

1

Introduction

The Problem

LUKE'S PASSION NARRATIVE IS distinct from those of Matthew, Mark, and John in several ways: it includes content that the others do not, it strongly emphasizes Jesus' innocence, and it has parallels with the trials and deaths of main characters in Acts. These differences, along with other facets of Luke's passion narrative, have resulted in Luke's passion narrative being one of the most studied sections of Luke's Gospel.

Despite this attention, at least three issues remain unsettled with regard to the interpretation of Luke's passion narrative. First, scholars debate what sources Luke used in composing his narrative: did he use only Mark, additional written sources, oral traditions, or some combination of these three? Second, scholars debate the best translation of *δίκαιος* in the centurion's confession in 23:47, along with how this relates to Luke's larger characterization of Jesus. Third, scholars debate the function of the parallels between Jesus in Luke and Paul and Stephen in Acts. How do these parallels contribute to Luke's larger purpose? I begin this study by exploring how scholars have approached these interpretive issues along with their various solutions. Since these approaches have left the conversation in somewhat of a stalemate, I then propose to approach these interpretive issues in Luke's passion narrative anew with the aid of rhetorical criticism.

Interpretive Issues in Luke's Passion Narrative: The State of the Question

The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative

The presence of several unique features in Luke's passion narrative and an order somewhat distinct from Mark's have led to a mass of speculation on the sources behind Luke's passion narrative. While the question over the sources of Luke's passion narrative cannot be divorced from the larger question of the sources of Luke's Gospel,¹ Luke's account of Jesus' death has its own set of problems that has led the source-critical discussion in its own direction. For example, while much of the discussion of the sources of Luke's Gospel outside of the passion narrative revolves around the potential use of Q, Q is rarely a part of the conversation about Luke's passion narrative because there are few minor agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in their passion narratives.² Without Q as a possible source for the passion narrative, scholars are forced to explain the origin of non-Markan material in other ways. The observation that Luke does not follow Mark's order as closely in his passion narrative as he does elsewhere in his Gospel³ also sends scholars in search of a way to explain Luke's order.

1. For a summary of the source issues of Luke's Gospel, see Tyson, "Source Criticism," 24–39. Tyson describes the four primary solutions to the Synoptic Problem as they relate to Luke (the Two-Document Hypothesis, the Farrer Hypothesis, the Griesbach Hypothesis, and the Lindsey Hypothesis). I treat my own view of the Synoptic Problem in the methodology section of this chapter.

2. Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 85–87. Kloppenborg rejects the notion that Q had a passion narrative. Though some scholars have proposed that Luke derived some of his special passion material from Q, Kloppenborg points out that "such proposals do not, however, succeed in proving the existence of a passion narrative since in all cases they concern *sayings* which do not even deal directly with the passion" (85, emphasis original). For proponents of Luke's use of Q in his passion narrative, see Hirsch, *Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums*; Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*; Burkitt, *Gospel History and Its Transmission*.

On the other hand, the few agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in the passion narrative put the nail in the coffin of Q for Farrer Hypothesis proponent Michael Goulder: "As long as we had a firm definition—Q had no Passion story—it looks as if we had a hypothesis excluding certain possibilities: Luke did not know Matthew, so there could be no significant [minor agreements] in the Passion story." Since there are agreements in the passion stories between Luke and Matthew, Luke must have used Matthew, he posits. See Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 10.

3. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 97–99; Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 50; Soards, *Passion according to Luke*, 13; Schweizer, *Good News*, 354.

Harrington's history of research on the Markan material in Luke 22:54—23:25—a grand total of 1,003 pages that interacts with over 1,500 authors—demonstrates that the sources behind Luke's passion narrative have not lacked scholarly attention.⁴ Nonetheless, despite the volumes and pages devoted to the topic, scholarship remains divided over what sources Luke did or did not use in constructing his passion narrative, in part because of differing approaches and assumptions.⁵

The source theories regarding Luke's passion narrative fall into two categories, broadly speaking: (1) those who argue that Luke's only written source⁶ was Mark, and (2) those who argue that Luke used a written source or sources other than Mark. When I speak of a "written source in addition to Mark" in this study, I am referring to a non-canonical written source, not to Matthew or John.⁷ We will explore each of these groups in turn.

Mark as Luke's Only Written Source

A prominent stream of scholarship posits that Luke did not use any written sources besides Mark when constructing his passion narrative.⁸ These scholars attribute the special Lukan material to either Luke's own creative hand or to his incorporation of irrecoverable oral traditions, but generally emphasize the former. Notable advocates of this theory include

4. Harrington, *Lukan Passion Narrative*. For a more manageable survey, see Bovon, "Lukan Story," 88–92.

5. In his influential monograph on Luke's passion narrative, Taylor describes four methods used in approaching the sources behind Luke's passion narrative: "(1) the numerical or statistical method, (2) the literary or stylistic study, (3) the form-critical approach, and (4) the use of historical criticism." Taylor, *Passion Narrative*, 31–37.

6. Here I follow Brown in distinguishing between a source and tradition. By a source I mean "a sequential (most likely written) account of the whole passion or a good portion of it," and by a tradition I mean "isolated items of information or brief episodes of various derivation, many of which would have circulated orally." Some scholars attempt to reconstruct sources, but rarely do they attempt such for traditions. See Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 66.

7. On Matthew and John as potential sources for Luke's passion narrative, see the methodology section below. Furthermore, because the literature on the topic is so extensive, I am focusing primarily on the most prominent scholars in the last fifty years. For a more comprehensive survey from 1891–1997, see Harrington, *Lukan Passion Narrative*.

8. For a survey of redaction critics who dispense with a special source from 1960 through 1997, see *ibid.*, 566–676.

Raymond Brown and Frank Matera.⁹ Brown allows for Luke's incorporation (whether consciously or not) of non-written traditions not utilized by Mark;¹⁰ Matera made room for non-written traditions in some of his earlier works, but his later works emphasize Luke's sole use of Mark.¹¹ Despite this distinction between the two scholars, the heart of their analyses (and those of others who hold this view) rests on Luke's creative editing of Mark's passion narrative toward his own theological interests.

Two primary observations lead scholars like Matera and Brown to conclude that Luke did not use a written source in addition to Mark: (1) themes and theological interests in Luke's passion narrative that are prominent elsewhere in Luke and Acts, and (2) Luke's stylistic and compositional tendencies.¹² I will address both of these in turn.

First, scholars who dispense with a written source behind Luke's passion narrative notice the theological continuity between Luke's passion narrative and the rest of his work, which suggests to them that Luke

9. So also Soards, *Passion according to Luke*, who only treats chapter 22, but argues that Luke did not have a continuous written passion source besides Mark. Cf. Unter-gassmair, *Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu*, 1.

10. Brown says, "On a general level, to imagine that Matt and Luke worked only with writings (Mark, Q, perhaps the special material), much in the manner a modern scholar works with copies of Mark, Matt, and Luke, staggers the imagination. Can one seriously believe that Matt and Luke knew nothing of the passion before they read Mark, and what they already knew was not blended (perhaps unconsciously) with what they read?" See Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 45. He later comments that Luke combined oral traditions with Mark to produce his narrative, but did not use either Matthew or John. See *ibid.*, 92.

11. In his 1985 article on the sources of Luke's passion narrative, for example, Matera says, "I am arguing that Luke did not have another continuous [passion narrative] in addition to Mark. It is clear that at times he may have drawn from individual traditions not known to Mark. But when he does so, he integrates them into Mark's narrative." See Matera, "Death of Jesus," 472, n. 11. Cf. Matera, *Passion Narratives*, 155, 170. However, from 1989 onward, he became more adamant that Mark was Luke's only source. He says, "[i]n each instance these differences can be explained in terms of Luke's redactional activity and . . . there is no need to appeal to other traditions, or to another version of the passion narrative in addition to Mark's." See Matera, "Luke 22,66-71," 48. He makes a similar statement in "Luke 23,1-25," 550.

