

A READING OF THE GOSPEL  
ACCORDING TO LUKE  
AS A RESPONSE TO THE TRAGIC TRADITION

by  
James M. Donovan  
Departmental Honors  
Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

APPROVAL FOR HONORS

Director:

Donald A. Kliefelton

Department Committee:

R. C. Fulton

John H. P. [unclear]

Chairperson,

[Signature]

Department:

Int. Studies

Chairperson, Departmental Honors Committee:

Kevin A. M. [unclear]

April 13, 1981

## INTRODUCTION

Among the many purposes of the author of Luke-Acts, one of the most pertinent was "to present Roman authority to Christians, and the Christians to Roman authorities, in the best possible light, in the hope of fostering good relations between them."<sup>1</sup> The presentation of "Roman authority to Christians" was accomplished primarily through the refutation of the Jewish tradition, and the substitution of the Romans as both the legitimate political rulers and as the equally intended, more receptive recipients of the 'good news.' Toward this end, Luke portrays Romans throughout his narrative as being sympathetic or, at least, non-antagonistic. For example, the words, "this man was innocent," are voiced in Luke by a Roman centurion. This declaration may be contrasted with that of Matthew and of Mark, who both use the statement, "Truly this was the son of God," in the following manner: Matthew has this said by an unspecific "they," and while it is uttered by a lone centurion in Mark, translation defies differentiation between the all-important "the Son," or the more generic, "a son." Luke chooses to avoid this ambiguity altogether and pens a line which is much more in keeping with his tragic tone (see Part II below) by preventing a premature Discovery.

By this rejection of the Jews Luke also sought to emphasize the independence of Christianity as a religion apart

from Judaism; as long as Christianity was viewed by the Romans as merely a heretical sect among the Jews, it would be denied the official sanction which would guarantee freedom from persecution.

Christianity thus being severed from the blanket covering Judaism, it became imperative that Roman authorities be swayed as soon as possible towards the opinion that this new religion presented no threat of rebellion against their occupation and deserved their laissez-faire policy. Approaching, then, the problem of presenting "the Christians to the Roman authorities," Luke chose to fashion his apology after a literary form with which the Romans were already familiar, one which they could understand and thereby be predisposed to accept: the Greek tragedy.

These two decisions, to deny the Jews and to utilize the Greek tragedy, are, as this paper shall attempt to demonstrate, fundamental to the construction of the Gospel and hence must be dealt with when formulating a theological interpretation. Each question shall be addressed separately and in chronological order: the Judaic literary tradition must first be dismissed before the introduction of the Hellenic.

The first issue, pertaining to Luke's rejection of the Jews and the Jewish tradition, shall be undertaken from a historical and literary perspective, while the second, dealing with Luke's possible adaptation of the Greek tragedy, shall be a structural analysis and thematic study.

One question, however, must be first addressed before proceeding: Who was Luke? If we can answer this, we may perhaps have better insight into how the character of the author influences the nature of his work.

Some few statements may be made about Luke from my own researches:

- 1) Luke was not of Jewish descent. His condemnation of the Jews for the murder of Jesus comes far too easily to be from a native son;
- 2) He was extremely learned. The Greek composed by this author, while not the best, far exceeds that of the rest of the New Testament, with the possible exception of Hebrews.<sup>2</sup>

Norval Geldenhuys also reaches these conclusions, although his proofs are more substantial:

With regard to the Gentile descent of the author, the books, e.g., show signs throughout that they were written for Gentiles by a person who was himself of Gentile descent. This is evident from such facts as that (a) the citations in Luke and Acts from the Old Testament are made from the Septuagint (Greek) translation and not from the Hebrew; (b) in the Gospel the Lord is addressed not as "Rabbi" but by the Greek titles Didaskalos (Teacher) and Epistates (Master); (c) the author, unlike Matthew and Mark, never makes Jesus use Aramaic words, and only very occasionally the typically Jewish "amen" (verily); (d) the author is free from all Jewish particularism.<sup>3</sup>

Further, Geldenhuys quotes a prologue (dated between A.D. 160-180) to this third gospel:

Luke was an Antiochan of Syria, a physician by profession. He was a disciple of the apostles and later accompanied Paul until the latter's martyrdom. He served the Lord without distraction, having neither wife nor children, and at the age of eighty-four he fell asleep in Boeotia, full of the Holy Spirit. While there were already Gospels previously in existence--that according

to Matthew written in Judaea, and that according to Mark in Italy--Luke, moved by the Holy Spirit, composed the whole of this Gospel in the parts about Achaia.<sup>4</sup>

Geldenhuis feels that tradition and evidence both substantiate these claims and offer almost no contradiction.

