INTERPRETING LUKE’S GOSPEL
An Overview of the Research

The intention of this lecture is to lay a foundation for our study of Unit Three, the Gospel of Luke. Such a goal borders on the presumptuous since the amount of research into this gospel in the last two hundred years is staggering. Yet, the intent is defined in terms of a snapshot view, rather than a miniseries treatment. The area of greatest focus will be on the post-Conzelmann era beginning with the mid 50’s.

In this regard some comments about the bibliography are in order. It is rather lengthy so as to provide a maximum amount of reference sources. The first section is especially important for the objective of this lecture. It contains references to numerous synopses of Lukan studies in the twentieth century. Most important are the analyses of Hans Conzelman and Andreas Lindemann. Although their scope is wider than the third gospel, they contain extensive treatments of new publications and trends in Lukan studies from 1963 through 1983. Also very significant is the focus on Lukan studies by Martin Rese and François Bovon. Two of the more important, though less extensive, recent treatments of Lukan studies in English are those by Earl Richard and by Charles Talbert. These analyses collectively can provide a rather thorough understanding of developments in the post-Conzelmann era of Lukan studies. Sections two and three of the bibliography are intended to provide references to studies on various topics in Lukan research and references to some of the more important commentaries on the third gospel.

First a synopsis of this history of Lukan studies, then an exploration of current trends.

HISTORICAL SUMMARY

Research into the Gospel of Luke in the modern era began with the focus on the historical questions of authorship etc. which had their antecedents in the patristic period, though without the technicalities which characterize modern scholars. Questions began to be raised about authorship (R. Simon), which in turn raised questions about authority since it was presupposed to have not come from apostolic authority (J. D. Michaelis). The patristic tradition of Pauline oversight of Luke was called into


question (J. G. Eichhorn) in favor of a Marcionite origin for the Gospel (J. S. Semler). Although this pattern of research did not gain widespread acceptance it has periodically picked up supporters such as F. C. Bauer toward the close of the last century and John Knox in this one.

The focus of attention in the nineteenth century shifted to source critical concerns. The main concerns centered around the Griesbach Matthean priority hypothesis versus the two document Markan priority hypothesis, although numerous proposals were suggested.\(^9\) The issue of the historical setting of the gospel was impacted greatly by F. C. Bauer’s contention that the third gospel represented a second century reaction to Marcion. He further impacted Lukan studies by (1) “tying literary-historical analysis to an imaginative philosophical framework,”\(^10\) by (2) laying the foundation of later “tendency criticism” and of “adversary theology” through his philosophical linkage to Hegel’s dialectic, and by (3) attempting to explain consistently the “origin and development of Christianity in accordance with principles of historical criticism.”\(^11\) Although much of Bauer’s work was heavily negative in impact, it must be noted that he “freed NT exegesis from the domination of traditional dogma,”\(^12\) even though he did move it into servitude to his dialectical philosophy.

The direction of work in the twentieth century on Luke’s Gospel was largely determined by the agendas set in the nineteenth century. Ellis mentions five areas which have been the focus of concern for much of this century: Literary Style; Text; History and Theology; Purpose; and Date of Composition.\(^13\)

Literary Style. Beginning with the intensive analysis of J. C. Hawkins with his Horae Synopticae in 1909, the Gospel and Acts have been recognized as a literary unit. Luke’s style of writing has been described as generally as a more polished Greek than Mark by its tendency occasionally to remove Mark’s Hebraisms (cf. Mk. 11.9) or substitute Greek equivalents (cf. Lk. 3.12).\(^14\) Many have recognized the Septuagintal flavor of Luke’s style coupled with “the lingering secularism in his style”\(^15\) and have drawn the conclusion that Luke most likely was a Gentile proselyte to Judaism before becoming a Christian.

Text. In the 1800’s attention was drawn to the textual variations between the Western and the Alexandrian texts of Luke-Acts. F. Blass in 1898 (Philology of the Gospels) suggested that Luke first wrote his gospel in Palestine during Paul’s Caesarean imprisonment and later issued a subsequent “Western” draft from Rome. His thesis did not gain much acceptance, neither did Westcott and Hort’s contention that only the “non-interpolations” in the Western text are original.\(^16\) Concentration on individual readings characterizes the work today, rather than any general, all inclusive hypothesis.

