

Cambridge University Press
0521616921: The Passion Narrative of St Luke
Vincent Taylor
Excerpt
[More information](#)

PART ONE
INTRODUCTION

Cambridge University Press
 0521616921: The Passion Narrative of St Luke
 Vincent Taylor
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

I. SUMMARY OF CRITICAL OPINION

Before examining the Passion narrative of Lk. xxii–xxiv it is desirable to give some account of earlier research in this field. A useful summary of critical opinion is supplied by J. Moffatt in his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (3rd ed. 1918)¹ with special attention to the three-source theories of P. Feine, G. H. Müller, B. Weiss, and J. Weiss. A fuller account is given by W. Bussmann in *Synoptische Studien* (1925–31).² Bussmann lists the contributions of H. J. Holtzmann, C. Weizsäcker, H. H. Wendt, P. Ewald, P. Feine, J. C. Hawkins, P. Wernle, J. Wellhausen, J. Weiss, B. Weiss, G. H. Müller, A. Jülicher, F. Spitta, K. L. Schmidt, R. Bultmann, Ed. Meyer, E. Burton, B. H. Streeter, and W. Larfeld. The third source is usually designated by the symbol S or, by British scholars, L. As described by the earlier of these writers, S consists of Lukan tradition included in Q, but in the opinion of most of them it is a special source, oral or written, which the evangelist combined with Q. It will be seen that the number of scholars who have defended a three-source theory is considerable, especially when we add the contributions of F. C. Burkitt, V. H. Stanton, J. V. Bartlet, and W. Sanday in Great Britain, A. M. Perry, B. S. Easton, B. W. Bacon, and F. C. Grant in America, and J. Jeremias, H. Schürmann, and F. Rehkopf in Germany.

I propose to give some account of the views of Feine, B. Weiss, and J. Weiss, and of the British, American, and German scholars just mentioned.

P. Feine³ was the first to describe Luke's use of a third source. In the Passion narrative it included Lk. xxii. 14–23, 31–8, 39–46, 47–53, 54–62, 63–71; xxiii. 1–56 and xxiv. 1–53. B. Weiss⁴ included xxii. 1–6, 14–23, 31–4 and 39 – xxiv. 51, and

¹ Pp. 274–8.

² III, 89–96.

³ *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas* (1891).

⁴ *Die Quellen der synoptischen Überlieferung* (1908).

Cambridge University Press
 0521616921: The Passion Narrative of St Luke
 Vincent Taylor
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

THE PASSION NARRATIVE OF ST LUKE

J. Weiss¹ xxii. 15–19, 21–3 (?), 24–38; xxiii. 6–9, 11f., 27–31, 34, 39–43; xxiv. 13–53. In his *Life of Christ* (1883), B. Weiss made a significant observation when he wrote, ‘The supposition is ever suggesting itself, that beside Mark’s Gospel there lay before the Evangelist another comprehensive delineation of the whole life of Jesus, even if his assertions regarding the many men, to whose attempts he refers, will scarcely permit of all the materials peculiar to himself being allotted to this source.’²

In Great Britain an important step was taken by F. C. Burkitt in his *Gospel History and its Transmission* (1906) when he claimed that in Luke the source Q contained a story of the Passion. In this form his suggestion has been widely rejected, and rightly, for it leaves unexplained the neglect of the presumed Passion narrative by Matthew. But this rejection tended to obscure the value of his strong case for the independence and historical value of the Lukan Passion narrative.

Burkitt points out that, while the narrative in Matthew is based on Mark, the position is very different in Luke. The third evangelist, he claims, deserts Mark ‘to follow another story of the last scenes’.³ Burkitt lays stress on the saying about ‘twelve thrones’ in Lk. xxii. 30. He contrasts it with the parallel saying in Mt. xix. 28, where it is inserted into the framework of Mark, and argues that, since Luke does not as a rule disturb the order of his sources, the Lukan saying is a fragment of Q, and that Q contained a story of the Passion as well as discourses. Other narrative matter stood in Q (e.g. the story of the centurion’s servant), and there is nothing therefore to surprise one that it should have given an account of the last scenes.⁴

Burkitt supports his suggestion, the speculative character of which he realises, by pointing out the intrinsic merits of the Lukan Passion narrative. In several respects Mark and Luke do not agree as to the time and order in which events occurred, and the superior tradition is that of Luke. These incidents include Peter’s denial, the trial by the priests, and the mocking. ‘According to Mark’, Burkitt writes,

the chief priests try Jesus in the dead of night, and the rough horse-play and buffeting appears to be done by some members of the Council them-

¹ *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (1906).