## PART I: LUKE'S REJECTION OF THE JEWS

If someone during the first century A.D. had sat down to write of the life and sayings of Jesus the Christ, ordinary circumstances would have led him to consider the Judaic literary precedents. He would be, after all, telling the story of a Jew; further, the one Gospel he would most likely have before him, Mark's, while itself addressed to the Gentiles, was intended primarily to interpret Jewish customs.<sup>5</sup> While drawing from this Gospel and shaping its contents to his needs, he would need to decide how much of the Judaic tradition, current and otherwise, to use, and to what end.

This situation generally depicts the circumstances with which Luke was faced. Since he was a non-Jew, Luke's Judaic references would necessarily be deliberate, well-considered, and deemed complementary to his chosen themes--to the other, Jewish, Gospel writers, their use would be more natural, more automatic.

Two bodies of representative Judaic literature were available to Luke: the Old Testament and the Qumran writings. I shall argue that Luke, in his Gospel, chose to emphasize a connection to the Qumran writings, more commonly referred to as the "Dead Sea Scrolls," rather than the Old Testament. The Old Testament had been composed over an extremely long period of time, and its books had reached a static form centuries before the Christian era.<sup>6</sup> Beyond 3:22, Luke makes

only two major original insertions of Old Testament material-- all others are rooted either in his Markan usage, or in the literary tradition he shares with Matthew. These references, 9:54-55 and 7:11-17, both serve to identify Jesus with Elijah and shall be discussed later when the question of Jesus' identity is examined.

Minor insertions serve generally two purposes: 1) to re-iterate already present examples, but not to convey new images (e.g., 18:28-29), and 2) to depict Jewish life. Indeed, if it was Jewish life, then it is conceivable that Luke was not referring to the Old Testament, but rather to what practices he had himself observed (e.g., 12:47-48).

Prior to 3:22, the abrupt division between John and Jesus, Luke makes liberal use of Old Testament sources, utilizing them to demonstrate that Jesus was the prophesied Messiah. More importantly, Luke builds a progression: Jesus was born a Jew to fulfill Jewish scripture, but when he began his mission (3:22), he departed from this heritage and proclaimed a new message; there was no further need, then, to root him in Judaism.

This is not to say, however, that at any point it is forgotten that Jesus is himself a Jew. Throughout, Luke is ever-ready to remind the reader that Jesus will fulfill the ancient prophecies; the conflict between Jesus' prophetic fulfillment and the fact that the actualization of Hebrew expectation is the impetus of Christianity is an important consideration, and it shall be discussed in the second part of this thesis.

Other than prophecy, then, only at the end of the Passion does Luke return briefly to the Old Testament, assigning Jesus lines recorded only in this Gospel: 1) 23:30 ("Then they will begin to say to the mountains, 'Fall on us'; and to the hills, 'Cover us '"), from Hos. 10:8; 2) 23:46b ("Father, into your hands I commit my spirit"), from Ps. 31:5; and 3) 23:48 ("And all the multitude who assembled to see the sight, when they saw what had taken place, returned home beating their breasts"), from Zech. 12:10.

The Scrolls, though, unlike the Old Testament canon, if not being composed, were being edited constantly, up to within decades of the writing of the Gospels themselves.<sup>7</sup> Consequently, both the Scrolls and Luke's Gospel are the results of similar environments, reacting to much the same stimuli, and, indeed, each responding very much to the other.

That consideration explains why Luke chose the Scroll writings over the Old Testament: any statement he made concerning the Jews would be directed to the Jews of his day, rather than to those of a bygone age. That is, Luke would address the contemporary rather than the ancient literature.

That Luke is concerned primarily with the Jews he encountered may be seen at 16:14-31 (Lazarus and the rich man): "Jesus draws details from contemporary ways of expressing Jewish faith, including items not found in the Old Testament."<sup>8</sup> That he chose the Essene literature to represent that viewpoint may be supported by the use at 16:8 of the term, "sons of light," a Qumran expression for the righteous.



Normally, the teachings and writings of the Essene community at Qumran are considered to have been for practical purposes restricted to the community itself, making little impression, and none favorably, upon mainstream Judaism. John M. Allegro, in The Chosen People, makes a connection which would make Luke's attention to the Scrolls all the more plausible: He relates the growth, and hence the demise, of the Essenes to the Zealots. Instances of this relationship may be seen philosophically from a comparison of the following:

For from of old, since the first dawn of intelligence, we have been continually taught by those precepts, ancestral and divine--confirmed by the deeds and noble spirit of our forefathers--that life, not death, is man's misfortune. For it is death which gives liberty to the soul and permits it to depart to its own pure abode, there to be free from all calamity. But so long as it is, in sober truth, dead, for association with what is mortal ill befits that which is divine.