History and Theology. Geographical and time references in Luke-Acts have been recognized as significant not only for historical concerns but also for theological purposes. Passages such as Lk. 2.1-4 and 3.1-3 provide important points of connection with secular Roman history, and thus a important link to the establishment of chronological understanding for Jesus’ ministry. Luke’s precision in geographical references caught the attention of Sir William Ramsay in the early part of this century and became an important factor in his shifting from sympathy to criticism of F. C. Bauer’s reconstruction of early Christian history.

---
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The work of Martin Dibelius early in this century underscored the theological aspect of Luke: He is “an historian who expounds the meaning of an event by striking description; we see him also in his capacity as **herald and evangelist**, a role which he fulfills completely in his first book and wishes ultimately to fulfill also in Acts.”17 One of the current debates rests on the theological agenda which Luke had in mind with the writing of his gospel.

**Purpose.** Great diversity of position has emerged around the identification of Luke’s purpose.18 The viewpoints range from a defense of Christianity before Roman officialdom (Sahlin), to a presentation of the claims of Christianity to the Roman public (Streeter, Bruce, O’Neill), to a confirming of believers in their faith (Plummer, Marshall, Schürmann, Haenchen), to an expression of “adversary theology,” that is to counter gnosticizing influences in the church (Talbert). Ellis argues that a pastoral objective to the community of faith best explains the Lukan objective.19

**Date of Composition.** The concern with the delay of the parousia and the Jewish rejection of Jesus as the Messiah have been significant motifs in the effort to identify a date for the gospel. T. W. Manson suggested a time about 70 A. D.; Harnack, Bruce, Ellis and Blass, about 60-65; whereas Kümmel, 70-90. The second century proposals of O’Neill, Loisy and others have not gained much acceptance.

**CURRENT TRENDS**

Without question the most pivotal work of the mid-twentieth century on the Gospel of Luke was *Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* by Hans Conzelmann first released in 1954. Since this pioneering work in what came to be called Redaktionsgeschichte (Redation Criticism), serious work with the Lukan gospel has had to address the issues which Conzelmann raised.20 To be sure “nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg lag die Redaktionsgeschichte gleichsam ‘in der Luft’.21 The groundwork for this method which sifted attention from Luke the historian to Luke the theologian had been already laid by Rudolf Bultmann’s *Theology of the New Testament*.22 But the work of Conzelmann became the catalyst for this radical shift toward theological interests in Luke-Acts. Thus a decade later W. C. van Unnik could write of “Luke-Acts, a Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship.”23

The thesis of Conzelmann’s work, from which comes the title, is that the ministry of Jesus lay, in Luke’s perspective, in the second of three eras of human history, that is, in der Mitte der Zeit.24 First there was the “Zeit Israels” that culminated in the ministry of John the Baptist, then the “Zeit des Wirkens Jesu”, followed by the “Zeit seit der Erhöhung des Herrn, auf Erden Zeit

____________________


18Ellis, ISBE, 3:183. For detailed analysis see Kümmel, *Introduction*, 130-47.

19Ibid.


der Kirche, in welcher die Tugend der Geduld gefordert ist. Denn die Kirche wird in der Welt verfolgt, und dieses Leiden wird als gottgesetzt anerkannt (Apg. 14,22); aber sie ist ausgerüstet worden, damit sie die Verfolgung bestehen kann, indem sie den Geist empfing. Dieser ist das eigentliche Charakteristikum dieser dritten Epoche."25

The expectation of the imminent return of Christ which characterized early post-ascension belief gradually began to be called into question with the passing of years without the parousia taking place. "Luke’s achievement was to produce a theology adapted to a long period of waiting for the parousia. He reinterpreted the eschatological content of the tradition which he incorporated in his Gospel in such a way that the parousia was regarded as sudden rather than as soon and [was] transferred to the indefinite future rather than expected at any moment."26 Consequently imminent parousia expectation moved into the background as a motivation for Christian living. The question of what is the value of today in Christian experience was answered by the affirmation that we now are living in the meaningful era of the Spirit and the Church in which God is continuing to carry out his heilgeschichtliches Programm, rather than it being just a temporary interlude before Christ’s glorious return. The Church, empowered and guided by the Holy Spirit, is the key earthly agent being used by God for the carrying out of this redemptive plan for all mankind. As a result, the close identification of the Christian movement with the mission of Christ became imperative: thus the objective in Luke-Acts. Throughout the treatment the motif of promise/fulfillment stands central. The link of Jesus to Israel depends on it as does the link of the Church to Jesus.27 Also the Church living in a Jewish world under Roman domination must come to grips with its situation—a situation which Jesus’ ministry can greatly illuminate. All of this comes together for the Church in comprehending its place in God’s Heilsgeschichte as the proclamation and living out of the Gospel which focuses in Jesus Christ.