² *Life of Christ*, 1, 80.

³ *Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 130.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 135.

Cambridge University Press
 0521616921: The Passion Narrative of St Luke
 Vincent Taylor
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

SUMMARY OF CRITICAL OPINION

selves while they are waiting till it is time to go to Pilate, not by the Temple guards waiting till it is time for the Council to assemble. I venture to think that S. Luke's account is the more probable.¹

Similarly, Burkitt maintains the superiority of Luke's account of the mock adoration of Jesus as king by Herod's soldiers, as compared with Mark's story (xv. 16–20a) which ascribes this act to the soldiers of the Roman governor. He points to the 'genuinely Jewish phrase', *χριστὸν βασιλέα* (= Malka Meshiḥa, 'King Messiah') in the accusation of the priests before Pilate. Speaking of the words about buying swords (Lk. xxii. 36) he says, 'They are among the saddest words in the Gospels, and the mournful irony with which they are pervaded seems to me wholly alien from the kind of utterance which a Christian Evangelist would invent for his Master.'²

Burkitt's contention that the Lukan Passion narrative rests upon an early and valuable source, which is independent of Mark, has great force. The opinion that the source is Q is among the things that pass. The conjunction of the view that the Passion narrative comes from Q undoubtedly delayed the discussion of his main contention. Thus, it is interesting to note that V. H. Stanton's criticism of Burkitt's theory turns exclusively upon the question of Q; it ignores his argument regarding the Lukan Passion narrative.

V. H. Stanton took up the question of Luke's sources in the second volume of his great work, *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (1909). He held that the birth stories and the genealogy were parts of a written source, and maintained that for his account of the ministry of Jesus, Luke used in addition to Mark 'one other principal source', an expanded form of Q. With this source as a foundation a good deal of other material was embodied somewhere in Palestine; 'it has supplied the greater part of the non-Markan matter in the Gospel from the beginning of the Synoptic outline onwards', mainly in two portions, Lk. vi. 17–viii. 3 and ix. 51–xviii. 14. He ascribes this source to a writer other than Luke. He draws attention to the temporal connexions between successive paragraphs (xi. 27, 37, 53; xii. 1, 13; xiii. 1, 31; xvi. 14) and concludes that they 'were found by the evangelist in his source, not invented

¹ *Op. cit.* pp. 137f.

² *Op. cit.* pp. 140f.

Cambridge University Press
 0521616921: The Passion Narrative of St Luke
 Vincent Taylor
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

THE PASSION NARRATIVE OF ST LUKE

by him'.¹ In particular, the accounts of incidents in the history of the Passion and appearances of the risen Christ, peculiar to this Gospel, were added by him. In the Gospel as a whole Stanton notes nine sections whose literary form should in all probability be attributed to the evangelist (v. 1–11; vii. 36–50; viii. 1–3; x. 29–37; xvii. 11–19; xix. 41–4; xxiii. 5–12, 14, 15; xxiii. 39–43; and xxiv).²

In his essay in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (1911), 'St Luke's Use of St Mark's Gospel', J. C. Hawkins says that he used to think the strongest arguments in favour of the three-document theories of Feine and others were to be found in Luke's Passion narrative. But closer investigation, he says, led him to think that Luke's additions 'suggest a long and gradual conflation in the mind rather than a simple conflation by the pen'.³ Luke was a fellow worker with Paul, and so will have been a preacher of the Pauline type. In his preaching the crucifixion would be thrown into special prominence, and this would have its effect when Luke approached this theme in his Gospel. 'May it not have been that the preacher (and perhaps catechist) who afterwards became the Third Evangelist, had for his homiletic purposes gradually supplemented, and in supplementing had to some extent modified and transposed, the generally accepted Markan record, so far as it related to the Passion and Crucifixion?'⁴ In this way Hawkins explains the phenomena of Lk. xxii. 14 ff. as due to Luke's 'memories of his past teaching'.

