙΗΣΑΙ Η ΚΑΚΟ-
ΠΟΙΗΣΑΙ ΨΥΧΗΝ ΣΩΣΑΙ Η
ΑΠΟΛΕΣΑΙ
10. ΚΑΙ ΠΕΡΙΒΛΕΨΑΜΕΝΟΣ
ΠΑΝΤΑΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ
ΕΚΤΕΙΝΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ ΣΟΥ Ο
ΔΕ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΟΚΑΤΕΣ-
ΤΑΘΗ Η ΧΕΙΡ ΑΥΤΟΥ

Codex D

9. ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ Ο ΤΩ ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ
ΕΠΕΡΩΤΗΣΩ ΥΜΑΣ ΕΙ ΕΞΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΩ
ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩ ΑΓΑΘΟΠΟΙΗΣΑΙ Η ΚΑΚΟ-
ΠΟΙΗΣΑΙ ΨΥΧΗΝ ΣΩΣΑΙ Η
ΑΠΟΛΕΣΑΙ ΟΙ ΔΕ ΕΣΙΩΠΩΝ
10. ΚΑΙ ΠΕΡΙΒΛΕΨΑΜΕΝΟΣ
ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΠΑΝΤΑΣ ΕΝ ΟΡΓΗ ΛΕΓΕΙ
ΤΩ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩ ΕΚΤΕΙΝΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ
ΣΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΕΞΕΤΕΙΝΕΝ ΚΑΙ
ΑΠΕΚΑΤΕΣΤΑΘΗ Η ΧΕΙΡ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΩΣ
ΚΑΙ Η ΑΛΛΗ

11. αυτοι δε επλησθησαν
ανοιας και διελαλουν προς
αλληλους τι αν ποιησαιεν
τω ιυ.

"9. And Jesus said to them,
I will ask you if it is law-
ful to do good on the Sab-
bath or to do evil, to
save life or destroy?

"10. And when he had
looked around upon them
all he said to him,
Stretch out your hand,
and he did so,
and his hand was restored.

"11. And they were filled
with anger, and discussed
with one another what they
might do with Jesus."

[5.] και ελεγεν αυτοις οτι
κς εστιν ο υιος του ανθρωπου
και του σαββατου

11. αυτοι δε επλησθησαν
ανοιας και διελογιζοντο προς
αλληλους πως απολεσωσιν
αυτον.

"9. And Jesus said to them,
I will ask you if it is law-
ful to do good on the Sab-
bath or to do evil, to
save life or destroy? And
they were silent.

"10. And when he had
looked around upon them
all in wrath he said to the
man, Stretch out your hand,
and he stretched it out,
and his hand was restored
as the other.

[5.] And he said to them,
the Son of Man is Lord also
of the Sabbath.

"11. And they were filled
with anger and discussed
with one another how they
might destroy him."

-
- v. 9 + οι δε εσιωπων post απολεσαι, D al Tatian
v. 10 + εν οργη post αυτους παντας, D @ pm it Tatian
ειπεν αυτω] λεγει τω ανθρωπω, D
ο δε εποιησεν] και εξετεινεν, X D pm
+ ως και η αλλη post αυτου, D al l 131
v. 5 post v. 10, D Marcion
v. 11 τι αν ποιησαιεν τω ιυ] πως απολεσωσιν αυτον, D

By adding οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων ("and they were silent")
and ἐν ὀργῇ ("in wrath"), D harmonizes Luke with Mark and
intensifies the confrontation between Jesus and the relig-
ious leaders. D now climaxes this intensified confronta-
tion by a third harmonization, i.e. the leaders took coun-
sel as to how they might destroy Jesus. By this series of

harmonizations D increases the tension between Jesus and the leaders where Luke had softened the confrontation in his tradition.

By inserting v. 5 between vv. 10 and 11, which had been displaced by the addition of the man working on the Sabbath, it appears that D is seeking additional strength for the Sabbath tradition of Luke, for now the approval of the Son of Man follows a display of divine power in healing instead of following the action of the disciples in the grain field, where there is no display of divine power.

The final two confrontations between Jesus and the religious leaders over proper Sabbath observance are peculiar to Luke (13:10-17; 14:1-6). They both involve the question of healing on the Sabbath (the crippled woman and the man with dropsy). In both pericopes Jesus reminds the religious leaders that they do not consider it a violation of the Sabbath to care for their livestock or to aid an animal in distress; therefore, why should it be a violation of the Sabbath to bring physical healing to a human being, and to a child of Abraham at that? These two pericopes add to the weight of evidence concerning Jesus' understanding of proper Sabbath observance. D offers no significant variants here.

We will now summarize what we have discovered from

these Sabbath controversies about Luke's tradition and the changes made by D.

1. Whereas in Mark's tradition we have the call of the first disciples before the exorcism of the unclean spirit on the Sabbath, in Luke's tradition this miracle was performed before any disciples joined Jesus. It is probable that Jesus' attitude toward what was lawful on the Sabbath was a part of the "new teaching" that amazed the people in Mark.

An interesting observation is made by Montefiore about Jesus' understanding of proper Sabbathkeeping:

So far as we can gather, Jesus's attitude towards the Sabbath was something like the attitude of Liberal Judaism today. It must be observed rather in the spirit than in the letter. The regulations for its observance must not be allowed to destroy its intention. Directly the Sabbath becomes a burden, the object of the Sabbath is frustrated. The aim is the important point: how precisely we carry out the aim is less important. Nevertheless, one must not push the antithesis between Jesus and Rabbinic teaching too far.

His teaching is an excellent counterbalance to that casuistic minuteness which is the danger of legalism. It is emancipating; it enables one to breath freely. In modern times, at any rate, and with modern ideas, the Sabbath can hardly be observed except on the lines suggested by Jesus.³³

2. The first encounter between Jesus and the religious leaders over Sabbath observance is caused by the disciples. In Mark's tradition they are following Jesus' precedent, the "new teaching." But in Luke it is just a natural

³³Montefiore, Vol. I, pp. 63-64.

action on the part of hungry men.

In Mark's tradition the indignation of the Pharisees is leveled at Jesus because they see the disciples breaking the Sabbath as a result of Jesus' teaching and influence. Therefore, Jesus' reply is a defense of his "new teaching," a part of which is the removal of the man-made restrictions around the Sabbath.

In Luke the indignation of the Pharisees is leveled at the disciples for yielding to physical desires which led them to set aside the traditions of the elders. Jesus' reply is a defense of his disciples' actions. D, however, imposes Mark's tradition on Luke by harmonization, thus changing Luke's tradition and making Jesus the object of direct castigation for the disciples' actions.

3. The addition at the end of Luke 6:4 (the man found working on the Sabbath) does not appear to be an attempt by D to do away with the Sabbath, but rather an attempt to strengthen the Sabbath motif being developed by Luke.³⁴ This motif of Jesus' special understanding of

³⁴The position taken here is, as we have already seen, in agreement with that taken by Montefiore (Vol. I, p. 409), also, Leon E. Wright, Alterations of the Words of Jesus (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 137-38: "We should venture the suggestion, however, that the purport of the saying is not in defense of Sabbath-breaking"; Easton (p. 75): ". . . it does not represent Christ's attitude (against P, Ls), for Christ did not teach the repeal of the Sabbath law"; Godet (p. 185): ". . . Jesus, who never permitted Himself the slightest infraction

the Sabbath is strengthened by each Sabbath encounter between Jesus and the religious leaders, i.e. it is lawful to do deeds of kindness and love for fellow human beings and to supply immediate personal, physical needs.³⁵ In the Sabbath addition of D, we are not informed as to the nature of the work performed by the man seen by Jesus. From Jesus' remarks we may be safe in concluding the following:

a) The deed being performed would have been forbidden by the traditions of the elders.

b) Appearing as it does in connection with the disciples' experience of passing through the grain field and Jesus' use of the Old Testament illustration of David and the bread of the presence, the unknown deed should fit into Jesus' understanding of proper Sabbath observance, i.e. a deed of kindness and love or the supplying of some immediate personal need.³⁶ It is logical to assume that

of a true commandment of Moses (whatever interpreters may say about it), certainly would not have authorized this premature emancipation in anyone else"; and Jeremias (p. 63): "So far from advocating the abrogation of the Sabbath the intention of the logion is the exact opposite-- to protect the Sabbath from frivolous neglect."

³⁵Cf. Harvie Branscomb, "Jesus and the Pharisees," Union Seminary Magazine, XLIV(1932-33), 37.

³⁶Cf. Jeremias (p. 64, cf. p. 63): "No, from all we know of Jesus' attitude to the Sabbath, it must be the nature of the work he is doing which causes Jesus to praise him. Jesus reckons with the possibility that he is engaged in a labour of love"; and Käser, p. 420.

it does, since Jesus is made to give his approval.

c) The negative aspect of Jesus' remarks to the man indicates that if the man has performed this deed, whatever its nature, not being aware of the humanitarian and spiritual nature of the Sabbath law in general, he is in danger of being accused of becoming a breaker of the whole law because he has failed to see the humanitarian and spiritual nature of God's law as a whole.

It may very well be that D views Luke as too slow in freeing the Sabbath from Jewish tradition. Luke omits the "new teaching" motif and the statement regarding the purpose of the Sabbath; therefore, D strengthens in chapter six what it takes Luke to chapter 14 to develop.

4. In the second Sabbath confrontation (the man with the withered hand), Luke softens Mark's tradition. D, however, with a series of harmonizations intensifies the encounter. Then, with one final harmonization, D changes Luke's tradition regarding the nature of the counsel being taken by the religious leaders; this alters from what should be done with him to how they might kill him. Thus D advances in point of time the plottings of the religious leaders to kill Jesus from 19:47 to 6:11 in Luke's tradition.

We are now ready to examine the second division in the block of Sabbath material, i.e. the miscellaneous statements on the Sabbath. Here we need look at only two changes

made by D.

First of all, let us observe what is said in connection with the Sabbath on Jesus' visit to his home town of Nazareth. We shall again compare Luke against Mark:

Mark 6:1,2

1. και εξηλθεν εκειθεν, και
ερχεται εις την πατριδα
αυτου και απολουθουσιν
αυτω οι μαθηται αυτου
2. και γενομενου σαββατου
ηρξατο διδασκειν εν τη
συναγωγη. . . .