12. Also determinative for Brown are the different constructions hypothesized by those who posit an additional written source. Some attribute only the material that has no Markan parallel to the source (though not all of this material is relegated to a source). Others attribute Markan parallels to the source if the parallels appear in some sort of changed form. These different working methods result in vastly different constructions of Luke's supposed source, which diminishes their likelihood, Brown thinks. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 66-67.

is composing his own material rather than incorporating source material. Their assumption is that if one can make sense of a change from Mark's passion narrative to Luke's in light of Luke's wider narrative and theology, then it suggests that Luke was not drawing on a source other than Mark.¹³ For example, these scholars view the second criminal's positive response in Luke as "the culmination of the Lukan pattern of acceptance or rejection that has characterized the response of people to the earthly ministry of Jesus."¹⁴ Since it aligns so well with one of Luke's larger theological goals and could feasibly have its origin in Mark, these scholars see it as Luke's creative adaptation of Mark, possibly under the influence of oral tradition.¹⁵

Second, these scholars note stylistic and compositional tendencies (e.g., removing doublets) that suggest Luke's passion narrative could have come from his use of Mark alone. Brown notes, for instance, the contrast between the infancy narrative, which is a complete non-Markan block written in Semitized Greek, and Luke's passion narrative, which contains interwoven Markan material and has a style not particularly dissimilar to Mark.¹⁶ He even suggests, "[i]f one only had Luke's [passion narrative] without a copy of Mark, I doubt that one could successfully isolate two distinct sources behind it."¹⁷ Matera also points to the evidence of Marion Soards, who shows that in other instances where Luke differs significantly from Mark it is not necessary to posit another source.¹⁸ Soards reminds us, "That Luke often follows Mark closely should not create a maxim that he always must do so, as if Luke wrote in a rigidly uniform manner."¹⁹

13. Matera, "Death of Jesus," 484. See "Refutation 6" in chapter 4 for an example of Matera relating Luke's changes of Mark's centurion's words to his Christology.

14. Soards, *Passion according to Luke*, 111.

15. See "Refutation 4" in chapter 4 for a fuller discussion.

16. Both Brown and Matera, like the other schools surveyed in this study, acknowledge that Luke draws on Mark more freely in his passion narrative than he did in the rest of his Gospel. See Matera, *Passion Narratives*, 153; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 67.

17. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 265–66 (quotation from 266).

18. For example, the level of verbal agreement between Luke and Mark is lower in the transfiguration (Luke 9:28–37//Mark 9:2–8) than in the passion narrative. He points this out to expose "a fallacious assumption . . . that the Passion Narrative is qualitatively different from the rest of Luke's Gospel." See Soards, *Passion according to Luke*, 122.

19. Ibid., 123; Matera, *Passion Narratives*, 154.

In sum, those who posit that Luke had no written source(s) in addition to Mark for his passion narrative base their hypothesis primarily on the theological continuity between Luke's passion narrative and the rest of his Gospel and Acts and on Luke's stylistic and compositional tendencies. They work under the assumption that Luke was a creative and capable author, not just a cut-and-paste editor.

*A Non-Canonical Written Source in Addition to Mark*²⁰

The discussion of a source behind Luke's passion narrative is complex. The terminology for the source(s) varies widely, as does the extent and nature of the source.²¹ For some, Luke drew upon L—a source that he used for the rest of his Gospel (Bovon, Fitzmyer; possibly Schweizer).²²

20. A variation on the theory that Luke used Mark is that Luke used a different version or versions of Mark than that which survives in the canon. Fuchs, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas*, for example, argues that Luke used a revised edition of Mark. Cf. Trocmé, *Passion as Liturgy*, 27–37. More recently, Tolppanen, “Source Critical Reassessment,” has argued that Luke derived his triple tradition material not from canonical Mark but from either a single non-canonical Markan source/tradition or two non-canonical Markan sources/traditions. While his analysis is of Luke's whole Gospel, Luke's passion narrative is one of three key pieces of support for his thesis that “Luke did not use canonical Mark as his source” (295). Using statistical analysis in a vein similar to Taylor, he points out that (1) “the general verbatim agreement level between Luke and Mark notably diminishes in their Passion-Resurrection sections compared to their non-Passion sections. While verbatim agreement in the non-Passion section is 37.5 percent, it is only 22.8 percent in the Passion-Resurrection section”; (2) “The Lukan order of material differs from the Markan order four times more often in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection Narrative than in the Lukan non-Passion narrative”; and (3) “The number of non-Markan passages in the Lukan Passion-Resurrection section is much higher than in its non-Passion section in relation to the length of these sections” (297–98). He finds it inexplicable that Luke would “change his copy-editing technique so remarkably when he moved from his non-Passion section to his Passion-Resurrection section,” so he posits that Luke used a different source: either a single non-canonical Markan source/tradition or two non-canonical Markan sources/traditions, which “had the same origin [as canonical Mark] but different development histories, developing in partly different directions probably due to the interaction of orality and literacy” (iii). Though this theory varies from Taylor's significantly, I am not treating it separately because it works with similar assumptions (i.e., that Luke uses Mark the same way throughout his entire Gospel; that divergences suggest a different source) and some similar methods (i.e., statistical) as Taylor.

21. For a survey of what verses various scholars classify as “special Lukan material,” see Soards, *Passion according to Luke*, 15–16. He summarizes: “[L]ittle of Luke is not thought by someone to be special Lukan material” (16).

22. See Bovon, *Luke* 1, 6–8. For a more thorough discussion of his source theory as

Others think Luke drew upon Proto-Luke,²³ a work that resulted from Luke's combination of Q and L, which he later expanded when writing his Gospel (Jeremias, Taylor, Grundmann).²⁴ And still others do not comment on the source's connection with "special material" earlier in Luke (Green, Marshall).²⁵ Some think Luke inserted Markan material

it relates to the passion narrative, see Bovon, "The Lukan Story of the Passion," 92–102. In the latter he explains that Luke's special material ("L") fits within the gospel genre and was literarily superior to Mark. He proposes that L was to Luke what Mark was to Matthew (102). Both Schweizer and Fitzmyer are skeptical of describing L in too much detail. Fitzmyer says that L is "not necessarily written" (64). He later describes it as a "source" in a broad sense, either oral or written, but which is not to be put on a par with 'Mk' or 'Q'" (83). And later still he refers to L as "a designation for source(s) of information about the Jesus-story in the early Christian community Luke would have tapped in various ways" (85). Schweizer argues for a written source (351), but will not say with certainty whether that is L in the passion narrative (354). He only notes, "Purely oral tradition cannot explain these observations" (346). See Fitzmyer, *Gospel according to Luke*; Schweizer, *Good News according to Luke*.

23. Terminology for and the extent of what Taylor calls Proto-Luke varies among scholars. Taylor describes the nuances of the various scholars' theories in *Passion Narrative*, 3–11, 17–23.

24. Taylor builds on the monumental work of Streeter, who argued that Luke produced Proto-Luke when he combined Q and L (Luke's special source) around 60 CE. Luke then inserted Markan material into the framework of Proto-Luke to produce his Gospel a few decades later. See Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 199–222. For more on why Streeter thought Luke used the framework of Proto-Luke instead of Mark, see 208–12. Similarly, Taylor argues that "the substance of Lk. xxii–xxiv was put together independently of Mark, and that it existed as a document before the evangelist had seen Mark. At a later time he expanded the Passion narrative by inserting extracts from Mark." Taylor, *Passion Narrative*, 125. For a list of the Markan insertions, see *ibid.*, 119.

Jeremias' description of the source is much less detailed than Taylor's. From 22:14 onward, Luke's narrative "is no longer built upon a Markan basis, but comes from *Ur-lukas*." Grundmann thinks that Luke's special tradition (SLk) "may have been joined to Q," but he follows Grant in describing SLk as "nothing more than a little loose, but fairly homogeneous collection of material that Luke had collected from various locations." See Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 99; Grundmann, *Das Evangelium*, 17; Grant, *Growth of the Gospels*, 62.

25. E.g., Green, who describes it as "a second, unified narrative like Mark's" (104, emphasis original). It "has numerous points of contact with the Johannine passion narrative" and "was part of a developing narrative" (i.e., it was not a collection of isolated fragments) (103). Marshall comments that "the existence of a connected 'L' source . . . has not been confirmed by [his] investigations" (31), but that "there can be little doubt of [the presence of] non-Markan source material" (785). At times he refers to this as "a separate tradition" and at others "his special source" (847). See Green, *Death of Jesus*; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*.

into the framework of the source (Taylor, Jeremias),²⁶ while others think Luke alternated between large blocks of Mark and large blocks of the special source (Bovon).²⁷ We could spend chapters elucidating the details of these various theories, but of most concern here is not the details of the source (its name, its date, or even its extent), but rather how these scholars conclude that such a source existed and the assumptions lying behind that conclusion.