Luke's use of Mark does not favour this view. In *Oxford Studies* W. Sanday expressed a personal preference for Hawkins's earlier view.⁵ He pointed out that none of Luke's additions has any doctrinal significance. 'St Luke's additions', he wrote, 'are narrative for narrative's sake, not narrative for the sake of doctrine.'⁶ The character of the added matter was naturally accounted for if Luke had access to some special source of information; 'they do not seem to deal with the special doctrinal teaching of St Paul'.⁷ This effective criticism tells strongly against Hawkins's suggestion and favours the view that the special Lukan source was a document.

¹ *GHD*, II, 229.

² *Op. cit.* p. 310.

³ *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 90.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 92.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. xiii.

⁶ *Op. cit.* p. xiv.

⁷ *Op. cit.* p. xiv.

SUMMARY OF CRITICAL OPINION

In *Oxford Studies* J. C. Hawkins also notes a change in Luke's procedure at ix. 51 and suggests that its cause is due to 'his ceasing to use the Markan document as the framework into which his various extracts were inserted'. He makes two conjectures which may account for this change of procedure. (1) 'Luke may have drawn up this "travel-document" with some special purpose before he knew of, or at least before he began to found a Gospel upon, the Markan *Grundschrift*, and he may thus have had it ready to his hand for incorporation here'.¹ (2) Mark is laid aside possibly because 'at Caesarea or Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 8ff., 15ff.) or elsewhere, a more exact and chronological account of this final journey had been supplied to him by one who had at the time of the commencement of that journey become "an eyewitness and minister of the Word"'.² There Hawkins was content to leave the matter, but the question could not long be delayed whether, with due regard to the scientific caution Hawkins enjoined, evidence might be found to warrant a further step.

It is interesting to recall that in another essay in *Oxford Studies*, on Luke's sources, such a step was taken by J. V. Bartlet.³ He suggests that, in addition to an oral version of Q which he calls QL, Luke used a second written source 'alongside and indeed in preference to Mark'. This source he distinguishes by the symbol S, and he suggests that it was probably written down while Luke was in Caesarea along with Paul. We need not stay to describe more fully the details of Bartlet's hypothesis or the objections to which it is exposed. The objections concern the large extent of S, the suggestion of an oral version of Q, the fact that his hypothesis reduces Luke's part in the composition of his Gospel to a minimum, and the manner in which S is related to Mark. In the introduction to *Oxford Studies*, W. Sanday⁴ cordially welcomed Bartlet's views regarding Luke's special source, but he questioned the idea of Q as an oral source and the suggestion that S contained much of the material generally assigned to Q. His closing sentence is so full of significance for our investigation that it must be given in full: 'But I should like to ask whether it is not possible to rally round the clear and sharply drawn definition of Q as it is

¹ *Op. cit.* pp. 55f.

³ *Op. cit.* pp. 315-62.

² *Op. cit.* p. 57.

⁴ *Op. cit.* pp. xx-xxiii.

Cambridge University Press

0521616921: The Passion Narrative of St Luke

Vincent Taylor

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE PASSION NARRATIVE OF ST LUKE

presented to us in the earlier essays, and so pass on to the closer testing of the supplementary hypothesis of St Luke's special source.¹ These are prophetic words, when we remember that B. H. Streeter, the author of some of the essays to which Sanday refers, has taken the very step described. Without departing in any essential particular from the two-document hypothesis, Streeter has passed on 'to the closer testing of the supplementary hypothesis of St Luke's special source', and has found reason to include it in a comprehensive view of the origin of the Third Gospel.