"1. And he departed from
there, and came into his
own country and his
disciples followed him.
"2. And when the Sabbath
was come, he began to
teach in the synagogue
. . . ."

Luke 4:16

και ηλθεν εις ναζαρα, ου ην
τεθραμμενος και εισηλθεν
κατα το ειωθος αυτω εν τη
ημερα των σαββατων εις την
συναγωγην και ανεστη
αναγνωσαι.

"And he came to Nazareth,
where he had been brought
up, and entered the syna-
gogue on the Sabbath accord-
ing to his custom, and stood
up to read."

The significant thing here is that Luke informs us that it was Jesus' custom to go to the synagogue on the Sabbath day and when the opportunity was presented to take part in the worship service he did so. Mark gives us none of this information. One would almost conclude from Mark that Jesus went to the synagogue to find a crowd of people so that he could preach and teach.

The fact that Luke tells us it was Jesus' custom to go to the synagogue on the Sabbath does not detract in the least from Luke's attempt to separate the Sabbath from Jewish tradition (as will be shown presently). The issue in Luke's tradition is not whether a person should go to

religious services on the Sabbath or not, but what constitutes work on the Sabbath.

We are now ready to compare D's rendering of:

Luke 4:16

Codex B

και ηλθεν εις ναζαρα ου ην
τεθραμμενος και εισηλθεν
κατα το ειωθος αυτω εν τη
ημερα των σαββατων εις την
συναγωγην και ανεστη αναγ-
ωναι

"And he came to
Nazareth, where he had
been brought up, and en-
tered the synagogue on the
Sabbath according to his
custom,

and stood up to read."

Codex D

ελθων δε εις ναζαρεδ οπου ην
κατα το ειωθος εν τη
ημερα των σαββατων εις την
συναγωγην και ανεστη αναγ-
ωναι

"And when he had come to
Nazareth, where,

according to the
custom, he was in the syna-
gogue on the Sabbath, he
also stood up to read."

και ηλθεν εις ναζαρα ου ην τεθραμμενος] ελθων δε εις
ναζαρεδ οπου ην, D
om. και εισηλθεν, D
om. αυτω, D

By omitting αὐτῷ ("his"), D implies that it was the custom of the townspeople of Nazareth to attend synagogue services on the Sabbath, and it was not necessarily Jesus' custom,³⁷ but he attended the services primarily or solely for the opportunity to address the people.

³⁷The omission of the phrase that connects Jesus with Nazareth has been dealt with in Chapter Two. It was concluded there that D has no reservations about Jesus having been brought up in Nazareth. If this text is a "Marcionite" reading, D used it, not for the omission of Jesus' connection with Nazareth, but because of its position on the Sabbath, cf. J. R. Harris, "New Point of View in Textual Criticism," Expositor, VIII, 7(1914), 318-20.

The intention of D seems obvious. By omitting αὐτῷ ("his") D is changing Luke's textual tradition because D does not want to say that Jesus was personally bound by Jewish custom or tradition.³⁸ If Jesus enters a synagogue on the Sabbath for purposes of worship, which is the custom of the Jews, he does so on his own volition. It appears that D is lessening the significance of the Sabbath in the life of Jesus against Luke's normal text in order to have Jesus free from the traditions of the elders.

It also appears that D intends his readers to see Jesus' followers as being free from Jewish tradition concerning the Sabbath. In connection with the placing of Jesus' body in the tomb we have this statement that is peculiar to Luke:

Luke 23:56

Codex B

Codex D

υποστρεψασαι δε ητοιμασαν
αρωματα και μυρα και το
μεν σαββατον ησυχασαν
κατα την εντολην

υποστρεψασαι δε ητοιμασαν
αρωματα και μυρα και το
μεν σαββατον ησυχασαν

"And they returned and
prepared spices and oint-
ments, and rested the
Sabbath day according to
the commandment."

"And they returned and
prepared spices and oint-
ments, and rested the
Sabbath day."

om. κατα την εντολην, D

³⁸As we have already seen by D's alteration in connection with tithe paying.

By omitting the phrase "according to the commandment," D is again changing Luke's textual tradition. Luke endeavors to maintain the Sabbath institution by saying that it is Jesus' personal custom not only to attend worship services on the Sabbath but also to participate in them when the opportunity is presented, and by having the women rest according to the commandment contained in the Decalogue. D, on the other hand, is not as concerned about the Sabbath as a religious institution. His main objective is to hold forth Jesus and his followers as free from Jewish traditional restrictions regardless of what alteration this position makes in the Sabbath of the Decalogue as a religious institution.

Conclusion

From what we have seen in this chapter, we may conclude that the anti-Judaic bias in D can be seen in the following:

1. D strengthens the idea that Jerusalem is a place of hostility and enmity by omitting any indication that its people were responsive to Jesus' ministry.
2. D pictures the leaders as being "evil" in their designs toward Jesus, while the penitent thief declares that Jesus has done no "evil."
3. Understanding the old wine as representing Judaism, D eliminates the statement that a man who drinks

the old wine will not desire new because the old is better.

4. D minimizes the idea that Jesus supported Jewish tradition in his teaching, so he omits the instruction that tithe should be paid.

5. The analogy to hidden graves, with which personal contact would bring spiritual defilement, is removed and D makes Jesus call the Pharisees the hidden graves in actuality.

6. In the parable of the pounds, D presents the unprofitable servant as representative of the Jewish people. In his alterations he makes the unprofitable servant suffer more intensely than the rebellious people who did not want the king's rule.

7. Throughout the Sabbath controversies D heightens the encounters between Jesus and the Pharisees. When opportunity is presented, D manifests his anti-Judaic bias, as was seen by harmonizing Luke's softened account of one controversy with the harsher accounts of Matthew and Mark and making the religious leaders plot the death of Jesus much earlier.

8. D does not intend to lessen the significance of the Sabbath by the addition of the man found working on the Sabbath, but rather attempts to strengthen Luke's presentation of Jesus' understanding of proper Sabbathkeeping in opposition to the teachings of the religious leaders

of Jesus' day.

9. D attempts to free Jesus and his followers from Jewish custom and tradition in the matter of Sabbath-keeping.

CHAPTER VII

THE PASSION, RESURRECTION, AND ASCENSION IN D

Perhaps few of the variants in the D text of Luke have received as much attention as the "Western non-interpolations" found in the last three chapters, beginning with the institution of the Lord's Supper.¹ However, these famous variants actually tell only a part of the story of D's view of the passion and resurrection. It is the purpose of this chapter to piece together a picture of D's editorial work in regard to the final events of Jesus' earthly life, and to see if the variants in these last chapters give evidence of theological overtones or biases as do variants in previous chapters.

The Lord's Supper

Luke begins his account of the Lord's Supper with

¹For a recent survey of the "Western non-interpolations," cf. Klyne Snodgrass, "'Western non-Interpolations'," Journal of Biblical Literature, XCI(1972), 369-79. Snodgrass states briefly the position of Westcott and Hort, then examines their position in the light of recent studies, especially that of Jeremias and Aland. Following a quick examination of the "Western non-interpolations" found in all four Gospels, Snodgrass concludes, "The papyri have forced a reconsideration of this question, and it now appears doubtful that any of the readings supported only by D and its non-Greek allies are the genuine text" (p. 379). Cf. Kenyon, The Western Text, p. 313.

material that is peculiar to himself. This material will be presented here as a single unit, to be followed by a comparison between B and D of the verses that contain the omission.

καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ ἔν τῃ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ $\Theta\Upsilon$. καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν· λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτοὺς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ $\Theta\Upsilon$ ἔλθῃ.

"And he said to them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer, for I say to you, I will not eat of it again until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves, for I say to you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come" (Luke 22:15-18).

Luke 22:19,20

Codex B

19. καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλάσεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδομένον τοῦτο ποιεῖτε τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναμνησιν
20. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνησαὶ λέγων τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχύννομενον

"19. And taking bread, when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them saying, This is my body which is given for you. This do in remembrance of me.

Codex D

19. καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλάσεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου

"19. And taking bread, when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them saying, This is my body."

"20. And the cup likewise after supper, saying, This is the cup of the new covenant in my blood, which is poured out for you."

v. 19 om. το υπερ υμων διδομενον τουτο ποιεετε την
 εμην αναμνησιν, D a ff² i l sy^h
 v. 20 om. verse, D a ff² i l sy^h

The debate² among scholars centers in the authenticity of the shorter form³ as opposed to the authenticity of the longer form.⁴ Those who take the shorter form

²For a discussion of the arguments for the shorter and longer text, cf. Metzger, pp. 174-76. Vincent Taylor, with a few others, believes that the similarity between the account of the Lord's Supper as found in Luke and I Cor. results from a common dependence upon an earlier source. Vincent Taylor (ed. by Owen E. Evans), The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation (Cambridge: University Press, 1972), pp. 50-58.

³Williams identifies Nestle, J. Weiss, Loisy and Westcott and Hort as supporters of the shorter form (p. 51). To this list can be added Herbert E. D. Blakiston, "The Lucan Account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper," Journal of Theological Studies, IV(1902/03), 548-55; Blass, p. 179; F. C. Burkitt, "On Luke xxii.17-20," Journal of Theological Studies, XXVIII(1926/27), 178-81; Henry Chadwick, "The Shorter Text of Luke xxii.15-20," Harvard Theological Review, L(1957), 249-58; Creed, pp. 262-264; Easton, p. 321; Geldenhuys, pp. 557-59; Montefiore, p. 591; Plummer, p. 497; Karl Th. Schäfer, "Zur Textgeschichte von Lk 22:19b-20," Biblica, XXXIII(1952), 237-39; Arthur Vööbus, "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke," New Testament Studies, XV(1968/69), 457-63.