Often times studies arguing for the use of a special source are based on a numerical or statistical method with special emphasis on word counts.²⁸ Not all source-positing scholars agree on what should be attributed to Luke's hand and what should be attributed to Luke's non-Markan source, however.²⁹ For example, Taylor, relying on the distinctive word lists from Stanton and Rehkopf, argues that Luke composed 23:6–16 himself rather than relying on a source because these verses contain so many of Luke's own words and phrases.³⁰ Easton, on the other hand, thinks that Luke derived the pericope from L.³¹ John Donahue's observation of such attempts to divide the text by sources is apt here: "the suggested divisions of the text of the Passion Narrative . . . encourage a fragmentation of the text which rivals attempts early in this century to divide the Pentateuchal

26. Taylor, *Passion Narrative*, 125; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 99, n. 1.

27. Bovon, *Luke* 3, 241.

28. Taylor does not specifically intimate his criteria for locating source material, but Matson summarizes his approach well: "Taylor uses a number of criteria to distinguish between Lukan material and the various sources: statistical patterns of 'Markan' words, Lukan style, Lukan theology, and the order of events. No single criterion is decisive, but a combination of criteria can be strongly suggestive. In order to find that a verse was based on Mark instead of an alternate source, *the* key factor is usually the existence of a mathematical preponderance of Markan words in the verse; usually this would require more than 50 percent of the verse being very close to Mark's language." Matson, *In Dialogue*, 243.

In addition to Taylor's *Passion Narrative of St. Luke*, see also his "The Value of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis," 476–77; *Behind the Third Gospel*; "Rehkopf's List of Words and Phrases Illustrative of Pre-Lukan Speech Usage," 59–62. Cf. Trocmé, *Passion as Liturgy*, 27–37. While word counts do play into his analysis, see Green's critique of statistical analyses as a means of determining sources: Green, *Death of Jesus*, 18.

29. For a summary of different scholars' positions on what parts of Mark Luke used for his passion narrative, see the chart in Neiryneck, "La matière marcienne dans l'évangile de Luc," 196–97.

30. Taylor, *Passion Narrative*, 87. Cf. Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*; Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*.

31. Easton, *Gospel according to St. Luke*, 343. For more scholars' assessments of whether this pericope is Lukan or pre-Lukan, see "Refutation 2" in chapter 3.

narrative into a multitude of J's, E's, and P's."³² Also determinative for some who posit a special source behind Luke's passion narrative are the connections between Luke's and John's passion narratives. Instead of positing literary dependence between the two books, these scholars argue instead that the writers relied on a common narrative.³³

While not always the case, a key assumption unites many scholars who posit a special source behind Luke's passion narrative: content and order that differ from Mark are best explained by Luke's reliance on another source, rather than on his own traditions, creativity, or theological aims.³⁴ Thus, those who posit a special source for Luke's passion narrative often approach the text asking if words or phrases in Luke can be attributed to Luke's editorializing or to Mark.³⁵ If they cannot, they attribute them to another source. Verbatim agreement is key to determining if another source was involved. This method (and subsequent results) has been critiqued for its subjectivity, despite its adherents' confidence in its

32. Donahue, "Introduction," 15; cited in Green, *Death of Jesus*, 12–13.

33. See, e.g., Taylor, *Passion Narrative*, 37; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 853; Schweizer, *Good News*, 355; Green, *Death of Jesus*, 103; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 7. See below for more on the relationship between Luke and John.

34. For example, when analyzing the differences between the centurion's confession in Mark and Luke (discussed more fully under "Refutation 6" in chapter 4), Taylor concludes that Luke must have been relying on a separate source since "it is very improbable that δίκαιος in the centurion's confession (v. 47) is a modification of υἱός θεοῦ in Mk. xv. 39." See Taylor, *Passion Narrative*, 96. Cf. a similar mentality by Jeremias (discussed more fully in "The Big Picture" in chapter 3) and Schramm on the differing orders between Luke and Mark. See Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 99; Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, 50–51. For a critique of this assumption, see Soards, *Passion according to Luke*, 18.

35. One of the more systematic explanations of how to determine if something is pre-Lukan or Lukan is in Rehkopf, *Die Lukanische Sonderquelle*, 87. Rehkopf dubs something pre-Lukan if "1) in Lk selten oder nie von Lukas selbständig gebraucht wird. 2) im MkSt sonst weitgehend oder immer von Lukas ersetzt wird. 3) einem Synonym oder einer ähnlichen lukanischen Vorzugswendung gegenübersteht. 4) im Nicht-MkSt ein relativ häufiges Vorkommen aufweist. 5) in der Apostelgeschichte in Reden oder Wir-Stücken selten oder nie zu finden ist." Cf. Jeremias' six-point list in Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 8.

objectivity.³⁶ Often times this position results in a picture of Luke as more of an editor than an author.³⁷

The Translation of *δίκαιος*

A second issue that has left scholars at an impasse in the interpretation of Luke's passion narrative is the translation of *δίκαιος* in the centurion's proclamation in 23:47. Though the proclamation only differs from Mark by a few words, the substitution of *δίκαιος* for Mark's *υἱὸς θεοῦ* is significant (Mark 15:39). Scholars fall into three camps on this issue: those advocating for a translation of "righteous" or "just"; (2) those advocating for a translation of "innocent"; and (3) those advocating for a dual or overlapping meaning between the terms.³⁸ The first translation emphasizes the messianic implications of *δίκαιος* by drawing connections with the Suffering Servant. The second impacts whether Jesus' death should be viewed as a martyr's death and whether Luke's larger work should be understood as having a political apologetic motive. The last attempts to be inclusive of both of these interpretations or sees Luke constructing different meanings for different readers.

36. Word counts and statistical analyses can give the impression of objectivity, but the differing results amongst scholars (often the result of different words lists, etc.) suggests that this method is far from objective. Nonetheless, Taylor's comments reveal his optimism about the objectivity of statistical analysis: "It is not claimed that numerical considerations taken by themselves are enough to prove that a special Lukan source is drawn upon in Lk. xxii. 14—xxiv. 11, but it is suggested that the statistics point definitely in this direction, and that the hypothesis becomes almost a certainty if it is further supported by literary and stylistic criticism." Taylor, *Passion Narrative*, 33–34. Easton makes a similar comment about the value of linguistic analysis: "A considerable subjective element is bound to exist in any list [of Luke's vocabulary] of this sort; for instance, it is difficult to determine whether some passages in Lk are really based on Mk or not (particularly in chs 22–23). But the bulk of the evidence is unambiguous, and in work of this sort only bulk counts." See Easton, *Gospel according to St. Luke*, xxv (emphasis added). For a critique of this approach, see Matson, *In Dialogue*, 246–47.

37. Easton's comments are suggestive: "The analysis made thus far of Lk's sources is a guide to his methods as an editor; it is rather idle to speak of a 'plan' of the Gospel, for its construction was determined very largely by the order of the sources." Easton, *Gospel according to St. Luke*, xxx.

38. For an evaluation of the merits of these various stances, see Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1160–67. See chapter 5 for my evaluation of these stances in light of my rhetorical analysis.

Notable scholars in the first camp include Schweizer, Karris, Nolland, and Doble.³⁹ These scholars intimate at least three reasons for translating *δίκαιος* as “righteous” or “just” in 23:47.⁴⁰ First, *δίκαιος* and its cognates elsewhere in Luke and Acts are never restricted to the meaning of “innocent.” The two nearest in context—*δικαίως* in 23:41 and *δίκαιος* in 23:50—mean “justly” and “righteous.” Second, Luke’s description of the centurion’s words as praise or glorification (*δοξάζω*) suggests a “theological thrust”⁴¹ to the verse, which a juridical interpretation like “innocent” does not capture. Third, the recitation of Ps 31—a psalm of the righteous suffering one—aligns Jesus with the righteous one and Son of God,⁴² which Luke develops in Acts through people’s proclamation of Jesus as *ὁ δίκαιος*, a title usually translated as “the righteous one” (Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14).