Conzelmann’s work raised numerous issues which have evoked numerous responses over the subsequent decades.28 These will be discussed under the categories of text, sources and theology.

Conzelmann’s neglect of the text of Luke 1-2 and rejection of these chapters as integral to the Gospel have drawn heavy attack.29 Some, while accepting the Heilsgeschichte schema, have sought to fit the infancy narratives into it.30 Others have used these chapters as a basis of challenging the salvation-history construct.31 Both sides agree, though, that the separation of John the Baptist from Elijah as claimed by Conzelman for Luke is erroneous in the light of Lk. 1.17, 26.32

In the matter of Luke’s sources, several trends have emerged in the last two decades.33 Conzelman did not treat the issue of sources with any depth; instead, he worked off the then in vogue two document hypothesis.34 But the nature of Q, as earlier
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28For detailed discussion see van Unnick, Storm Center, 15-32; Kodell, BTB, 3-4; Richard, BTB, 3-4. Most recently a volume has appeared with provides excellent updating to the mid-eighties: François Bovon, Lukas in neuer Sicht, trans. Elisabeth Hartmann, Albert Frey and Peter Strauss (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985).

29Talbert, Shifting Sands, 385-86.


33See Kümmel, Introduction, 130-38, for helpful survey of research. Also, Lindemann, TR, 257-63.
defined and adopted by Conzelman, has been increasingly questioned, as well as its very existence.\(^{35}\) Ellis challenges the alternative proposal of A. Farrer who in favor of disposing with Q maintains the two document position with a simple dependence of Luke on Matthew. A more radical proposal which emerged earlier, the so-called Proto-Luke (unitary document composed of Q plus L minus Lk. 1-2 as the core of Luke’s gospel into which Markan passages were inserted), was updated and reaffirmed by Rehkopf,\(^{36}\) but has been rejected by others.\(^{37}\) Two helpful tools for source analysis in regard to the Q passages which have emerged in the post-Conzelmann era are R. A. Edwards’ *A Concordance to Q* (Missoula: Scholars’ Press, 1975) and A. Polag’s *Fragmenta Q: Texte zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukircher Verlag, 1979), which attempt a detailed reconstruction of the Greek text. A major effort (though highly criticized), which comes out of this period, was the last scholarly production of Joachim Jeremias’ *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980). Jeremias attempts to isolate Luke’s redactional material and his numerous stylistic and lexical characteristics. The major criticism of his work is that of not allowing for enough redactional activity by Luke.\(^{38}\)

The perception of the *theology* of Luke by Conzelmann has been another major focus of reaction. A major, early critique was that of Helmut Flender in his *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*.\(^{39}\) Flender demonstrates the onesideness of Conzelmann’s representation of Lukan theology as well as highlighting a number of other motifs which should be given much more consideration than that given by Conzelmann. Also in this group of early critics are Schuyler Brown, F. Schütz, and W. C. Robinson.\(^{40}\)


Subsequent to this volume came the article of W. G. Kümmel, first appearing in French in 1970: “Luc en accusation dans la théologie contemporaine.” Kümmel both survys the developments in the sixties and answers five criticisms of Luke coming out of this decade of research: the delay of the parousia, the elimination of the salvific character of the cross, capitulation to “early
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Catholicism” and the historicization of both faith and the kerygma. His work set the tone for much of the research in the 1970’s. Martin Rese concludes that the net impact of Kümmel’s work as reflected in several major works during the seventies was:

“In beiden Tendenzen, der Kritik an der Redaktionsgeschichte und der positiveren Sicht der Theologie des Lukas, kommt zum Ausdruck, was sich auch sonst in der Exegese des Neuen Testaments beobachten läßt: ein starker Zug hin zu weniger kritischem und mehr konservativem Vorgehen.”