⁴Williams identifies Kenyon and Legg, along with himself, as supporters of the longer reading (p. 51). To these three can be added Piere Benoit, "Le Récit de le Cène dans Lc. XXII,15-20: Étude de critique textuelle et littéraire," Revue Biblique, XLVIII(1939), 357-93; Clark, "Theological Relevance," p. 10; Alexander R. Eagar, "St. Luke's Account of the Last Supper," Expositor, VII, 5(1908), 252-

as the original believe that vv. 19b,20 are an interpolation from I Cor. 11:23-26. Several scholars note the unstructured form of the rite in the early church, as does Creed:

Luke writes in an age when Christian rites and institutions are still in a fluid state. No fixed interpretation has yet become normative. That this was so at the close of the first century is supported by other evidence: the Didache can give forms of blessing for the cup and the bread (in the Lucan order) and thanksgiving after the Eucharist without an allusion to the Last Supper or to the death of Christ; St. John can record the Last Supper without any mention of the bread and wine and attach his eucharistic teaching to the feeding of the multitude. However, as the Pauline conception of the Eucharist tended to become normative, the Lucan account of the Last Supper must have been felt to be defective and anomalous. It was in consequence already by the middle of the second century, as it seems (Justin, Apol. i.66) supplemented by an interpolation from I Cor.⁵

Some scholars who prefer the longer text believe that the Lord's Supper was incorporated into the paschal meal. This is based upon Luke mentioning two cups. The location of the incorporation varies from the second to

62; Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 142-55; majority of scholars that worked on the United Bible Society's text, Metzger, p. 176; George Gardner Monks, "The Lucan Account of the Last Supper," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLIV(1925), 228-60; Harold McA. Robinson, "The Text of Luke xxii.17-25," Princeton Theological Review, VIII(1910), 613-56; H. Schürmann, "Lk. 22:19b-20 als Ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung," Biblica, XXXII(1951), 364-92; Snodgrass, "'Western non-Interpolations'," pp. 372, 374; Burton H. Throckmorton Jr., "The Longer Reading of Luke 22:19b-20," Anglican Theological Review, XXX(1948), 55-56.

⁵Creed, p. 262.

the fourth cup of the paschal meal.⁶ Benoit believes that the two cups in Luke are one and the same. At the point where the "first cup" is mentioned (v. 17) the disciples did not drink of it; it was only divided among them. The content of this cup was drunk at the point where Luke speaks of the "second cup" (v. 20). Thus, in reality there is only one cup in Luke's account.⁷

If one accepts the shorter text, the addition of vv. 19b,20 can be explained simply as an interpolation from I Cor. 11, for the purpose of bringing Luke into agreement with the other accounts of the institution. If one accepts the longer text, a possible explanation of the omission of vv. 19b,20 is the confusion that results from the two cups.⁸ However, Jeremias takes the position that,

the popular view that the Short Text arose because of the exception taken to the two cups (Luke 22:17f,20) and that the second cup was deleted because of the supposed repetition is not satisfactory.⁹

Again, one might say that the omission was caused by a desire of some copyist to remove indications of the

⁶Arndt, p. 438; Farrar, p. 325; Jeremias, pp. 84-88; van Oosterzee, p. 336; Plummer, p. 495; William F. Skene, "St. Luke's Account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper," Expositor, II,3(1882), 478-80.

⁷Benoit, pp. 291-92.

⁸This is the usual explanation of those who support the longer text; cf. the majority of scholars listed in footnote 3.

⁹Jeremias, p. 157.

bodily suffering of the Lord. Because D includes both the scene of the angel strengthening Jesus in Gethsemane (22:43) and the account of the bloody sweat (22:44), however, without omitting any of the other scenes of bodily suffering, this point does not seem likely.

Jeremias believes that vv. 19b,20 were omitted because of the danger of misinterpretation (blood drinking). In his view, a copyist around the middle of the second century abbreviated the account when he was asked for a copy of Luke's gospel by a pagan. Because there are numerous examples of sacred formulas being abbreviated among pagans at this time to protect the sacred meaning from uninitiates, Jeremias reasons that any Christian who read the first words of the Eucharistic formula would be able to supply the remainder.¹⁰

However, Benoit disagrees; he says that Christians have never hesitated to describe their more sacred mysteries, and when they did so they were properly understood.¹¹ Benoit suggests that the phrase "for you" that is attached to the bread and the cup in vv. 19b,20 was not part of the liturgical text that was then in use. Therefore, vv. 19b,20 were omitted because vv. 17-19a contained a liturgical sound that was more familiar.¹²

¹⁰Jeremias, pp. 158-59. ¹¹Benoit, p. 369.

¹²Ibid., p. 365.

Because Luke begins this passage with Jesus expressing the anticipation with which he had awaited this Passover meal, it appears that the longer text is the original, with the Lord's Supper being inserted into the paschal meal. The reading in D has the following results: (1) the cup precedes the bread,¹³ (2) there is no symbolism attached to the wine, and only the bread has symbolic value--"this is my body"; the remainder of the verse is harmonized with Matthew 26:26 and Mark 14:22 by the omission of "which is given for you," (3) the redemptive significance is lessened in the symbolism of the bread and completely eliminated in the wine. This leads Blass and Creed to the conclusion that this event is just an ordinary meal and that it was not Luke's intention to record the institution of what we call the Lord's Supper.¹⁴

In evaluating this variant in D on its own merit and in the light of D's theological biases and trends as

¹³As noted above, the Didache presents the service in this order; thus Creed (p. 262) feels there must have been some churches in the first century that were following the reversed order. Benoit believes that the account in the Didache is not to be trusted nor relied upon: "As for supporting the short text of Luke by the Didache, is that not to call a bonesetter to the bedside of an amputee?" (p. 366). Jeremias says, "No more can the Short Text finally be explained by saying that it presupposes a Lord's Supper in the order wine-bread (Luke 22:17-19a); such a Lord's Supper has never happened" (p. 157).

¹⁴Blass, p. 180; Creed, p. 262.

they have been seen up to this point, the solution suggested by Jeremias (blood drinking) for the omission of 22:19b,20 seems to be the most logical. We have already noted the care with which D deals with Gentiles as they appear in Luke's account. This would certainly impress a Gentile reader. D probably found vv. 19b,20 omitted in the manuscript he was copying. Rather than correct the omission, he was content to let it stand for fear the symbolism of the wine would cause misunderstanding among his Gentile readers.

Trial and Crucifixion

D presents the trial and crucifixion of Jesus with some interesting variations. For the first time in Luke, the people of Jerusalem are presented as openly hostile to Jesus. We have seen previously that they were passively unresponsive to Jesus' ministry in D. However, D keeps the people out of the preliminary trial before the Sanhedrin. The initial verdict of death is the responsibility of the rulers, but the people play a far more active role in showing contempt toward Jesus in D than in the normal text. Perhaps the best way to investigate these variants is to follow them through their chronological sequence. We will begin with the arrest in Gethsemane:

Luke 22:47

ετι αυτου λαουντος
ιδου οχλος και ο
λεγομενος ιουδας
εις των δωδεκα προηρχετο
αυτους

" While he was yet
speaking, behold a
crowd and the one called
Judas, one of
the twelve, was going
before them."

ετι δε αυτου λαουντος
ιδου οχλος πολυς και ο
καλουμενος ιουδας ισκαριωθ
εις των ιβ προηγεν
αυτους

"And while he was yet
speaking, behold a great
crowd and the one called
Judas Iscariot, one of
the twelve, was leading
the way before them."

+ πολυς post οχλος, D 544 sy^{SC} Tatian
+ ισκαριωθ post ιουδας, D 1
προηρχετο] προηγεν, D 1 22 69

In the text of D the size of the crowd actively participating in the arrest is increased beyond the normal text by means of a harmonization with Matthew 26:47. Because the chief priests, captains of the temple, and elders are included in "the crowd" of the normal text, it would be logical to assume that the increase in number, expressed in D as a "great crowd," would be mainly composed of the people from Jerusalem.

Upon being arrested, Jesus was led to the home of the high priest (v. 54). Here he was interrogated. Although there were those who observed this interrogation, they serve only as a backdrop for Peter's denial; the ὄχλος πολὺς ("great crowd") that participated in the arrest is not present. D indicates this in the next variant:

Luke 23:1

Codex B

Codex D

και ανασταν απαν το
 πληθος αυτων ηγαγον αυτον
 επι τον πειλατον

"And when the whole
 multitude of them
 arose, they led him
 to Pilate."

και ανασταντες
 ηγαγον αυτον αυτον
 επι πειλατον

"And when they
 had
 arisen, they led him
 to Pilate."

ανασταν] ανασταντες, D Θ 131 239 299 sy^{SCP} cop^{sa}
 om. απαν το πληθος αυτων, D

The active support and interest of the populace of Jerusalem in the arrest and the trial of Jesus before Pilate is presented by D as greater than what we find in the normal text. Thus we have a "great crowd" (v. 47) involved in the arrest instead of a "crowd" in the normal text; Pilate calls together "all the people" for his verdict (v. 13) instead of the "people" in the normal text (see below). Therefore, the omission of "the whole multitude of them" in the variant above now becomes significant, for it seems that D wishes to indicate that only the religious leaders interrogated Jesus, and when this interrogation was completed it was the rulers who led him to Pilate.

The omission of "the whole multitude of them" would seem to indicate that the "great crowd" of 22:47 had dispersed after the arrest, perhaps because they could not witness the proceedings in the home of the high priest. However, once Pilate had examined Jesus and had arrived at a tentative verdict, D then brings the populace back into the drama:

Luke 23:13

Codex B

πειλατος δε συν-
καλεσαμενος τους αρχιερεις
και τους αρχοντας και
τον λαον

"And when Pilate him-
self had called together
the chief priests and
the rulers and
the people."

Codex D

ο δε πειλατος συν-
καλεσας τους αρχιερεις
και τους αρχοντας και
παντα τον λαον

"And when Pilate
had called together
the chief priests and
the rulers and all
the people."

συνκαλεσαμενος] συνκαλεσας, D
+ παντα ante τον λαον, D c sy^C

As D makes the inhabitants of Jerusalem active participants in the arrest of Jesus, so he makes them active participants in the uncompromising demand for Jesus' crucifixion (22:18-25). D further incriminates the people of Jerusalem at the site of the crucifixion. In the account of Matthew and Mark, Jesus is ridiculed by both the people and the rulers, the people saying in essence, "You who can destroy the temple and in three days raise it up again, save yourself and come down from the cross" (Matthew 27:40; Mark 15:29,30) and the priests saying, "He saved others, he cannot save himself; if he is king of Israel, let him come down from the cross and we will believe him" (Matthew 27:42; Mark 15:31,32).