Notable scholars in the second camp include Kilpatrick, Talbert, Schmidt, and Cassidy.⁴³ These scholars typically intimate three reasons for translating *δίκαιος* as “innocent.” First, this translation accords with the larger theme of Jesus’ innocence in Luke’s passion narrative. The explicit testimonies of Pilate, Herod, and the second criminal regarding Jesus’ guiltlessness argue for a similar interpretation in 23:47. Second, a proclamation of “righteous” (in the Ps 31 sense advocated by those in the first camp) would not be fitting speech for a Roman centurion. Kilpatrick muses, “If, however, it is argued that *δίκαιος* here has the suggestion of ‘the righteous one’, apart from the question whether the adjective alone can imply so much, it is equally difficult to understand why such an ambiguous expression, obscure to any but a religious Jew, should be put into the mouth of a heathen centurion.”⁴⁴ Finally, this interpretation aligns with

39. Schweizer, *Good News according to Luke*, 362; Karris, “Luke 23:47,” 65–74; Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1155, 1159; Doble, *Paradox of Salvation*, 25–183.

40. I follow Karris most closely here, but the other scholars provide similar reasons, though not necessarily all of them. Karris states explicitly, “I will argue that *dikaïos* does not mean innocent, but means righteous” (65). This stands in contrast to his position from the prior year where he cautioned against “get[ting] trapped in an either-or-dead-end discussion” and instead said that *dikaïos* “means both ‘innocent’ and ‘righteous’ in 23:47.” For this earlier position see Karris, *Luke*, 110.

41. Karris, “Luke 23:47,” 66.

42. Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*

43. Kilpatrick, “Theme of the Lucan Passion Story,” 34–36; Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics, and Society*, 72; Talbert, “Martyrdom in Luke-Acts,” 99; Schmidt, “Luke’s ‘Innocent’ Jesus,” 117–18.

44. Kilpatrick, “Theme of the Lucan Passion Story,” 34. While Kilpatrick’s article is

what they see as Luke's purpose in Luke (and Acts)—to show that Jesus (and his followers) were not politically subversive.⁴⁵ If even the centurion who oversaw Jesus' death deems this leader of the movement innocent, Christianity must not be a threat to Rome. Furthermore, since Luke and Acts have parallel purposes to some extent, the emphasis on Paul's innocence in Acts further mitigates for a translation as "innocent" in Luke.

Often, though not always, the interpretation of *δίκαιος* as innocent is related to the view that Luke casts Jesus' death in line with the ancient noble death and martyr traditions.⁴⁶ The thesis that Luke presents Jesus as a martyr goes back to Dibelius, but has been further developed by scholars like Ruppert, Talbert, Carroll, Kloppenborg, Collins, Sterling, and Scaer, who find parallels between Luke's account of Jesus death and the deaths of Socrates and the Jewish martyrs.⁴⁷ Because so many other elements of Luke's passion narrative align with the noble death/martyrdom tradition (e.g., the depiction of the Last Supper as Jesus' last words to his disciples, the presence of friends throughout the narrative, the manner of Jesus' death—noble, without fear, regret, grief, or crying⁴⁸), these scholars often interpret the centurion's confession as "innocent" to accord with the emphasis on innocence that noble death/martyrdom accounts often included.⁴⁹

Finally, the third camp, probably the largest of the three, seeks to avoid the extremes of the other two, which exclude one interpretation in favor of the other. Advocates include Büchele, Beck, Fitzmyer, Matera, Green, Brown, Bock, Marguerat, Neagoe, and Easter.⁵⁰ Some emphasize

dated, many recent commentators rely on Kilpatrick's article as a basis. On Kilpatrick and the emergence of the "innocence" translation, see Doble, *Paradox of Salvation*, 70–75.

45. See below for more on the political apologetic motif in Luke and Acts.

46. The opposite of this is true, as well. Karris, for instance, a strong advocate of the "righteous" translation, denies that Luke presents Jesus' death as a martyrdom. See Karris, "Luke 23:47," 68–70. Other opponents to the martyrdom view include Unter-gassmair, *Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu*, 162–63; Matera, *Passion Narratives*, 68–70.

47. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, 201; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 212–25; Talbert, "Martyrdom in Luke-Acts"; Carroll, "Luke's Crucifixion Scene," 118–19; Kloppenborg, "Exitus Clari Viri," 106–20; Collins, "From Noble Death," 481–503; Sterling, "Mors Philosophi," 383–402; Scaer, *Lukan Passion*.

48. For more details on the connections between Jesus' death and the noble death/martyrdom traditions, see especially Kloppenborg, "Exitus Clari Viri," 108; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 212–25.

49. On innocence as a theme in the noble death/martyrdom traditions, see Sterling, "Mors Philosophi," 398–99; Kloppenborg, "Exitus Clari Viri," 113.

50. Büchele, *Der Tod Jesu*, 54, n. 233; Beck, "Imitatio Christi," 42–43; Fitzmyer,

one translation without denying a secondary place for the other. Easter, for example, argues that the primary connotation is christological and thus ought to be translated as “righteous,” but he acknowledges that this notion does carry the connotation of innocence.⁵¹ Others argue that Luke intended δίκαιος to carry a double meaning. For example, Marguerat thinks that δίκαιος would have connoted innocence for non-Jewish readers and righteousness for Jewish readers, while Fitzmyer’s view of the stages of composition of Luke’s Gospel leads him to conclude that δίκαιος had one meaning (“innocent”) on the lips of the historical centurion (i.e., during “stage 1” of the composition of the Gospel) and another meaning (“righteous”) for the readers of Luke’s Gospel (i.e., “stage 3”).⁵² These both-and approaches stem from a recognition that “just,” “righteous,” and “innocent” are related ideas and allow room for Luke to have intended a double meaning of sorts, even if emphasizing one over the other.

Luke’s Passion Narrative, Parallels, and the Purpose of Luke-Acts

The third interpretive issue under consideration here is the function of the parallels between Jesus in Luke and Stephen and Paul in Acts and how these parallels relate to Luke’s larger purpose. Attempts to explain the function of the parallels can be placed into three sometimes overlapping categories: apologetic motivation, pastoral motivation, and theological motivation. I will summarize each of these motivations then explore them in further detail below.

The apologetic motivation—which takes various forms—is probably the most common proposal. One variation of this proposal is the political apologetic, said to prove that Christianity was not threatening to the Roman Empire (Cadbury, Conzelmann, Kloppenborg, Heusler). Another variation suggests the apology is on behalf of Rome—an attempt to show Christians or potential Christians that Rome was not a threat to them (Walaskay). Still another variation is the apology for Jesus or, more commonly, Paul (Mattill). The sufferings of these protagonists needed defense,

Gospel according to Luke, 1515; Matera, “Death of Jesus,” 479; Green, *Death of Jesus*, 99; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1163; Bock, *Luke*, 377; Marguerat, *First Christian Historian*, 69–70; Neagoe, *Trial of the Gospel*, 102–3; Easter, “Certainly This Man Was Righteous,” 35–51.

51. Easter, “Certainly This Man Was Righteous.”

52. See Marguerat, *First Christian Historian*, 69–70; Fitzmyer, *Gospel according to Luke*, 1520.

so Luke aligned their stories to present Jesus' death as a noble one and Paul's sufferings as following those of Jesus, the model. The pastoral motivation also takes differing forms, ranging from the concern to set up Jesus and the parallel characters in Acts as a model for Luke's readers (Mattill, Carroll, Neyrey, Grundmann) to the concern to show continuity between Jesus and the church (Radl and Talbert). Finally, a theological motivation for the parallels sees a requirement for Peter, Stephen, and Paul to suffer like prophets in the same way that Jesus did (Moessner). I will explore each of these proposals in more depth, highlighting when possible the proposals that focus on Luke's passion narrative and its parallels.

The political apologetic understanding was popular among both English and German interpreters in the twentieth century.⁵³ Cadbury views Luke's two works as "Luke's defense of Christianity from charges brought against it as breaking Roman law."⁵⁴ The stories of Jesus and Paul needed explanation if they did not want to appear suspect, so Luke constructed the hearings of Jesus and Paul in a similar fashion, blaming the Jewish leaders and exonerating the Romans. Conzelmann argues similarly, "It cannot be disputed that Luke's apologetic aims are political."⁵⁵ These apologetic aims, he explains, are most evident in Jesus' passion and in Paul's missionary journeys. In Luke's passion narrative, "the political supremacy of Rome is the sole point at issue. The whole account presented in Acts confirms this finding."⁵⁶ Luke aims to show that being a Christian is no threat to Roman law,⁵⁷ and Jesus' passion and Paul's trials demonstrate that reality, particularly through their multiple declarations of innocence.