Before discussing Streeter's contribution, consideration must be given to A. M. Perry's *Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative* (1920), which he describes as the most thorough attempt he knows to unravel Luke's sources.²

After a detailed examination of the Passion narrative in Luke, Perry concludes that it has been taken from a non-Markan source, which he designates as J or the Jerusalem source, a Greek document, probably translated from Aramaic, which, he conjectures, was produced in the community at Jerusalem about A.D. 45 by a disciple of Jesus. Following E. D. Burton, Perry substitutes for Q two non-Markan sources, one embodied in the Lukan account of the Galilean ministry (G) and the other (P) in the 'Perean' section, and to these J was added. He holds, however, that his results are equally available for those who accept the two-document hypothesis,³ and this is largely true. The date and other details in Perry's construction are open to question, but the non-Markan character of J and its considerable historical value are of permanent value. Like Burkitt, Perry holds that in many of its peculiar features 'the narrative is inherently more probable' than Mark 'in its details and relation'.⁴ In many respects it anticipates Streeter's findings, and to these we now turn.

Streeter's Proto-Luke hypothesis is well known and it is not necessary to describe it in detail, especially as our main interest in this investigation is the Passion narrative. Stated in its simplest terms, it is the claim that Luke first combined Q and his special source L about A.D. 60, and some twenty years later

¹ *Op. cit.* p. xxiii.² *The Four Gospels*, p. 217n.³ The latter appears to be the more probable alternative.⁴ *Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*, p. 99.

SUMMARY OF CRITICAL OPINION

expanded Q+L in compiling his Gospel.¹ The Lukan Passion narrative, he maintains, was composed by Luke, and contains extracts from Mark in xxii. 18, 22, 42, 46f., 52–61, 71; xxiii. 3, 22, 25f., 33–4b, 38, 44–6, 52f., and xxiv. 6, with possible assimilations to Mark in xxii. 69; xxiii. 35, 49, 51; xxiv. 1–3, 9f.² Whether these passages are inserted from Mark or are assimilated to it are among the questions to be examined afresh in the present investigation. It will be recalled that where Mark and Proto-Luke are parallel, Streeter suggested that Proto-Luke is sometimes inferior in historical value and sometimes superior, and that ‘as historical authorities they should probably be regarded as on the whole of approximately equal value’.³ At its inception his hypothesis was received with considerable favour in Great Britain and America.

In a full review of *Behind the Third Gospel*, A. S. Peake observed that, ‘Even if at all points the author’s suggestions may not ultimately be accepted, a substantial part of his conclusions will probably commend themselves to his fellow-workers.’⁴ H. G. Wood wrote, ‘This theory is certainly attractive, and I should say that a high degree of probability attaches to it.’⁵ G. S. Duncan declared that Proto-Luke was no longer a hypothesis; it was an established fact and the unearthing of it meant the discovery of what is ‘our earliest Gospel’.⁶ C. H. Dodd said that in his opinion Streeter’s hypothesis is right in substance, and that behind the Third Gospel probably lies a ‘proto-Luke’ which might be as early as Mark, but he doubted whether we are entitled to give the same weight to this hypothetical document as we give to the Second Gospel. His reasons for hesitation were: (a) ‘We do not know what amount of revision “proto-Luke” underwent in being incorporated in the Third Gospel’, and (b) ‘The peculiarly Lukan material, on its merits, seems in places almost demonstrably secondary to Mark, even though in some places it may be thought to have preserved a more primitive tradition.’⁷ T. W. Manson wrote, ‘It is probable that

¹ Cf. *BTG*, pp. 182–215.

² Cf. *FG*, p. 222.

³ *FG*, p. 222.

⁴ *The Holborn Review* (July 1926), pp. 368–70.

⁵ *The Friend* (July 1926).

⁶ *The Review of the Churches* (July 1926).

⁷ *The Parables of the Kingdom* (1935), p. 40.

Cambridge University Press
 0521616921: The Passion Narrative of St Luke
 Vincent Taylor
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

THE PASSION NARRATIVE OF ST LUKE

the first stage in the composition [of Luke] was the bringing together of Q and L to form a document about the size of Mark.' 'Later, material from Mark was added and the Birth and Infancy narratives were prefixed to produce the Gospel as we know it.'¹ This, of course, is the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

It is sometimes said by way of reproach that the hypothesis has received much less support in Germany and America than in Great Britain. This is true; but in Germany, as will be seen later,² J. Jeremias, H. Schürmann, and F. Rehkopf have added their support to the hypothesis. American opinion was divided, but favourable judgements were expressed by such leading scholars as B. S. Easton, F. C. Grant, and B. W. Bacon, in addition to A. M. Perry, already mentioned.