Luke pictures the people as silently watching the one who was crucified while the rulers alone scoffed at him. However, D takes the words spoken by the rulers and

puts them into the mouths of the crowd:

Luke 23:35

Codex B

και ειστηκει ο λαος
θεωρων εξεμυκτηριζον
δε και οι αρχοντες
λεγοντες αλλους
εσωσεν σωσατω εαυτον
ει υιος εστιν ο $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$
του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ ο εκλεκτος

"And the people stood
by watching, but the
rulers scoffed, saying,
Others he saved; let
him save himself if he
is the Christ, the elect
Son of God."

Codex D

και ειστηκει ο λαος
ορων εμυκτηριζον
δε αυτον και
ελεγαν αυτω αλλους
εσωσας σεαυτον σωσον
ει υιος ει του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ ει
 $\overline{\chi\rho\varsigma}$ ει ο εκλεκτος

"And the people stood
by watching, and
they scoffed at him and said,
Others you saved; save
yourself if you are the
Son of God, if you are the
Christ, if you are the
Elect one."

θεωρων] ορων, D
εξεμυκτηριζον δε και οι αρχοντες λεγοντες] εμυκτηριζον δε
αυτον και ελεγαν αυτω, D
αλλους εσωσεν σωσατω εαυτον ει υιος εστιν ο $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$ του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$] αλλους
εσωσας σεαυτον σωσον ει υιος ει του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ ει $\overline{\chi\rho\varsigma}$ ει, D

Although the scoffing of the priests in the normal text is directed at Jesus, it is not a bold challenge hurled into his face. Through D's alterations, the people continue their active role in Jesus' humiliation, and their scoffing is a direct challenge of bold defiance.

D underscores this bold defiance of the people with further alterations: (1) by altering the remarks of the soldiers and the unrepentant thief, and (2) by altering the conversation between the penitent thief and Jesus (cf. the change in the thief's appraisal of Jesus, from

"he has done nothing amiss" to "he has done no evil," in the previous chapter).¹⁵

Luke 23:36,37,39

Codex B

36. ενεπαιξαν δε αυτω
και οι στρατιωται προσ-
ερχομενοι οξος προσ-
φεροντες αυτω

37. και λεγοντες ει συ
ει ο βασιλευς των
ιουδαιων σωσον σεαυτον

39. εις δε των κρεμασ-
θεντων κακουργων
εβλασφημει αυτον ουχι
συ ει ο χς σωσον σεαυτον
και ημας

"36. And the soldiers also
mocked him, coming and
offering vinegar to him,
"37. And saying, if you
are the king of the Jews
save yourself.

"39. And one of the
criminals who was hang-
ing blasphemed him, Are
you not the Christ? Save
yourself and us."

v. 36 om. αυτω, D
v. 37 om. και, D lat

Codex D

36. ενεπεζον δε αυτω
και οι στρατιωται προσ-
ερχομενοι οξος τε προσ-
εφερον

37. λεγοντες χαιρε
ο βασιλευς των
ιουδαιων περιτεθεντες
αυτω και ακανθινον
στεφανον

39. εις δε των
κακουργων
εβλασφημει αυτον

"36. And the soldiers also
mocked him, coming and
offering vinegar,

"37. Saying, Hail
king of the Jews,
placing on him a thorny
crown.

"39. And one of
those who was hang-
ing blasphemed him."

¹⁵G. D. Kilpatrick, "A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story and Luke xxiii.47," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIII(1942), 34-36, adds an interesting thought that would further support D's emphasis on the defiance of the people. He takes the word δίκαιος, spoken by the centurion regarding Jesus, to be "innocent" and not "righteous." Thus the centurion supports Herod, Pilate, the soldiers, and the thief in their appraisal of Jesus against the people.

ει συ ει ο βασιλευς των ιουδαιων σωσον σεαυτον]
 χαιρε ο βασιλευς των ιουδαιων, D c
 + περιτεθεντες αυτω και ακανθινον στεφαναν post
 ιουδαιων, D c

v. 39 om. κρεμασθεντων, D 26 e

om. ουχι συ ει ο χς σωσον σεαυτον και ημας, D e

The mockery of the people (v. 35) had stemmed from Jesus' claim to be the Messiah. Their challenge, "Save yourself," indicated their disbelief and rejection of Jesus' claim to be able to save. They were responsible for his crucifixion and this crucifixion in turn testified to the accuracy of their appraisal of him. They challenged him to disprove their appraisal and their reasons for rejecting him.

The soldiers' mockery stemmed from a different point of view. They mocked him because he claimed to be a king, not because he claimed to be the Messiah, the Son of God. By changing their words, D indicates that he does not see the soldiers' treatment of Jesus as the same in nature as that of the people. The soldiers were not rejecting Jesus' claim to be the Saviour. They only mocked his claim to be a ruler in Caesar's stead.

The apparent reason for D's omission of the blasphemy of the thief is to make the rejection by the people complete. In the normal text, the blasphemy of the thief centers in Jesus' claims of being the Saviour--"Are you the Christ? Save yourself and us" (v. 39); therefore, the words of the blasphemy are omitted by D, and he simply

states that the thief blasphemed. Of all those who blasphemed and mock Jesus in D's text, the people alone touch the very heart of Jesus' proclaimed mission as Saviour; they alone are pictured as rejecting this mission.

As a general rule, one would look at the attitudes of the rulers in order to appraise the attitudes of a city or nation. D uses the people of Jerusalem to portray the attitude of rejection in the passion story. In the previous chapter we noticed that D emphasizes Luke's idea that Jerusalem is the place of enmity by portraying this city as unresponsive to Jesus' ministry. The part played by the people of this city in the passion story of D verifies the observation made concerning Jerusalem in the previous chapter.

During the trial before Pilate, one of the charges pressed against Jesus by the rulers was that of insurrection: "We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding us to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king" (23:2); "But they were urgent, saying, 'He stirs up (ἀνασείω) the people'" (23:5). In the normal text of Luke this same charge is brought against Barabbas, but it is dropped by D:

Luke 23:25

Codex B

απελυσεν δε τον δια στασιν
και φονον βεβλημενον εις

Codex D

απελυσεν δε τον ενεκα
φονου βεβλημενον εις

φυλακην ον ητουντο τον
δε ιν παρεδωκεν τω
θεληματι αυτων

"He released the man
who had been cast into
prison because of in-
surrection and murder,
whom they asked for;
but Jesus he delivered
up to their will."

φυλακην ον ητουντο τον
δε την παρεδωκεν τω
θεληματι αυτων

"He released the man
who had been cast into
prison because of
murder,
whom they asked for;
but Jesus he delivered
up to their will."

δια] ενεκα, D
ομ. στασιν και, D

D allows the charge of insurrection logged against Jesus to stand (23:5), but separates him from the company of Barabbas by dropping the same charge against the criminal. Barabbas is now guilty of murder and Jesus, despite the charge of insurrection, is not. Thus D makes a distinction between the charges brought against the two men and indicates that Jesus' execution is not justified.

The Empty Tomb

The alterations in D that deal with the empty tomb seem to revolve around the attitude of the apostles toward the report brought to them by the women. Why did not the apostles believe? Because the women in D's text could not give the apostles any positive assurance that the resurrection had taken place. All they could offer was circumstantial evidence and an admonition to remember a prediction made by Jesus while he was yet in Galilee.

The first variant in D that relates to the empty tomb is circumstantial evidence of the resurrection:

Luke 23:53; 24:1,2

Codex B

53. και καθελων ενετυλιξεν
αυτο σινδονι
και εθηκεν αυτον εν μνηματι
λαξευτω ου ουκ ην
ουδεις ουπω κειμενος

1. τη δε μια των σαββατων
ορθρου βαθεως επι
το μνημα ηλθαν φερουσαι α
ητοιμασαν αρωματα

2. ευρον δε τον
λιθον αποκεκυλισμενον απο
του μνημειου

"53. And he took it down
and
wrapped it in a linen
shroud, and laid him in a
rock-hewn tomb, where no
one had ever yet been laid.

"1. And on the first day
of the week, at early
dawn, they came to the
tomb, taking the spices
they had prepared.

"2. And they found the
stone rolled away from
the tomb."

Codex D

53. και καθελων ενετυλιξεν
το σωμα του τηυ εν σινδονι
και εθηκεν αυτον εν μνημειω
λελατομημενω ου ουκ ην
ουπω ουδεις κειμενος και
θεντος αυτου επεθηκεν τω
μνημειω λειθον ον μογισ
εικοσι εκυλιον

1. μια δε των σαββατων
ορθρου βαθεως ηρχοντο επει
το μνημα φαιρουσαι α
ητοιμασαν και τινες συν
αυταις ελογιζοντο δε εν
εαυταις τις αρα αποκυλισει
τον λιθον

2. ελθουσαι δε ευρον τον
λιθον αποκεκυλισμενον απο
του μνημειου

"53. And he took down
the body of Jesus and
wrapped it in a linen
shroud, and laid him in a
rock-hewn tomb, where no
one had ever yet been laid
and when he was interred a
stone was placed upon the
tomb which twenty men could
hardly roll.

"1. And on the first day
of the week, at early
dawn, they came to the
tomb, taking what
they had prepared, and
certain others came with
them. And they began
to reason among themselves,
Who will roll the stone
away?

"2. And they found the
stone rolled away from
the tomb."

-
- v. 53 αυτο] το σωμα του τησ, D
 + εν ante σινδονι, D 440
 μηνματι λαξετω] μνημειω λελατομημενω, D
 + και θεντος αυτου επεθηκεν τω μνημειω λειθον ον
 μογισ εικοσι εκυκλιον post καιμενος, D c cop^{sa}
- v. 1 om. τη, D
 ηκθαν] ηρχοντο, D
 om. αρωματα, D it sy^{sc} cop^{sa}
 + και τινες συν αυταις ελογιζοντο δε εν εαυτοις τις
 αρα αποκυλισει τον λιθον post ητοιμασαν, D 0124 c cop^{sa}
- v. 2 ευρον δε] ελθουσαι δε ευρον, D 0124 c cop^{sa} Tatian

There are those who immediately see a correlation between this stone described by D and the one that appears in Homer's Odyssey (ix.241).¹⁶ Whether or not D borrowed the general dimensions of the stone from Homer is not our concern here. What we are interested in is the fact that the women, conscious of the size of the stone and knowing that a sufficient number of men from their party had not gone to the tomb to move the stone, must have been impressed that something unusual had taken place.¹⁷

By an omission in the next few verses, D continues to build the case of circumstantial evidence:

Luke 24:5,6,7

¹⁶Cf. Creed, p. 292; Plummer, p. 542; Blass, pp. 185-87.