Many scholars today still espouse this view. Kloppenborg, for instance, affirms that Luke's presentation of Jesus attempted to remove suspicion that Christianity was politically subversive.⁵⁸ Heusler, too, sees

53. For a brief history of research prior to Cadbury on the function of this presentation of Jesus and Paul, see Moessner, "The Christ Must Suffer," 221; Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 53. Walaskay traces this proposal as far back as Heumann in 1721. See Walaskay, "And So We Came to Rome", ix.

54. Cadbury, *Making of Luke-Acts*, 308.

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

56. *Ibid.*, 139.

57. Haenchen comes to the same conclusion on Luke's purpose but, because he writes on Acts, focuses primarily on Paul. See Haenchen, *Acts of the Apostles*, 102.

58. Kloppenborg, "Exitus Clari Viri," 107, n. 9. He does not restrict the purpose of Luke's characterization of Jesus to this interest, however. He also argues that Luke depicts Jesus' death in the line of other illustrious persons whom his audience would recognize.

the parallel depictions of Jesus and Paul as an attempt to convince Rome that Jesus, Paul, and Christianity did not threaten the state. Toward this end, Rome's governors repeatedly affirm the innocence of the characters in both Luke and Acts. She even describes this apologetic purpose as "widely agreed upon" amongst NT exegetes.⁵⁹ Rowe also recently assessed, "Without question, the dominant trend in NT scholarship has been to read Acts as a document that argues for the political possibility of harmonious coeval existence between Rome and the early Christian movement."⁶⁰

Though this view holds the day, it has not gone without critique and counter proposals. Gaston, for instance, also sees the parallels as an attempt to defend the church, but instead of the government being the address of the apology, Gaston argues that it is the synagogue. The picture of Roman injustice, the sharp contrast between Pilate's declarations and the Jews' demands, and the setting of the charges against Paul in the context of a debate with the synagogue all point to "an agonizing relationship of [Luke's] community with an outside group"—the synagogue.⁶¹ Another critique comes from Walaskay, who argues the exact opposite of the dominant thesis. Instead of the parallels demonstrating that Christianity was not threatening Rome, Walaskay argues that the parallels show that Rome was not threatening to Christianity—Luke writes "an *apologia pro imperio* to his church."⁶² That Roman leaders found Jesus and Paul innocent multiple times shows the government acting congenially to Christians.

Another variation is that of Mattill, who still sees the parallels serving an apologetic purpose but instead of the apology being for Christianity or for Rome he sees it being "an irresistible apology for Paul."⁶³

59. Heusler, *Kapitalprozesse im lukanischen Doppelwerk*, 259–60 (translation mine).

60. Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 53. Recent surveys documenting this trend include Horn, "Die Haltung des Lukas zum römischen Staat"; Neagoe, *Trial of the Gospel*, 9–12; Walton, "State They Were In," 1–41.

61. Gaston, "Anti-Judaism," 151–52.

62. Walaskay, "And So We Came to Rome", 64 (emphasis original). For other critiques of the thesis that Luke was defending the church to the Romans (though these are not related to the parallels between Luke and Acts), see Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics, and Society*, 128–30; Barrett, *Luke the Historian*, 63; Maddox, *Purpose of Luke-Acts*, 20–21, 90–97.

63. Mattill, "Jesus-Paul Parallels," 37. Mattill does not limit his study of the parallels to the passion/trial narratives, but he does devote significant attention to this portion of the stories.

Paul's sufferings needed explanation, so Luke aligned them with Jesus. Luke 6:40 ("A disciple is not above the teacher, but everyone who is fully trained will be like his teacher"⁶⁴) points to this notion,⁶⁵ especially since, in Luke, Jesus says this to a broad circle of disciples (6:20), which in later interpretation could include Paul.⁶⁶ Mattill also appeals to 1 Cor 11:1 ("Be imitators of me, just as I am of Christ") as confirmation of his exegesis of Luke 6:40: Paul does not call the Corinthians "to imitate Christ directly but rather the concrete copy which they have in Paul."⁶⁷ Ultimately, then, the purpose of the Jesus-Paul parallels is to show "how Paul is perfected by his experiences, especially suffering, to be like his Model and Master, and thus himself be a model for his churches."⁶⁸

We now move away from the apologetic motive to an interpretation similar to that of Mattill's (i.e., with emphasis on Jesus as model) but without the apologetic emphasis. This interpretation—which understands Jesus as the model for Luke's readers—also has a strong scholarly backing. Carroll understands Jesus as the "model martyr," followed in Acts by Stephen and Paul (though not completely in the case of the latter, since Luke does not narrate Paul's death in Acts).⁶⁹ With the potential of persecution and martyrdom for Luke's community (Luke 21:12–19), "Christians will find in Jesus' death (imitated by Stephen) a model for their own."⁷⁰ To the Luke 21 reference that Carroll highlights⁷¹ Neyrey also adds Luke 12:8–12, another of Jesus' predictions of the trials and persecution that his followers will face. But these passages are more than mere prophecies fulfilled in Acts, Neyrey explains: with the parallels that Luke constructs between Jesus and characters in Acts, "Jesus himself is the archetype and model of the Church's experience. . . . He is the prime

64. All translations of the Bible are my own.

65. Mattill, "Jesus-Paul Parallels," 40–41. He thinks this verse anticipates the sufferings not just of Paul, but also of Stephen, James, and Peter.

66. Ibid., 43. Cp. Matthew's Jesus who speaks a similar saying to the Twelve (10:5, 24).

67. Ibid., 44–45. He also points to similar statements in 1 Thess 1:3–8; 2 Thess 3:6–9; Phil 3:17; 1 Cor 4:16; 11:1; Gal 4:12.

68. Ibid., 46.

69. Carroll, "Luke's Crucifixion Scene," 118–20.

70. Ibid., 119–20.

71. Neyrey details the ways Luke redacts Mark 13:7–9 (Luke 21:12–15) to accommodate his own perspective, which paves the way for the parallels between Luke and Acts. See Neyrey, *Passion according to Luke*, 85–88.

witness and his moral example is intended to be followed.”⁷² Grundmann, too, explains the parallelism in terms of the relationship between Jesus and the church—Jesus’ time has “beispielhafte Bedeutung” for the time of the church, because the church’s life is determined by Jesus’ example. The mission of the church includes the whole person, and thus may include death, as Jesus, Stephen, James, and Paul exemplified.⁷³

Two of the most detailed studies on the parallels across Luke and Acts both appeared in 1975: Walter Radl’s *Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk: Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven im Lukas-evangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte* and Charles Talbert’s, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Both of these works intimate extensive parallels between Luke and Acts.⁷⁴ Though their works are different in many ways, both Radl and Talbert interpret the parallels as pointing to continuity between Jesus and the church,⁷⁵ a need prompted by the delay of the Parousia, according to Radl.⁷⁶ Radl’s thesis is informed by Plutarch’s *Parallel Lives*,⁷⁷ which presents the Roman Empire as a continuation of Hellenism. A similar use of synkrisis by Luke suggests to Radl that though there is a temporal distinction between the ages of salvation history in Luke (i.e., that of Jesus and that of the church), the parallels between them (particularly those of struggle and suffering)

72. Ibid., 88. Neyrey also briefly mentions the apologetic role that Jesus’ prophecies in Luke 12:8–12 and 21:12–15 serve. Because the many trials and proceedings against Jesus and his followers were “potentially scandalizing,” Jesus’ prophecies about them demonstrate his authority and control over the events in the lives of his disciples. Elsewhere he adds that Luke’s emphasis on the innocence of his protagonists functions as a “strong political apology . . . for Jesus and the early Church, especially in light of the Roman-Jewish war so recently concluded” (83). Thus, while Neyrey sees Luke’s primary goal as setting up a model for his readers to follow, he also sees a secondary apologetic purpose.

73. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 4. Others adopting this interpretation include Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1068–69; Matera, *Passion Narratives*, 205.