Pivotal works contributing to this trend include those which raised questions about the work of redaction criticism as first practiced, and usually went on to refine the methodology. Among these are Heinz Schürmann’s commentary on Luke 1.1-9.50, first appearing in 1969, in the Herders series. The inclusion of the section “Bemerkungen über die Handhabung der redaktionsgeschichtlichen Methode” (161-70) in the 1978 edition of his Jesu Abschiedsrede, Lk 22.21-38 continued to insist upon improvements in the redaction critical method. Also the voices of Kümmel, François Bovon and Martin Hengel were added to that chorus of more positive assessments of Luke’s work. It is Schürmann, however, that Rese credits with “eine Wende um hundertachtzig Grad” toward a positive appraisal of Luke’s Gospel. Others, to be sure, contributed to this swing away from negative attitudes toward Luke, including Eduard Schweizer, I. Howard Marshall, J.-W. Taeger, Geoffrey F. Nuttell, Michael Dömer and G. Lohfink. Additionally, the work of Augustin George, Études sur l’œuvre de Luc (Paris: Gabalda, 1978) is much more than a survey of the Lukan research from 1950 to 1975. Numerous points are set forth very persuasively from a positive stance about Luke’s Gospel.

Rese, TLZ, 228.

He stressed “daß die redaktionsgeschichtliche Methode nirgends besser ihre Grenzen erkennen kann als bei der Kommentierung des Lukasevangeliums” (161).

Rese, LTZ, 227: “Eine wichtige Rolle bei der Wende in der Bewertung des Lukas wieder Schürmanns Lukas-Momentar gespielt.”


G. Lohfink, Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie (Munich: Kosel, 1975). Other contributions which could be added to this list include Earle Ellis, The Gospel of Luke. The New Century Bible (London: Thomas
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Concerning particular theological topics, the area of eschatology crops up as a significant area of research. In general the trend has been to accept the claim of Lukan Heilsgeschichte perspective while rejecting Conzelmann’s claim of its Lukan uniqueness. The shift away from an imminent expectation of the parousia in Luke claimed by Conzelmann has been widely rejected and countered with demonstrations of its presence in the third Gospel.

One area of continuing difference of opinion relates to how one properly goes about finding Luke’s perspective on Christ. Conzelmann rejected the effort to deduce Lukan Christology from an analysis of the titles given to Jesus, in favor of looking at Luke’s perspective in the total context of salvation history. While some individuals have continued to attempt Lukan Christology from such an approach, most have sided with Conzelmann’s view and sought to discern it in the context of the perceived Heilsgeschichte in Luke-Acts. Consequently, “it has now become commonplace to view Jesus’ entire life, according to Luke, as redemptive.

Lukan ekklesiology perspectives have responded rather extensively to Conzelmann’s earlier contention of Frühkatolizismus in Luke. Opinion has been divided over the presence and/or extent of the early Catholic tendencies which Protestant tradition has usually contended did not emerge until the apostolic fathers. Although the question remains unsettled in terms of a scholarly consensus, one related area of increasing recognition is the pastoral concern of Luke, although this is but one aspect of his overall purpose.

Some other areas of Lukan research include the credibility of Lukan history and genre identification of Luke-Acts. In the area of history there still prevails much skepticism over Luke as a reliable historian although several, such as Marshall, Richard et als, have sought to defend him at this point, especially by calling attention to the impossibility of assessing Luke’s credibility from the criteria of modern historiography. Rather, as Richard proposes, he must be assessed in terms of ancient standards such as those of Lucian of Samosata etc. When so done he comes out very well. This concern is closely identified
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with the literary genre identification issue. In contrast to the Hellenistic paradigm adopted by Talbert, Richard contends that “Luke is best . . . understood as biographical literature with Jewish background as well. He has borrowed the gospel form from Mark and has creatively adapted it by adding Hellenistic /Jewish features: prologue, genealogy, synchronisms etc.”

What about the future of Lukan research? Richard suggests that the volume of work is beginning to slow down, in spite of the fact that much work on Luke remains to be done. One possible signal of this in American circles is the fact that the Luke-Acts seminar in the SBL which was chaired by Charles Talbert completed its allotted five year life span in 1984. Talbert now chairs a seminar on Matthew. I suspect that the European scholarly community will increasingly become the source for most of the work done on Luke in the years to come. One thing can be stated with great conviction: Luke is no longer the storm center as van Unnick described in the 60’s. “Instead, Luke’s work is now view as one of several major contributions of the early community to Christian theology and history.”

---
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