¹⁷T. H. Wier, "The Stone Rolled Away," Expository Times, XXIV(1912/13), 284, suggests that Paul may have misunderstood the oral tradition of the women arriving at the tomb, and instead of finding the stone rolled away, they found Peter hastening away (for stone and Peter are identical in Aramaic), thus Paul concluded that Peter was the first to see the resurrected Lord.

Codex B

5. ενφοβων δε γενομενων
αυτων και κλεινουσων τα
προσωπα εις την γην
ειπαν προς αυτας τι
ζητειτε τον ζωντα μετα
των νεκρων

6. ουκ εστιν ωδε αλλα
ηγερθη μνησθητε ως
ελαλησεν υμιν ετι ων
εν τη γαλιλαια

7. λεγων τον υιον του
ανθρωπου οτι δει
παραδοθηαι εις χειρας
ανθρωπων αμαρτωλων και
σταυρωθηαι και τη
τριτη ημερα αναστηναι

"5. And as they were
afraid and bowed their
faces to the ground
they said to them,

Why do you seek the
living among the dead?

"6. He is not here, but
has risen. Remember
how he told you,

yet being in Galilee,

"7. Saying, It is neces-
sary for the Son of
Man to be betrayed into
the hands of sinful men
and to be crucified and
raised the third day."

Codex D

5. ενφοβοι δε γενομεναι
εκλειναν τα
προσωπα εις την γην οι δε
ειπαν προς αυτας τι
ζητειτε τον ζωντα μετα
των νεκρων

6.
μνησθητε δε οσα
ελαλησεν υμειν ετι ων
εν τη γαλιλαια

7. οτι δει τον
υιον του ανθρωπου
παραδοθηαι εις χειρας
ανθρωπων και
σταυρωθηαι και τη
τριτη ημερα αναστηναι

"5. And being
afraid they bowed their
faces to the ground and
the men said to them,
Why do you seek the
living among the dead?

"6.

Remember
as much as he told you,
yet being in Galilee,

"7. That it is neces-
sary for the Son of
Man to be betrayed into
the hands of men
and to be crucified and
raised the third day."

v. 5 ενφοβων δε γενομενων αυτων και κλεινουσων] ενφοβοι
δε γενομεναι εκλειναν, D a c r sy^{SCP} Tatian
+ οι δε ante ειπαν, D a c r sy

v. 6 om. ουκ εστιν ωδε, αλλα ηγερθη, D it
ως] οσα, D c sy^{SCP} Marcion Tatian

v. 7 om. λεγων, D c
om. αμαρτωλων, D it

By his omission in v. 6,¹⁸ D removes any direct

¹⁸Arndt feels that ". . . in the MS that was at the
basis of D . . . the copyist must have striven for the ut-
most brevity" (p. 483). Metzger (pp. 183-84) says that the

mention of the resurrection. Thus when the women return to report to the apostles what they have experienced, they could present the following:

1. The enormous stone had been moved from the mouth of the tomb (v. 2).
2. The tomb was empty (v. 4).
3. They talked with two men in dazzling apparel at the tomb (v. 4).
4. These men said, "Why do you seek the living among the dead?" and "Remember what he said while yet in Galilee."

The only thing of a relatively positive nature that the women could report that would support a resurrection was the words of the two men, "Why do you seek the living among the dead?" and the appeal to remember the prediction Jesus made while in Galilee. As a result the apostles did not believe (v. 11).

Two more variants in the text of D might be traced to the apostles' unbelief. First is the omission of v. 12: ὁ δὲ πέτρος ἀνάστας ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὄθονία μόνὰ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γέγονος ("And Peter arose and ran to the tomb; stooping and looking in, he saw the linen cloths alone; and he went home

majority of the men working on the United Bible Society's text preferred to keep the reading.

wondering at what had happened"--Luke 24:12).¹⁹ By the omission of this verse, D maintains a consistency with v. 11 that is lost when the verse is included, i.e. none of the "apostles" (v. 10) believed the report of the women, so no one bothered to go to the tomb to verify it.

But the problem is not solved this easily. For we have v. 24 to deal with, which contains a statement made by the two disciples while walking to Emmaus with the "stranger":

Luke 24:24

Codex B

και απηλθον τινες
των συν ημιν επι το
μνημειον και ευρον
ουτως καθως αι γυναι-
κες ειπον αυτον δε
ουκ ειδον

"And certain ones from
among us went to the
tomb and found it
exactly as the women
had said, but they
did not see him."

Codex D

και απηλθον τινες εκ
των συν ημειν επι το
μνημειον και ευρον
ουτως ως ειπον αι
γυναικες αυτον δε
ουκ ειδομεν

"And certain ones from
among us went to the
tomb and found it
as the women
had said, but we
did not see him."

¹⁹Opinion is divided over whether this verse should be included in the text. Those who favor its inclusion are Arndt, p. 485; Farrar, p. 358; Jeremias, p. 150; R. Leaney, "Resurrection Narratives in Luke (xxiv.12-53)," New Testament Studies, II(1955/56), 110-14; Metzger, p. 184; van Oosterzee, p. 385; Tinsley, p. 204; Snodgrass, p. 373. Those who feel it should not be included see it as an interpolation from John 20:3-10, cf. K. Peter G. Curtis, "Luke xxiv.12 and John xx.3-10," Journal of Theological Studies, XXII(1971), 512-15; Geldenhuys, p. 626; Gilmour, p. 420; Plummer, p. 550.

+ εκ ante των, D
καθως] ως, D
ειδον] ειδομεν, D e

The problem in the normal text has long been recognized; v. 12 says that Peter alone went to the tomb while v. 24 indicates more than one person went. This is an additional reason for the position that v. 12 was not part of the original text. We have already indicated that by this omission D sustains the unbelief among the apostles spoken of in v. 11.

However, because in D John precedes Luke in accordance with the Western order of the gospels, D was aware of John's account of both Peter and John going to the tomb (John 20:3-10). Therefore, the omission of Luke 24:12 serves a second purpose, it removes the inconsistency between Luke and John regarding Peter going to the tomb alone.

The normal text of Luke 24:24 would agree with John 20:3-10 (but disagrees with v. 12); therefore, because D eliminates Peter's trip to the tomb, he makes the visit apply to others, i.e. to at least one of the Emmaus disciples and at least one other person. At the same time D remains consistent with the context of Luke's normal text, for the women reported their experience to the "apostles" (v. 10), who did not believe and did not try to verify the report. Those who went to the tomb in D's account were

apparently outside of the circle of the twelve "apostles."
 Yet, as we will see presently, those who saw the empty
 tomb did not believe either.

Another omission that might very well stem from
 the disciples' unbelief is found earlier in v. 3:

Luke 24:3

Codex B

εισελθουσαι δε ουκ ευρον
 το σωμα του κ̅υ̅ ι̅υ̅

"And when they entered
 they found not the body
 of the Lord Jesus."

Codex D

εισελθουσαι δε ουκ ευρον
 το σωμα

"And when they entered
 they found not the body."

om. του κ̅υ̅ ι̅υ̅, D it

Farrar points out that this is the only place where
 this term, "the Lord Jesus," can be found in the gospels.²⁰
 However, it is found fifteen times in Acts²¹ and appears
 frequently in the epistles. Surveying the passages in
 Acts, one infers that the phrase "the Lord Jesus" is a

²⁰Farrar, p. 358 (except for a single use in the
 long ending of Mark 16:19). Those favoring it as being
 original: Arndt, p. 483; Creed, p. 293; Farrar, p. 358;
 the majority working on the United Bible Society's text,
 Metzger, p. 183; Ignace de la Potterie, "Le titre KYPIOΞ
 appliqué a Jésus dans l'évangile de Luc," Mélanges bibli-
ques en hommage an R. P. Béda Rigaux, A. Descamps and
A. de Halleux (eds.) (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), pp. 121-
24; Snodgrass, p. 375. Those who feel it is an interpo-
 lation: Geldenhuys, p. 625; Plummer, p. 547; van Oosterzee,
 p. 385.

²¹Acts 1:21; 7:59; 8:16; 9:29; 11:17,20; 15:11,26;
 16:31; 19:13,17; 20:21,35; 21:13; 28:31.

honorific title given to the resurrected Christ. The omission in Luke 24:3 may simply stem from the fact that at that point the resurrection of Jesus was not an object of faith as far as his followers were concerned. He was not yet "the Lord Jesus," as he thus becomes in the later preaching of the apostles in Acts.

Post-Resurrections Appearances

Luke records only two post-resurrection appearances, both of them in Judea and both on the resurrection Sunday, and both have variants in D. The first appearance is to the two disciples as they make their way to Emmaus. On reaching their destination they persuade the "stranger," who had been traveling with them, to remain in their company for the evening:

Luke 24:30,31

Codex B

30. και εγενετο εν τῳ
κατακλιθηναι αυτον μετ
αυτων λαβων τον αρτον
ευλογησεν και κλασας
επεδιδου αυτοις
31.

αυτων δε διηνοιχθησαν
οι οφθαλμοι και επεγνωσαν
αυτον και αυτος αφαντος
εγενετο απ αυτων

"30. And it came to pass
that while he was sitting
at supper with them,
taking the bread he blessed

Codex D

30. και εγενετο εν τῳ
κατακλιθηναι αυτον
λαβων αρτον
ηυλογησεν και
προσεδιδου αυτοις

31. λαβοντων δε αυτων
τον αρτον απ αυτου
ηνυγησαν οι οφθαλμοι
αυτων και επεγνωσαν
αυτον και αυτος αφαντος
εγενετο απ αυτων

"30. And it came to pass
that while he was sitting
at supper,
taking bread he blessed

and broke it and gave it
to them.
"31.

And their eyes were opened
and they knew him and he
disappeared from them."

and gave it
to them.
"31. And when they had re-
ceived the bread from him
their eyes were opened
and they knew him and he
disappeared from them."