74. They do not limit their study to the passion narrative and its parallels as I have. To the extent possible I will focus on their assessment of the passion narrative parallels, but their conclusions are based on their assessment of the parallels within and across the whole books.

75. Radl, *Paulus und Jesus*, 374; Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 97.

76. Radl, *Paulus und Jesus*, 374.

77. For his discussion of *Parallel Lives*, synkrisis, and their relation to Luke and Acts, see *ibid.*, 253–54.

means that there is no shift from one age of salvation history to another but rather similarity and solidarity between them.⁷⁸

Talbert, too, relies extensively on the ancient literary tradition for help in interpreting the parallels.⁷⁹ After analyzing the principle of succession in the philosophical tradition (especially Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*), he argues that Luke employs the *imitatio magistri* motif in his construction of the Jesus-Stephen parallels. "Luke wants to ground the disciples' acts in the deeds of Jesus. . . . In Luke-Acts such parallelism is frequently used by the author to emphasize unity. . . . Luke describes the death of Jesus as a martyrdom in order to give a basis for Christian suffering-martyrdom."⁸⁰ Unfortunately for this study, Talbert does not reflect specifically on the significance of the parallels between Jesus' trial and passion and the trials of Paul, besides to say that Luke shapes the trial sequence in Luke after that of Paul.⁸¹ Talbert is more concerned with the correspondences between Luke 9 and Luke 22–23,⁸² which asserts "a continuity between the one who works miracles and preaches in Galilee and the one who suffers and dies in Jerusalem."⁸³ While the *imitatio magistri* motif is somewhat similar to Mattill's thesis, Talbert differs from Mattill in that he views the parallels as part of Luke's larger concern to legitimate Christian teaching, tradition, and leadership succession in a time plagued by heresy and schism (cp. Mattill's emphasis on the potential suffering and persecution of early Christians, which engages more thoroughly the texts treated in this study).

If the above proposals can be categorized as apologetic and pastoral explanations, the final proposal can be described as a theological explanation. David Moessner, who, like the other writers, does not focus exclusively on the parallels of the trials and deaths, argues that Luke binds Peter, Stephen, and Paul to Jesus because the former "must suffer rejection like their Messiah, because that is the very manner in which the fulfillment of the messianic history takes place within the promised plan

78. *Ibid.*, 395.

79. A bulk of his effort is directed toward showing that balance was a key principle in ancient literature. See Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 67–70 (on classical literature), 71–75 (on Jewish literature), and 75–77 (on early Christian literature).

80. *Ibid.*, 96–97.

81. *Ibid.*, 22. This comment follows Talbert's intimation of the parallels on 17–18.

82. *Ibid.*, 26–27.

83. *Ibid.*, 120.

of God.”⁸⁴ Peter, Stephen, and Paul are bound to the same fate as Jesus, as the cycle of Israel’s history is one of continued disobedience and rejection of the prophets God sends to it.⁸⁵

Observations

That these issues remain unresolved (or at an impasse) suggests the need for a fresh approach to Luke’s passion narrative. As the above survey has shown, the most common approaches to Luke’s passion narrative have been source, redaction, and narrative criticism. Notably absent from these approaches is rhetorical criticism, despite its proven value for interpretation of other areas of the Third Gospel, as discussed below. In light of this observation, I now turn to an explanation of the approach of this study—a compositional-rhetorical approach—and why I think it has the potential to help us adjudicate between the various positions outlined above.⁸⁶

Rhetorical Criticism of Luke’s Passion Narrative: A Proposal

Methodology

The prominence of rhetorical studies of the NT,⁸⁷ and of Luke’s Gospel in particular,⁸⁸ makes the absence of a full-scale rhetorical analysis of Luke’s passion narrative somewhat surprising. Although some scholars have analyzed various rhetorical aspects of the passion narrative as part of a

84. Moessner, “Christ Must Suffer,” 224.

85. Ibid., 225–27.

86. Once this analysis is complete, I evaluate the strengths and weakness of these various proposals in light of my findings.

87. See, e.g., Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism*.

88. See, e.g., Kurz, “Hellenistic Rhetoric,” 171–95; Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*; Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian*; Hughes, “Parable,” 29–41; Parsons, “Luke and the *Progymnasmata*,” 43–63; Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller*; Brookins, “Luke’s Use of Mark,” 70–89.

larger study⁸⁹ or as one section of a commentary,⁹⁰ a full-scale rhetorical analysis of Luke's passion narrative is lacking due to the dominance of other methods like source, redaction, and narrative criticism. Here I argue not that rhetorical criticism should replace these other methods but rather that it should be used in conjunction with them.

The primary method of this study is "compositional-rhetorical criticism." This entails looking at the changes that Luke made to Mark (hence "compositional criticism"⁹¹) and analyzing Luke's passion narrative with

89. For example, Martin argues that the topic lists in the *progymnasmata* provided a "compositional template" for ancient biographies, including Luke. He only briefly discusses Luke's passion narrative under the topic "manner of death." Elsewhere, Tolppanen studies several Greco-Roman and Jewish authors (e.g., Josephus, Philo, Valerius Maximus, Tacitus, Livy, various OT passages, Diodorus Siculus, 1QapGen, and Psudeo-Philo) and argues that ancient authors were consistent in paraphrasing their sources (i.e., they either copied them almost word for word or paraphrased them extensively). Because he thinks Luke handles Mark inconsistently (i.e., Luke resembles Mark more outside of the Passion-Resurrection narratives than inside them) he argues that "Luke derived his triple tradition material not from canonical Mark but from either a single Non-Canonical Markan Source/Tradition (NCMS/T) or two NCMS/Ts, which Luke used consistently." Luke's editorial work in his passion narrative is only one facet of Tolppanen's larger source-critical study. Finally, Reich touches on several rhetorical figures in Luke's passion narrative, but this is only a small part of the rhetoric of the passion narrative and of Reich's study. See Martin, "Progymnasmatic Topic Lists," 18–41; Tolppanen, "A Source Critical Reassessment of the Gospel of Luke," ii–iii, 1–3, 10–14, 123–44, 295–300 (quotation from iii); Reich, *Figuring Jesus*.

90. Despite its title, Meynet's rhetorical analysis of Luke is quite different from what I undertake here. Meynet describes his approach as similar to structural linguistics in its three goals: (1) to isolate the units of the text at different levels of organizations; (2) to describe the relationships between those units; and (3) to express the meaning of the text as it is revealed through its composition. This approach results in one of the two volumes of his commentary being a map of the various relations between units of Luke. See Meynet, *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc*, 11.

Also, though not a commentary, Morgenthaler devotes one section of his study on Luke and Quintilian to Luke's "rhetorizing" ("Rhetorisierung") of Markan material, but does not discuss the passion narrative in that section, save for in a brief section on statistics (232) comparing Luke's words to Mark's (229–57). In a later section on Luke's special material the passion narrative only appears twice. First, he mentions the two criminals on the cross as an example of antithesis that Luke took from his source and, second, he refers to 23:31 as a metaphor that (when combined with other figures in Luke) shows Luke's concern for adorning his narrative (281–309). See Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian*, 229–57.

91. I adopt the term "composition criticism" from Haenchen, who suggests the term "Kompositionsgeschichte" in place of the more commonly used "Redaktionsgeschichte" because the former suggests that Luke did not just combine or edit his sources, but also composed some of final product. See Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu*, 24.

an eye toward ancient rhetorical technique, particularly as described in the rhetorical handbooks and *progymnasmata* (hence “rhetorical criticism”). Rhetorical criticism views the New Testament documents as “complex, interrelated wholes, and recognizes the argumentative nature of these texts.”⁹² Compositional criticism needs little justification due to its widespread use in biblical studies today, but rhetorical criticism—comparatively newer on the scene—requires some justification.

Though not without critique,⁹³ rhetorical criticism has become a common way of analyzing the New Testament in recent years and has

Soards, who treats Luke as an author and not just an editor, adopts this term as well. See Soards, “Tradition, Composition, and Theology,” 224. Though composition criticism is a common way of analyzing Luke’s passion narrative, when coupled with rhetorical criticism it has the potential to yield new results.

92. Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 110.

93. Described in *ibid.*, 111–12. Mitchell describes these critiques and provides able responses to them. See Mitchell, “Rhetorical Handbooks,” 350–52.