Easton's commentary on Luke (1926) appeared too early to take full account of the new theory. All the more interesting, therefore, are many opinions and judgements in the commentary which are in agreement with it. In addition to the two-document hypothesis, Easton gave an important place to the use of the L source by Luke, assigning over 500 verses to this document.³ He accepted the view that the evangelist inserted Lk. vi. 20 – viii. 3 and Lk. ix. 51 – xviii. 14 into Mark's narrative and observed that after Mk. xii, 'Luke's narrative is generally based on a non-Markan source'. Of the historical value of L he wrote,

It contains much matter of high worth, especially in the Passion narrative, but it contains also matter that is certainly secondary, with versions of historic scenes that betray theological or apologetic interests. Broadly speaking, the L narrative sections stand perhaps halfway between the best Markan tradition and the versions in the Fourth Gospel. But in the transmission of Christ's sayings the case is decidedly better, and in many respects L's contributions (particularly as regards parables) are inestimable.⁴

In the commentary from xxii. 14 onwards, the L tradition is held to be basic.

F. C. Grant in *The Growth of the Gospels* (1933) expressed a strong conviction of the fundamental correctness of Streeter's hypothesis. 'An examination of the reconstructed Proto-Luke',

¹ *A Companion to the Bible* (1939), p. 116. So also W. Manson, H. Balmforth, and H. K. Luce in their Commentaries on Luke (1930–3).

² See pp. 17–21.

³ *Commentary*, p. xxviii.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. xxviii.

Cambridge University Press

0521616921: The Passion Narrative of St Luke

Vincent Taylor

Excerpt

[More information](#)

SUMMARY OF CRITICAL OPINION

he wrote, 'will probably convince most readers that this was a real, if not wholly comprehensive, "Gospel", on a par with St Mark, and often as a source to be preferred to Mark, though they sometimes confirm each other.'¹ Especially in the Passion section, he affirmed, the narrative of Proto-Luke was in some particulars preferable to the other Gospels, preferable even to Luke which had not added greatly to the value of the narrative by the incorporation of the Marcan account of the last scenes. 'I cannot believe', he wrote, 'that in the following passages, for example, the Marcan element is the kernel or structural basis: xi. 15–18; xiv. 34; xvii. 2, 31; xix. 45f.; xxii. 3–6, 18–19, 25f., 34; xxiii. 3, 26, 38, 44f. It seems almost obvious that Marcan material has been inserted into a Q plus L framework.'² Later, in *The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth* (1957), influenced by Creed's criticism of Streeter's hypothesis, he spoke with greater reserve and indeed with considerable hesitation.³

B. W. Bacon's references to Proto-Luke in *Studies in Matthew* (1930) are brief and characteristically incisive. He pointed out that Streeter's views 'advance but little those published by Paul Feine... (1891) and since that date accepted (so far as the doctrine of a "Proto-Luke" is concerned) by many of our leading German and English critics'.⁴ 'Great impetus', he wrote, 'has undoubtedly been given by Streeter's advocacy to the theory of L (accepted since 1900 by the present writer; cf. *An Introduction to the New Testament*, New York, 1900, pp. 214ff.)'.⁵ Of Streeter's confession that for many years he was a victim to the illusion that Matthew and Luke used no other documents, or at least, none of anything like the same value as Mark and Q, he added, 'Others may decline with thanks to be included in this confession.'

It will be seen that at first the Proto-Luke hypothesis was received with considerable favour in Great Britain and America. Subsequently, however, it lost ground under the criticisms of J. W. Hunkin, J. M. Creed, and R. H. Lightfoot, and their objections must now be considered.

¹ *The Growth of the Gospels*, p. 170.

² *Op. cit.* p. 172n.

³ *The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth*, pp. 27, 118f., 129ff.

⁴ *Studies in Matthew*, p. 505.

⁵ *Ibid.*