-
- v. 30 om. μετ' αυτων, D e sy^{SC}
om. τον, D 131 1093 cop^{sa} Tatian
om. κλασας, D
επεδιδου] προσεδιδου, D
- v. 31 αυτων δε διηνοιχθησαν οι οφθαλμοι και επεγνωσαν
αυτον] λαβοντων δε αυτων τον αρτον απ' αυτου ηνυγησαν
οι οφθαλμοι αυτων και επεγνωσαν αυτον, D c e

There is nothing in the variants themselves that detracts from the record of an appearance by Jesus. Rather, the variants revolve around the disciples' identification of the "stranger." The normal text would lead us to infer that the disciples successfully identified the "stranger" by his mannerisms in the blessing, breaking, and distributing of the bread. In the text of D the general thought is the same, but some of the details are different.

It would seem that by two omissions in v. 30 D was trying to prevent the misunderstanding that this meal with the two Emmaus disciples was the celebration of the Lord's Supper with two followers who were not present when the rite was instituted.²² The presence of the definite

²²Cf. Brown (pp. 75-77), who sees this pericope of the Emmaus disciples as a successful attempt by Jesus to reclaim two disciples that have abandoned their faith in him and left Jerusalem, the place that was symbolic of

article τόν before ἄρτόν ("bread"--v. 30) in the normal text gives to this bread the ring of special quality. The sequence of blessing, breaking, and giving recalls the only other scene where these details are given so specifically--the Lord's Supper.

By the omission of the article and the second step of the sequence, "breaking," the danger of misunderstanding is reduced. At the same time D retains Luke's original thought, that Jesus is identified by his mannerism in hosting a meal, even though in this case he is a guest.²³

The reaction of the two disciples to the sudden realization of the identity of their traveling companion and to his sudden disappearance is also changed by D:

Luke 24:32,33,34

Codex B

32. και ειπαν προς αλληλους
ουχι η καρδια ημων καιομενη
ην ως ελαλει ημιν εν τη
οδω ως διηνυγεν ημιν τας
γραφας

33. και ανασταντες
αυτη τη ωρα υπεστρεψαν
εις ιερουσαλημ και ευρον
ηθροισμενους τους ενδεκα
και τους συν αυτοις

34. λεγοντας οτι οντως
ηγερθη ο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ και ωφθη
σιμωνι

Codex D

32. οι δε ειπον προς εαυτους
ουχι η καρδια ην ημων κεκαλυμ-
μενη ως ελαλει ημειν εν τη
οδω ως ηνυγεν ημειν τας
γραφας

33. και ανασταντες λυπουμενοι
αυτη τη ωρα υπεστρεψαν
εις ιερουσαλημ και ευρον
ηθροισμενους τους $\overline{\tau\alpha}$
και τους συν αυτοις

34. λεγοντες οτι οντως
ηγερθη ο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ και ωφθη
σιμωνι

Messianic hope and glory between the resurrection and ascension.

²³Cf. Creed, p. 262.

"32. And they said to each other, Was not our heart burning as he talked to us on the road, as he opened to us the scriptures?

"33. And arising the same hour they returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven gathered together and those who were with them,
"34. saying, The Lord has risen indeed, and has appeared to Simon."

"32. And they said to themselves, Was not our heart veiled as he talked to us on the road, as he opened to us the scriptures?

"33. And arising sorrowing the same hour they returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven gathered together and those who were with them,
"34. [And the two] said, The Lord has risen indeed, and has appeared to Simon."

-
- v. 32 και ειπαν προς αλληλους] οι δε ειπον προς εαυτους, D
καιομενη] κεκαλυμμενη, D
v. 33 + λυπουμενοι post ανασταντες, D c e cop^{sa}
v. 34 λεγοντας] λεγοντες, D Origen

The implications of the variants in these verses are significant. The alteration in v. 34 is the key to understanding their import. In the normal text, "the eleven and those who were with them" inform the returning Emmaus disciples that the report of the women can be accepted, for now Simon can verify it, having seen the risen Lord himself. D changes the participle from λέγοντας ("saying," accusitive plural agreeing with τούς ένδεκα και τούς σὺν αὐτοῖς, "the eleven and those with them") to λέγοντες ("saying," nominative plural agreeing with the two returning disciples who are the subject of the compound verbs in this verse). Thus it is the two returning disciples who announce to the assembled group in Jerusalem the surety of the Lord's resurrection on the basis of their

experience on the way to Emmaus.

But this change implies that the Lord had appeared to Simon before the two had left for Emmaus. They, as well as the group in Jerusalem, would have been aware of Simon's experience; but in the case of the women's report, apparently no one believed. Therefore, on their return the two are made to blurt out, "The Lord has indeed risen; you can believe Simon and the women, for we too have seen him." By implication, D has materially increased the unbelief of Jesus' followers immediately after the resurrection.

With this in mind the alterations in vv. 32,33 can be understood. After Jesus makes himself known and disappears, the two muse over the veil that has darkened their understanding. The implication of v. 32 is that instead of their hearts burning while Jesus expounded the Scriptures to them along the way, they failed completely to see the correlation between the events of the previous three days and the passages the "stranger" was endeavoring to explain. The veil stemmed from their refusal to believe the report of the women (v. 11) and of Peter (v. 34). When he failed to penetrate the veil by the exposition of Scripture, the "stranger" revealed his true identity.

Upon this revelation the two return to Jerusalem

sorrowing (v. 33D), not because of the appearance of the risen Lord, but in spite of it; for now they castigate themselves for their lack of faith in failing to see the fulfillment of Old Testament Scripture in the events of the previous three days, and in failing to accept the reports of the women and Peter.

The group in Jerusalem has the same veil of unbelief over their hearts that the two Emmaus disciples experienced. But once the two recount their experience D tries to minimize the persistent unbelief, for this is the second reported appearance collaborating the women's report of the empty tomb.

While the two disciples were in the very process of recounting their experience, Jesus appeared to the whole assembled group:

Luke 24:36,37

Codex B

36. ταυτα δε αυτων
λαλουντων αυτος εστη
εν μεσφ αυτων και
λεγει αυτοις ειρηνη
υμιν.
37. θρονηθεντες δε
και εμφοβοι γενομενοι
εδοκουν πνευμα θεωρειν

"36. And while they were saying these things, he stood in the midst of them and said, Peace to you.
"37. And they were frightened and being

Codex D

36. ταυτα δε αυτων
λαλουντων αυτος εσταθη
εν μεσφ αυτων
37. αυτοι δε πτοηθεντες
και ενφοβοι γενομενοι
εδοκουν φαντασμα θεωρειν

"36. And while they were saying these things, he stood in the midst of them.
"37. And they were terrified and being

terrified they
thought they saw a
spirit."

frightened they
thought they saw a
ghost."

v. 36 om. και λεγει αυτοις ειρηνη υμιν, D it
v. 37 θρονηθεντες] αυτοι δε πτοηθεντες, D
πνευμα] φαντασμα, D Marcion

The fear that is recorded in v. 37 of the normal text is somewhat hard to understand in the face of the evidence that has been given to this point.²⁴ However, if we follow D's account, the fear of the assembled group (except for the two Emmaus disciples and Peter) raises no problem, for their hearts are still veiled by unbelief and they truly suppose that they are seeing a spirit or ghost.

D's omission of "and he said, 'Peace to you'" in v. 36 is now calculated to minimize this unbelief.²⁵ For the disciples to react the way they do in v. 37, after the reports of the women, Peter, and the Emmaus disciples, and while having Jesus speak to them at his appearance to quiet their fears, only magnifies the condition of unbelief. Therefore, D minimizes this unbelief by omitting the words spoken by Jesus, words that would otherwise have failed in

²⁴Cf. Benj. W. Bacon, "The Ascension in Luke and Acts," Expositor, VII,7(1909), 255, who observes that this appearance must have been a "first" appearance: "It cannot possibly have been framed to stand after ver. 33-34, in which the two from Emmaus find 'the eleven gathered together and them that were with them, saying, 'The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.'"

²⁵Snodgrass, p. 375.

their intended purpose of quieting the disciples' fears and establishing their faith.

Throughout this and the previous section we have discovered in D a well-developed motif of unbelief up to the point where the two Emmaus disciples tell the Jerusalem group their experience. From this point on D endeavors to minimize the lingering doubt concerning the resurrection.

The Ascension

The last four verses of Luke contain the account of the ascension, which is parallel to the longer account found in Acts 1:6-11. We will observe briefly two omissions in the gospel account:

Luke 24:51,52

Codex B

51. και εγενετο εν τω
ευλογειν αυτον αυτους
διεστη απ αυτων και
ανεφερετο εις τον
ουρανον
52. και αυτοι προσ-
κυνησαντες αυτον
υπεστρεψαν εις
ιερουσαλημ. . . .

"51. And it came to pass, while he was blessing them, he was parted from them and borne up into heaven.
"52. And when they had worshipped him they returned to Jerusalem"

Codex D

51. και εγενετο εν τω
ευλογειν αυτον αυτους
απεστη απ αυτων
52. και αυτοι
υπεστρεψαν εις
ιερουσαλημ. . . .

"51. And it came to pass, while he was blessing them, he was parted from them.
"52. And they returned to Jerusalem"

v. 51 διεστη] απεστη, D
 om. και ανεφερετο εις τον ουρανον, χ * D it sy^S
 v. 52 om. προσκυνησαντες αυτον, D it sy^S

The omission of Luke's ascension account in D has caused a great deal of discussion. The omission in v. 52 ("when they had worshipped him") seems to be directly tied to the omission in v. 51. The whole problem centers in the apparent discrepancy between Luke and Acts over the time element of the ascension. In Luke it appears that Jesus ascended on the day of the resurrection, while Acts indicates that there was a forty day period between the resurrection and the ascension (Acts 1:3).