More recently, Padilla has critiqued those approaches that suggest Luke’s familiarity with the *progymnasmata* by pointing to Luke’s lack of intertextuality with Greek prose authors (with whom students would become familiar in tertiary levels of education) and his lack of speech pairing (i.e., rebuttals or defenses). He concludes, “It is possible that Luke received primary and probably some measure of secondary education in the literate context, but, when it came time for higher education, he did not follow the literate track but followed the scientific or technical track” (436). See Padilla, “Hellenistic παιδεία,” 416–37. First, Padilla’s argument from the absence of intertextuality with Greek prose authors and speech pairing neglects one of the primary functions of the rhetorical education—namely, that students were taught principles that they could adapt to their own rhetorical ends. A student’s familiarity with a technique or exercise did not necessitate its use in their works. Second, and more importantly, despite Padilla’s concession that the educational boundaries were in flux during the time of Luke’s writing (and thus that “Roman education, roughly during the period in which Acts was written, was in a stage of transition, with the *progymnasmata* increasingly becoming the domain of the secondary level of literate education” [419]), he nonetheless proceeds throughout his study as if the *progymnasmata* were at the tertiary educational level instead of the secondary level. See my refutation of this idea in chapter 2 and my argument below that many features of Luke and Acts weigh in favor of Luke’s familiarity with a level of education comparable to that represented in the *progymnasmata*.

Even if one were not willing to grant Luke a secondary level of education, however, one still ought to grant that an understanding of the basic principles of persuasion in the ancient world can help us understand Luke’s Gospel (and, indeed, the rest of the NT). Regardless of Luke’s educational résumé, he was trying to persuade his audiences (Luke 1:1–4; Acts 1:1–3), so he would have attempted to communicate in ways that his audience would have understood and found persuasive. On that basis alone, the ancient rhetorical tradition helps us understand Luke’s work by helping us understand how ancient people conceived of arguments, narration, and composition, even if they

provided fresh insights into the interpretive issues of several New Testament books, Luke included. Recent studies on rhetorical figures, chreia, fable, narrative, paraphrase, and prosopopoeia in Luke have yielded promising results for understanding Luke in light of the ancient rhetorical tradition and suggest that a similar study of Luke's passion narrative will be profitable.

Though the results of those studies can speak for themselves, I will nonetheless offer a brief justification of why the *progymnasmata* and other rhetorical treatises of the ancient world ought to aid our understanding of Luke. The *progymnasmata*, or preliminary exercises, were a common component of intermediate education; they were a series of exercises that gradually increased in difficulty that a student of rhetoric, poetry, or history would practice as preparation for speech composition or historiography.⁹⁴ One first-century *progymnasmata* author, Theon, describes the exercises as "the foundation of every kind of discourse" (*Prog.* 70 [Kennedy, 13]).⁹⁵ Students practiced various exercises that taught them to process information, identify important features of the text, and compose their own prose. In short, the exercises provided students with argumentative techniques, patterns on which to build their own compositions, and material to adapt to their own literary needs.⁹⁶ Because they were widespread (both geographically and chronologically) and because they reflect the curriculum of early stages of education, the *progymnasmata* are a fertile place to learn how ancient writers were thinking about constructing persuasive arguments. Ruth Webb explains, "Precisely because they [the *progymnasmata*] are elementary, they reveal the lowest common denominator of that training and reveal the basic conceptions of language, categories of composition, and modes of thought which informed both the production and reception of rhetorical and other texts."⁹⁷

The rhetorical handbooks represent a more advanced stage of rhetoric studied in preparation for civic life. At this stage students studied speech making: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Despite the fact that the rhetorical handbooks represent a level of training

lacked formal training.

94. For a more detailed discussion of the *progymnasmata* and rhetorical handbooks, see chapter 2.

95. On the notation system and translations of the *progymnasmata* cited in this study, see chapter 2.

96. Webb, "Progymnasmata as Practice," 290–91.

97. *Ibid.*, 292.

beyond that which Luke likely received (few advanced to this level of education), they can still be used to inform our understanding of the rhetorical techniques under consideration here because of the overlap between the *progymnasmata* and the rhetorical handbooks on many of the exercises. Furthermore, these handbooks, though advanced, nonetheless demonstrate how ancient composers conceived of their works and how audiences might receive them. Finally, the ancient rhetorical tradition (and the handbooks in particular) proves especially apt for this study since its focus is on the passion narrative. Many of the rhetorical theorists' comments are aimed specifically at those preparing for court (e.g., Quintilian, *Inst.* 5.13.44). Luke, of course, was not writing an oration to be delivered in court,⁹⁸ but the theorists' comments are nonetheless particularly apt for this analysis since Jesus' trials and the theme of testimony are key parts of Luke's passion narrative. Since Luke is telling a narrative about a trial,⁹⁹ it would be quite natural for him to employ themes, topics, and arguments from the forensic sphere.¹⁰⁰ He does just that with his employment of the topics of refutation and confirmation.

Furthermore, the quality of Luke's Greek, his ability to write the longest surviving canonical gospel, his ability to succeed that account with a second volume, and his capacity to work with sources (Luke 1:1–4) suggest that Luke may have been familiar with educational content similar to that represented in the extant *progymnasmata*.¹⁰¹ I am not suggesting that

98. Here we do well to remember that the application of rhetorical techniques was not a rigid science, nor was it limited by genre (see, e.g., Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.13). Quintilian explains that the rules of rhetoric can function as an aid to speaking "if they indicate the main road, and not just some one narrow track such that anyone who thinks it a sin to stray will need to walk as slowly as a tightrope walker" (2.13.16 [Russell, LCL]). The overlap between the various *progymnasmata* exercises (discussed in chapter 2) testifies to this flexibility as well. See also Gibson, "Learning Greek History," 103–29. Gibson discusses how the *progymnasmata* prepared students not just for oratory but for those writing poetry, history, and other genres. Further, Cribiore points out that "writing occupied a fundamental place in rhetorical education," which counters the notion that rhetorical training was not for writers. See Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 232.

99. On the sheer volume of Luke and Acts devoted to forensic trials, see Neyrey, *Passion according to Luke*, 84–85; Hogan, "Forensic Speeches."

100. That Luke narrates Jesus' trial does not necessarily imply an apologetic motivation for the passion narrative.

101. Luke's literary expertise has long been acknowledged. See, e.g., Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 548; Cadbury, *Making of Luke-Acts*, 4; Goulder, *Luke*, 115; Johnson, *Gospel of Luke*, 12–13; Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller*, 32; Jeffrey, *Luke*, 2–3.

Luke knew the specific *progymnasmata* or handbooks discussed here. Rather, I propose that the content contained in these *progymnasmata* is representative of the education Luke may have received, evinced by his capacity to write such sustained narratives as Luke and Acts. These exercises were a part of the rhetorical culture in which Luke lived; thus, even without direct access to these resources, he was likely familiar with the techniques contained therein.

Thus, the *progymnasmata* and the rhetorical handbooks are a fertile place for modern interpreters to learn what ancient writers—in this case, Luke—thought about composing narratives and constructing persuasive arguments; by looking at the exercises an ancient student would practice and at the ways a student would use and categorize such exercises, a modern interpreter is better able to understand an author's conception of her or his work and the ways an audience might hear it. The rhetorical techniques of refutation and confirmation, rhetorical figures, synkrisis, narration, and paraphrase are especially helpful in shedding light on the issues surrounding Luke's passion narrative.

Finally, before turning to the argument and framework of this study, it is necessary to intimate my view of the Synoptic Problem since a component of this study relates to Luke's use of sources. Along with the majority of scholars, I believe that Luke used Mark as his primary source for the entire Gospel. Luke supplements Mark with other traditions (cf. Luke 1:1–4), probably both oral and written.

Scholars have recently shown a renewed interest in the Farrer Hypothesis, a source-critical solution to the Synoptic Problem that dispenses with Q and instead argues that Luke used both Mark and Matthew. Luke's use of Matthew, for which Farrer Hypothesis proponents argue,¹⁰² would explain the few agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in the passion narrative.¹⁰³ For example, two of the most significant Matthew-Luke agreements—the description of Peter weeping at the end of the mocking scene (Matt 14:65; Luke 22:62) and the question from the mockers (Matt 14:72; Luke 22:64)—may reflect Luke's knowledge of

102. See Farrer's famous articulation of the theory that bears his name in Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," 55–88. More recently, however, see Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*. Goodacre, now one of the more famous proponents of the Farrer Hypothesis, describes Goulder as "the leading exponent of the view, the scholar who has done more than any other to work out the argument in detail. . . . [A]t present his is the only substantial commentary on Luke's Gospel working with the thesis that Luke used both Mark and Matthew." See Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels*, 22.