Numerous theories have been suggested for the origin of this apparent discrepancy in Luke's normal text:

1. After writing the account in the gospel and presenting the ascension and resurrection as happening on the same day, Luke later discovered another tradition (or evolved it himself) that places the ascension forty days later. The later discovery was worked into Acts 1.²⁶

2. Luke was aware of the forty days separating the resurrection and the ascension but did not mention it in the gospel because it would have disrupted the smoothness of the narrative; therefore, he preferred silence "to

²⁶Cf. Morton S. Enslin, "The Ascension Story," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVII(1928), 60-73. Plummer admits that this is a possibility (p. 564).

a pedantic completeness."²⁷

3. We have in Luke and Acts a twofold interpretation of the same event, one not excluding the other. The gospel presenting a "doxological interpretation" and Acts the "historical and 'pneumatic'" interpretation.²⁸

4. The ascension occurred at the beginning of the forty days of appearances to the disciples. Luke ". . . interjects in Acts 1:3 a general summary of the appearances to the disciples as having covered a period of 'forty days,'" and "in no way brings out the fortieth day as signalized by any particular occurrence."²⁹

Even though the reading of the longer text presents the difficulty of the apparent contradiction between Luke and Acts, interpreters are presently more inclined to take its reading as original, the shorter text being an

²⁷Zane C. Hodges, "The Women and the Empty Tomb," Bibliotheca Sacra, CXXIII(1966), 301-309. Cf. Bacon, pp. 254-61; Plummer (p. 564) who says, "And while he does not state either here or in ver. 44 that there was any interval at all, still less does he say that there was none"; Arndt, pp. 501-02; Theodore D. Woolsey, "The End of Luke's Gospel and the Beginning of the Acts: Two Studies," Bibliotheca Sacra, LIX(1882), 593-619.

²⁸p. A. van Stempvoort, "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts," New Testament Studies, V(1958/59), 30-90.

²⁹Bacon, p. 260. Cf. Gottfried Kinkel, "Historical and Critical Inquiry Respecting the Ascension of Christ," Bibliotheca Sacra, I(1844), 152-78.

attempt to remove the contradiction.³⁰ If the shorter text is taken as original, this would mean that Acts is the only book that deals with the ascension (unless the longest ending of Mark is accepted as original). However, the internal evidence of Luke 22:50-53 seems to call for the longer text.³¹

D's omission of προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν ("worshiping him") in v. 52 may be explained easily by saying that it is an attempt to harmonize the account in Luke with the more detailed ascension account in Acts, where there is no mention of the disciples worshiping Jesus at his ascension. The omission in v. 51, καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν ("and he was taken up into heaven"), is not as easily explained.

To say that D omitted the specific statement that Jesus ascended into heaven in an attempt to harmonize Luke with the other synoptic accounts, which have no mention of the ascension, is to ignore the presence of διέστη ἀπ'αὐτῶν

³⁰Blass, pp. 138-40; Jeremias, p. 151; Snodgrass, p. 375; Streeter, p. 143; van Stempvoort, p. 36; Williams, pp. 51-53; majority of scholars working on the United Bible Society's text; Metzger, pp. 189-90. Those who favor the short reading are: Arndt, p. 501; Creed, p. 301; Geldenhuys, p. 647. Plummer (p. 565) suggests that the variants in vv. 51,52 were not present in the original document, "but it is conceivable that Lk. himself (or Theophilus) may have added them in a second edition of the Gospel, in order to make it quite clear what διέστη ἀπ'αὐτῶν meant."

³¹Cf. Metzger, pp. 189-90 and Blass, pp. 138-40 for a presentation of the arguments in favor of the longer text.

("he was separated from them") in the immediate context. A normal separation between Jesus and his disciples that had no intimation of glory, or a separation that was shrouded in mystery, or that left the disciples bewildered as to what happened to their risen Lord, would not have caused the great joy of v. 52, nor would it have been the reason for their "blessing God" in the temple (v. 53).

It was not D's intent to omit the ascension from Luke. The "He was separated from them" of v. 51 together with the expressions of joy in vv. 52,53 are sufficient for the ascension account in Luke (especially in view of the detailed account of the ascension in Acts). It would appear that D made his omission in v. 51 in the interests of the Christian believers in his own time and in succeeding generations.

The long-awaited parousia of the Lord had not materialized. To guard the Christian community against an attitude of utter abandonment by its Lord, D omitted the phrase that had the disheartening ring of finality, "he was separated from them and was taken up into heaven." It was D's purpose to prevent the rise of a misunderstanding that the Lord had been separated from his church, and this separation was final. It was to prevent the rise of a sense of abandonment that the words "from them" could have produced when followed by "into heaven."

That D had the interest of the community at heart would appear to be verified by an omission in the ascension account of Acts that is almost identical to his variant in Luke: οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν ("This Jesus who has been taken up from you into heaven"--Acts 1:11) where εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν ("into heaven") is omitted by D 242 gig. D again omits the phrase that specifies the extent of the separation immediately after the statement of the separation (ἀπ' αὐτῶν ["from them"] in Luke 24:51 and ἀφ' ὑμῶν ["from you"] in Acts 1:11) thus endeavoring to minimize any danger that this separation might be construed by the church to have a ring of finality.

Conclusion

The following observations can be made as a result of the study of the variants in this chapter:

1. The omission of 22:19b,20 (the symbolism of the wine) would seem to result from D's sensitivity to Gentile reaction. D has shown repeatedly that he was editing Luke with an anti-Judaic bias and a Gentile interest. The omission would certainly minimize an occasion for misunderstanding among Gentile readers.

2. D strengthens the previous observation that Jerusalem is the place of enmity. He does this by showing a more hostile attitude on the part of the people of

Jerusalem toward Jesus during his passion, and by minimizing any indication of hostility toward Jesus as Saviour on the part of the soldiers and the unrepentant thief.

3. Around the empty tomb D develops a motif of unbelief on the part of the disciples. The women report circumstantial evidence of the resurrection and it is not believed by the apostles. Peter's encounter with the resurrected Lord is made to occur before Jesus appears to the Emmaus disciples, and his report is not believed. The Emmaus disciples castigate themselves for their unbelief after Jesus' appearance to them and are the ones who report the certainty of the resurrection to the Jerusalem group. From this point on D begins to minimize the unbelief of the disciples.

4. D omits the direct statement in Luke (and Acts) that Jesus was separated from his followers by going into heaven in an attempt to minimize any misunderstanding that the degree of this separation made it final.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The variant readings investigated in this study suggest that the text of D represents the work of more than a mere copyist. It is too simplistic to say with Kenyon:

Such are some of the more remarkable variants presented by this type of text in this single book of the Acts of the Apostles. In the Gospel of St. Luke they are for the most part less striking, often consisting merely of the omission or insertion of pronouns, the substitution of pronouns for proper names, or vice versa, or the interchange of καί and ὁί.¹

Remembering that D is the chief Greek witness of the Western text, it would be inadequate also to say with Hatch:

The reasons which led to the making of the "Western" additions mentioned above are not difficult to discern. First, the reviser or revisers desired to preserve whatever fragments of evangelic tradition could be found in sources other than those Gospels which were generally recognized in all parts of the Church, in order that no saying of Jesus or credible story connected with his life should perish. All such material was precious, and it was believed that a place should be found for it in the revised text of the New Testament. Secondly, the maker or makers of the "Western" text liked a full and smooth text, and they sought to obtain it by means of various editorial

¹Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism, pp. 346-47.

devices. In some cases, however, the desire for smoothness led to omissions.²

Although the observations of Kenyon and Hatch are correct, they fall short of explaining adequately the true nature of D's complex text in Luke. Omissions, additions, and substitutions of various nouns, verbs, and pronouns may be easily noted, but their impact upon the text remains unappreciated until the entire book is examined and it is determined whether an editorial design emerges. Until the methods used in this study were applied to D's text in Luke, its unique readings, as a whole, remained isolated elements that stimulated curiosity, but were not seen as supporting units that would help explain the existence of one another.

The text of D in Luke presents the picture of a copyist working from a manuscript containing the Western text, yet having access to other sources (Tatian and Marcion in particular, and at times showing a knowledge of the Alexandrian text). One would conclude two things about the copyist of D in Luke: (1) he was more than a copier; he was an editor; and (2) the editor of D in Luke worked with the aim of altering or strengthening Luke's tradition in compliance with his theological biases.

From the present study, one may also conclude that

²Hatch, The 'Western' Text of the Gospels, p. 22.

theological biases account for the major portion of D's unique readings in Luke. A frequent tool used by D to develop these biases is harmonization with the other gospels. On other occasions D uses apparent "Tatianisms" and "Marcionite readings" to further his editorial design.

Two major themes emerge from D's variants: (1) the exaltation of Jesus, and (2) an anti-Judaic bias. Three secondary themes are woven around these two major themes: (1) the two dominant characters in the first three chapters (the mother of Jesus and John the Baptist) are elevated beyond their significance in Luke's normal text; (2) Peter is made to stand out as "first" among the apostles, while the remaining apostles are protected from behavior that is not compatible with their position; and (3) Gentiles are favorably treated.

Finally it must be said that Epp's study of the text of D in Acts and the present study show a relatively consistent pattern of thought running through the variants of D in Luke/Acts.³

Because of the consistent editorial pattern seen in D in Luke/Acts, the remaining gospels in D are now

³Epp (pp. 165-71) found in Acts that the Jewish leaders are presented as more hostile toward Jesus, an anti-Judaic bias is present, there is an attempt to minimize the importance of Jewish institutions, the role of the apostles is magnified, and that there is a favorable attitude toward the Romans.

brought into question. One assumes that a manuscript which shows such marked evidence of editorial work by a copyist in two of its books would also show similar evidence in the remaining books. Should such an investigation show that Luke/Acts received editorial attention exclusive of or different from the remaining books in the manuscript, we would then face a new problem in the history of D's troublesome text.

Further questions arise concerning what the result would be if a major witness of another texttype was examined in a similar way. Would the variants of 1, 13, or ①, which put these manuscripts in a separate group, show evidence of a particular bias or biases? Could the unusual changes from one texttype to another within the gospels of W have resulted from theological biases? One might also ask, To what degree do variant readings within manuscripts from various centuries reflect the developing theology of the growing church? These questions, of course, remain to be answered.

Although the main approach to textual criticism will continue to be that of counting variants and aligning manuscripts according to the resulting figures, it is hoped that the present study will contribute to a fuller understanding of the nature of D as, perhaps, the most unusual manuscript that stands among the large number of New Testament witnesses.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

- Bamberger, Bernard J. Proselytism in the Talmudic Period. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1939.
- Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Blass, Friedrich. Philology of the Gospels. London: Macmillan and Company, 1898.
- Brown, Schuyler. Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting. Trans. by R. H. Fuller. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1956.
- Clark, K. W. "The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism upon New Testament Studies." The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: University Press, 1956.
- Cohen, A. Everyman's Talmud. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1949.
- Colwell, Ernest C. Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Vol. IX of New Testament Tools and Studies. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger. 9 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969.
- Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. Trans. by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960.
- Dodd, C. H. Parables of the Kingdom. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts. Cambridge: University Press, 1966.

- Harnack, Adolf. The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Trans. by J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams and Norgate, 1908.
- Hatch, William Henry Paine. The Principal Manuscripts of the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- _____. The 'Western' Text of the Gospels. Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1937.
- Heaton, E. W. The Hebrew Kingdoms. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Jeremias, Joachim. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- _____. Unknown Sayings of Jesus. 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- _____. Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts. Revised by A. W. Adams. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958.
- _____. The Text of the Greek Bible. London: Gerald Duckworth & Company, 1958.
- _____. "The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts." Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. XXIV. London: Humphery Milford Amen House, 1938.
- Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes. A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts. Utrecht: Kemink, 1949.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. Introduction to the New Testament. Trans. by A. J. Mattill, Jr. 14th ed. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Lake, Kirsopp. Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity. London: Macmillan and Company, 1920.

- _____. The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament. Oxford: University Press, 1904.
- Metzger, Bruce M. The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Montefiore, C. G., and Loewe, H. A Rabbinic Anthology. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1963.
- Reicke, Bo. The Gospel of Luke. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. London: Macmillan and Company, 1961.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation. Edited by Owen E. Evans. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.
- Torrey, Charles Cutler. Documents of the Primitive Church. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1941.
- Vogels, Heinrich Joseph. Die Harmonistik im Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910.
- Williams, C. S. C. Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951.
- Wright, Leon E. Alterations of the Words of Jesus. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

B. Commentaries

- Arndt, William F. Bible Commentary: The Gospel According to St. Luke. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956.
- Briggs, Charles Augustus and Emilie Grace. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms. Vol. I, Part 1 of The International Critical Commentary. Edited by Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer. 44 vols.

Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896-1937.

- Bruce, Alexander Balmain. Synoptic Gospels. Vol. I of Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967.
- Caird, George Bradford. The Gospel of St. Luke. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan and Company, 1960.
- Easton, Burton Scott. The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.
- Farrar, F. W. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Cambridge: University Press, 1891.
- Geldenhuis, Norval. Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- Gilmour, S. MacLean. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Vol. VIII of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 12 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952-1957.
- Godet, F. A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. Trans. by E. W. Shalders. New York: I. K. Funk and Company, 1881.
- Leupold, H. C. Exposition of the Psalms. Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1959.
- Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. 3rd ed. London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Montefiore, C. G. The Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan and Company, 1927.
- Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. Vol. XXVII of The International Critical Commentary. Edited by Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer. 44 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896-1937.

Tinsley, E. J. The Gospel According to Luke. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.

van Oosterzee, J. J. The Gospel According to Luke. Vol. XVII of Lange's Commentary. Trans. from 2nd German edition by Philip Schaff and Charles C. Starbuck. 25 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1869-1885.

C. Reference Works

Aland, Kurt. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Biblelanstalt, 1968.

_____, Black, Matthew, Metzger, Bruce M., and Wikgren, Allen, eds. The Greek New Testament. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1966.

Arndt, William F. and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Blass, F. and DeBrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Trans. from 9th-10th eds., rev. by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bover, Joseph M. Novi Testamenti Biblia Graeca et Latina. 3rd ed. Madrid: Matriti, 1953.

Dana, H. E. and Mantey, Julius R. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1966.

Hennecke, Edgar, Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, and Wilson, R. McL., eds. "The Protevangelium of James." The New Testament Apocrypha. Trans. by A. J. B. Higgins. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

James, Montague Rhodes. The Apocryphal New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Kittel, Gerhard, ed. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 9 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964-1973.

Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon Founded upon the Seventh

Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Merk, Augustinus. Novum Testamentum. 7th ed. Romae: Sumpribus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1951.

Metzger, Bruce M. Index to Periodical Literature on Christ and the Gospels. Vol. VI of New Testament Tools and Studies. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger. 9 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1962.

Moulton, J. H. Prolegomena to the Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. I. Edinbrugh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.

and Milligan, George. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952.

Nestle, Erwin and Aland, Kurt. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1967.

Reiling, J. and Swellengrebel, J. L. A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.

Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.

Scrivener, F. H. A. Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, Being an Exact Copy, in Ordinary Type.... Cambridge: 1864.

Singer, Isidore, ed. "Messiah." The Jewish Encyclopedia. Vol. VIII. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1904.

Thayer, Joseph Henry. Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Associated Publishers and Authors, Inc., N.D.

Tischendorf, Constantinus. Novum Testamentum Graece. 2 vols. 8th ed. Lipsiae: Giesecke et Devrient, 1869.

. ed. Novum Testamentum, post Angeli Maii aliorumque imperfectos labores ex ipso codice. Lipsiae: Giesecke et Devrient, 1868.

Yoder, James D. Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae. Vol. II of New Testament Tools and Studies. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger. 9 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961.

D. Periodicals

- Bacon, Benjamin. "The Ascension in Luke and Acts." Expositor, VII, 7 (1909), 254-61.
- Benoit, Pierre. "Le Récit de le Cene Hans Lc. XXII, 15-20: Étude de critique textuelle et littéraire." Revue Biblique, XLVIII (1939), 357-93.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. "The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers." Journal of Biblical Literature, XC (1971), 314-28.
- Betz, Otto. "Kerygma of Luke." Interpretation, XXII (1968), 131-46.
- Branscomb, B. Harvie. "Jesus and the Pharisees." Union Seminary Magazine, XLIV (1932/33), 24-40.
- Bulletin of the Bezan Club, I-XII (1925-37).
- Cerfaux, L. "Variantes de Lc. IX,62." Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, XII (1935), 326-28.
- Chapman, John. "The Order of the Gospels in the Parent of Codex Bezae." Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, VI (1905), 339-46.
- _____. "The Original Contents of Codex Bezae." Expositor, VI, 12 (1905), 46-57.
- Clark, K. W. "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variations in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (1966), 1-16.
- Enslin, Morton S. "The Ascension Story." Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVII (1928), 60-73.
- Glasson, T. F. "Did Matthew and Luke Use a 'Western' Text of Mark?" Expository Times, LV (1943/44), 180-84.

- Glaue, Paul. "Einige Stellen, die die Bedeutung des Codex D charakterisieren." Novum Testamentum, II (1958), 310-15.
- Graefe, F. "Der Codex Bezae und das Lukas Evangelium." Theologische Studien und Kritiken, LXXI (1898), 116-40.
- Harner, Philip B. "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1." Journal of Biblical Literature, XCII (1973), 75-87.
- Harris, J. Rendel. "New Points of View in Textual Criticism." Expositor, VII, 7 (1914), 318-20.
- Hatch, W. H. P. "The Text of Luke II,22." Harvard Theological Review, XIV (1921), 377-81.
- Hodges, Zane C. "The Women and the Empty Tomb." Bibliotheca Sacra, CXXIII (1966), 301-9.
- Hutton, W. R. "The Kingdom of God Has Come." Expository Times, LXV (1952/53), 89.
- Käser, Walter. "Exegitische Erwägungen zur Seligpreisung des Sabbatarbeiters Lk. 6,5D." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LXV (1968), 415-50.
- Kee, Alistair. "Old Coat and New Wine." Novum Testamentum, XII (1970), 13-21.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story and Luke xxiii.47." Journal of Theological Studies, XLIII (1942), 34-6.
- _____. "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts." Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (1943), 24-36.
- Ladd, George. "The Kingdom of God--Reign or Realm?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1962), 230-38.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "The Lucan Portrait of Christ." New Testament Studies, II (1955/56), 160-75.
- Leaney, R. "The Lucan Text of the Lord's Prayer," Novum Testamentum, IX (1965), 16-25.

- Lendsey, F. Duane. "Lucan Theology in Contemporary Perspective." Bibliotheca Sacra, CXXV (1970), 346-51.
- Mees, Michael. "Jesusworte in Lukas 12 und ihre Komposition nach Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis." Vetera Christianorum, VII (1970), 285-303.
- _____. "Lukas 1-9 in der Textgestalt des Codex Bezae: Literarische Formen in Dienste der Schrift." Vetera Christianorum, V (1968), 89-110.
- _____. "Sinn und Bedeutung literarischer Formen für die Textgestalt des Codex Bezae in Lukas 10-11." Vetera Christianorum, VII (1970), 59-82.
- Moir, Ian A. Journal of Theological Studies, XIX (1968), 277-78.
- Moxon, Cavendish. "'το σημεῖον Ἰωάνη'," Expository Times, XXII (1910/11), 566-67.
- Oliver, H. H. "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts." New Testament Studies, X (1963/64), 202-26.
- Scott, R. B. Y. "Sign of Jonah." Interpretation, IX (1965), 16-25.
- Sedgwick, W. B. "St. Luke and the δ-Text." Expository Times, LIX (1947/48), 222-23.
- Shedd, Andrew. "The Interpretation of Luke XVII.21." Expository Times, L (1938/39), 235-37.
- Snape, H. C. "The Composition of the Lukan Writings: A Re-assessment." Harvard Theological Review, LIII (1960), 27-46.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. "'Western non-Interpolations'." Journal of Biblical Literature, XCI (1972), 369-79.
- Tatum, Barnes. "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts." New Testament Studies, XIII (1966/67), 184-95.
- Thibaut, R. "Le Signe de Jonas." Nouvelle Revue Theologique, IX (1933), 532-36.

- van Stempvoort, P. A. "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts." New Testament Studies, V (1958/59), 30-90.
- Walker, Wm. O., Jr. "The Origin of the Son of Man Concept as Applied to Jesus." Journal of Biblical Literature, XCI (1972), 482-90.
- Wier, T. H. "The Stone Rolled Away." Expository Times, XXIV (1912/13), 284.
- Williams, C. S. C. "Did Matthew and Luke use a 'Western' Text of Mark?" Expository Times, LVI (1944/45), 41-45.
- _____. "St. Luke and the 'Western' Text." Expository Times, LX (1948/49), 24-6.
- Williams, G. O. "The Baptism in Luke's Gospel." Journal of Theological Studies, XLIII (1944), 31-8.