103. See Bovon, *Luke* 3, 227, for a list and explanation of these minor agreements.

Matthew. Alternatively, they may also reflect phrases that had become popular in oral tradition.¹⁰⁴

The primary portions of Luke that prompt the source critical debate over his passion narrative, however, are not those portions where Matthew and Luke agree against Mark. Those portions where Matthew and Luke do agree against Mark merit study informed by the ancient rhetorical tradition, but Luke's potential use of Matthew does not resolve most of the issues that drive the source critical discussion of Luke's passion narrative. That is, the material that solicits such divided responses amongst the scholarly community are not those portions where Matthew and Luke agree against Mark, but rather those portions where Luke and Mark differ markedly.¹⁰⁵ Thus, because scholarly attention has focused on Luke's potential use of a non-canonical written source, and since Luke's potential use of Matthew does not significantly impact that discussion, I will not explore the relationship between Matthew and Luke in this study.

104. Besides Goulder's proposal that Luke used Matthew, other proposals to explain their agreements against Mark include contamination of Luke's text by statements well-known from Matthew or another source common to both Luke and Matthew. On the former, see Bovon, *Luke* 3, 227. On the latter, see Nolland, *Luke* 18:35—24:53, 1098–99. Fitzmyer attributes both of these instances to "L," but does not explain how that relates to the overlap with Matthew. If one does not accept the Farrer Hypothesis, Soards' assessment of Luke 22:63–65 seems the best explanation of the Matthew-Luke agreements in the passion narrative: "The differences between the basic narratives of Luke and Matthew are striking. Except for this line [Matt 26:68/Luke 22:64], which is not found in Mark's story, Matthew closely follows Mark's order and action; but Luke differs from Mark's story in both narrative order and detail. The differences between Luke and Matthew make it unlikely that independently they used a common written source. It is even more unlikely that independently Luke and Matthew composed and added exactly the same five-word question . . . to the account of the mockery of Jesus. Thus, one best understands this striking agreement by inferring that Luke and Matthew knew the same non-Markan tradition; and, the dissimilarities between the accounts of Luke and Matthew make it unlikely this tradition was written. Therefore, it seems justified to conclude that Luke and Matthew had access to the same oral tradition in Greek." See Soards, "Literary Analysis," 89.

105. When Farrer Hypothesis proponents attempt to explain those other portions (where no apparent connection exists) as Luke's use of Matthew, it discredits their case. Goodacre challenges Goulder when Goulder posits that Luke derived the Herod pericope from Matthew. Goodacre refers to this as one of Goulder's "least plausible" solutions. The remainder of Goodacre's assessment is worth noting, as it reveals some of Goulder's underlying assumptions: "Goulder can be seen to be looking most eagerly for some justification of Luke's having created L stories. In the case of Herod, Goulder makes this explicit: before he introduces his theory he says that Luke 'cannot simply have manufactured a hearing before Herod from nothing' (758)." See Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels*, 254–55.

A fuller treatment of the source issue of Luke's passion narrative (i.e., not just entertaining the possibility of a special non-canonical passion source) would need to explore Luke's potential use of Matthew, but such a treatment is beyond the scope of this study. This lack of treatment and my conclusions on the source issue should not be understood as either confirming or denying the validity of the Farrer Hypothesis. Rather, I hope my analysis will provide a basis for further explorations of the Farrer Hypothesis, both inside and outside of the passion narrative.

Finally, because of space constraints I will not address the relationship between the passion narratives of Luke and John in this study.¹⁰⁶ The similarities between the two passion narratives have resulted in a host of theories to explain the relationship between the two: Luke used John,¹⁰⁷ John used Luke,¹⁰⁸ the two used a common source,¹⁰⁹ or the two used common traditions.¹¹⁰ I find the final option most convincing because of the nature of the similarities between the two, which are more in terms of thought content and order of the narratives than word agreement.¹¹¹ This understanding of the relationship between Luke and John supports my larger thesis here that Luke's passion narrative is explicable without recourse to a written source besides Mark.¹¹²

106. For a history of research on this topic, see Matson, *In Dialogue*, 21–90. Because Matson has so carefully intimated the various theories and their adherents, I only point to a few of the adherents below.

107. Ibid., 444. He concludes, “[I]t is very reasonable to read Luke as having used John in addition to Mark.” Elsewhere he notes that he is open to the possibility of this being an earlier version of John (264).

108. E.g., Neiryndck, *Jean et les synoptiques*. Cf. Matson, *In Dialogue*, 58–71.

109. E.g., Boismard, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles*, 40. Cf. Matson, *In Dialogue*, 63–67.

110. E.g., Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 91.

111. Matson, *In Dialogue*, 91–163, describes the points of contact between the two as (1) Close linguistic or striking substantive similarities; (2) Common order; (3) Common geographical references; (4) Common individual facts or allusions; (5) Common omissions; (6) Common named characters; and (7) Common themes or theology.

112. It also cautions against theories like Matera's (described above) which allow for minimal, if any, influence of oral tradition.

Argument and Framework

This compositional-rhetorical analysis of Luke's passion narrative entails reading Luke 22:66–23:49 with ancient compositional and persuasive strategies in mind, as described in the ancient rhetorical tradition. Such an analysis contributes to the interpretive questions described above in three ways. First, regarding the source issue, it provides new explanations for the reasons Luke's order differs from Mark and for the potential origin of special Lukan material through an understanding of ancient paraphrase and narration. Second, it highlights Luke's key theme of innocence by showing that Luke structures his passion narrative as a debate about Jesus' innocence through the use of the common topics associated with refutation and confirmation. The presence of these topics—topics that were commonly used in court settings—and their use as a key structural device in the narrative suggests that one of Luke's primary concerns is to portray Jesus as *politically* innocent. The placement of rhetorical figures throughout his narrative supports this concern. While not denying that *δίκαιος* carries spiritual or christological connotations, this study challenges those works that downplay or deny the political connotations of Jesus' innocence. Third, based on ancient examples of synkrisis, this analysis suggests that part of the purpose of Luke's characterization of Jesus in the passion narrative (especially when set in parallel to Paul and Stephen in Acts) was to set up Jesus as a model for his followers in case they would face similar persecution or death.

My analysis proceeds in three phases. First, in chapter 2 I describe the tools for the rhetorical analysis of Luke's passion narrative. This includes an introduction to ancient education, a review of the various sources (the treatises on the *progymnasmata*, collections of exercises, and rhetorical handbooks) and their contents, and an analysis of the exercises relevant to this study: refutation and confirmation, rhetorical figures, synkrisis, narration, and paraphrase. Chapter 2 provides the necessary foundation and background for the remainder of the analysis.

Chapters 3 and 4, the heart of the study, are the compositional-rhetorical analysis of Luke's passion narrative. These chapters bring to bear the findings of chapter 2 onto Luke's passion narrative. I follow Luke's argument from Luke 22:66–23:49, noting how Luke's structure, argument, style, and use of sources conform to or diverge from the techniques described in chapter 2. Chapter 3 analyzes the trial proper (Luke 22:66–23:25), which includes Jesus' appearance before the Jewish council, the

accusations against him, and his trials before Pilate and Herod. Chapter 4 analyzes Luke 23:26–49, which, though not a proper trial, can still be viewed as an informal trial. Here Jesus is “tried” by the soldiers, the criminals, God, and the centurion.

Chapter 5 highlights the specific techniques at work in Luke’s passion narrative. Whereas the preceding two chapters followed Luke’s text and discussed the techniques where appropriate, chapter 5 treats each of the techniques in turn (refutation and confirmation, rhetorical figures, synkrisis, narration, and paraphrase) and summarizes their role in Luke’s passion narrative. After this summary, I bring my findings to bear on the three interpretive issues described above: (1) the sources Luke used in composing his passion narrative; (2) the translation of *δίκαιος* in 23:47; and (3) the function of the parallels between Jesus in Luke and Paul and Stephen in Acts.