True, the soul possesses great capacity, even while incarcerated in the body; for it makes the latter its organ of perception, invisibly swaying it and directing it onward in its actions beyond the range of mortal nature. But it is not until, freed from the weight that drags it down to earth and clings about it, the soul is restored to its proper sphere, that it enjoys a blessed energy and a power untrammelled on every side, remaining, like God himself, invisible to human eyes. For even while in the body it is withdrawn from view: unperceived it comes, and unseen it again departs, itself of a nature one and incorruptible, but a cause of change to the body. For whatever the soul has touched lives and flourishes, whatever it abandons withers and dies; so abundant is her wealth of immortality.

Let sleep furnish you with a most convincing proof of what I say--sleep, in which the soul, undistracted by the body, while enjoying in perfect independence the most delightful repose, holds converse with God by right of kinship,

ranges the universe and foretells many things that are to come. . . .

(A speech delivered by Zealot leader Eleazar before the carrying out of a suicide pact after the defeat at Masada)

We are reminded of what Josephus had said earlier about the Essenes:

For it is a fixed belief of theirs that the body is corruptible and its constituent matter impermanent, but that the soul is immortal, and imperishable. Emanating from the finest ether, these souls become entangled, as it were, in the prison-home of the body, to which they are dragged down by a sort of natural spell; but when once they are released from the bonds of the flesh, then, as though liberated from long servitude, they rejoice and are borne aloft. . . .

The theological relationship stems from the fact that both the Essenes and the Zealots claimed to be the True Israel--an important consideration for Luke, as Christianity made essentially the same claim.

The fundamental standard of Zealotism, exclusivism for the Jews, was not a new concept, indeed having its post-exilic origins in the Deuteronomic admonitions against racial mixing (e.g., Deut. 7:3). This determination to preserve the racial identity of Judaism manifested itself violently throughout Jewish history, culminating in the Maccabean revolt against pressures to hellenize.

During the years 175-135 B.C., the house of Mattathias instigated and led a continuous revolt against the Seleucid emperor, striving first for religious freedom, then for political independence. The impetus for this uprising came in the form of hellenizing reform legislated by Antiochus IV

Epiphanes in his futile attempt to consolidate his multinational empire:

And the king wrote unto his whole kingdom, that all should be one people, and that everyone should give up his religious usages. And all the nations acquiesced in accordance with the command of the king. And many in Israel took delight in his form of worship, and they began sacrificing to idols, and profaned the sabbath. Furthermore, the king sent letters by the hand of messengers to Jerusalem and to the cities of Judah to the effect that they should practice customs foreign to the traditions of the land, and that they should cease the sacrificing of whole burnt offerings in the sanctuary, and that they should profane the sabbaths and feasts, and pollute the sanctuary and those who had been sanctified: that they should sacrifice swine and other unclean animals, and that they should leave their sons uncircumcized, and make themselves abominable by means of practicing everything that was unclean and profane, so that they might forget the Law, and change all the traditional ordinances.

I Maccabees, 41-50

The forced hellenization of Judea, whether or not it reached the cruel extremes chronicled by the Maccabean writers, was an unusual policy in the history of imperialism.<sup>10</sup>

World history offers many examples of the conqueror allying himself with the god(s) of the conquered, hence winning the support of the common folk. The head of state of Babylon became "the king . . . the chosen representative of Ashur, the warrior god of Assyria, and of Marduk, the great god of Babylon."<sup>11</sup> The Persian Cyrus, in 559 B.C., when he ascended the Babylonian throne, had written that "Marduk had visited all lands in search of an upright prince. . . . He named his name, 'Cyrus of Anshan.'"<sup>12</sup> Similarly, Alexander the Great caused himself to be identified at the Oracle of Siwah as the son of God (Amon).

Antiochus Epiphanes must then have had desperate cause to go so against tradition as to interfere in Jewish domestic custom, especially as the two preceding Seleucid monarchs, Antiochus III and Seleucus IV, are quoted by Josephus as "endorsing the rights of the Jews to live in accordance with their own laws and customs."<sup>13</sup>

The Syrian Seleucids had vied for centuries with the Egyptian Ptolemies for control over the so-called Fertile Crescent. Epiphanes had, prior to his hellenization decree, been ordered out of Egypt by Rome, who contrived to maintain a balance of power among the constantly feuding successors of Alexander, so that no one could rise to a power to rival its own. Fearing a Roman-backed Egyptian thrust into Palestine, Epiphanes sought to secure his defenses and to ascertain his subjects' loyalty to his throne. This decision required the conforming of a socially deviant Judea, so that, once in the mainstream of the empire, it might be trusted to struggle against Egyptian aggrandizement.

The Maccabean revolt, and the one later marshalled by the Zealots, justified Epiphanes' fears concerning a society not only dedicated to the practice of racial exclusivism, but also convinced of its manifest destiny to rule over the Gentile nations. When the initial revolt took place, it had the general support of all Jews, the situation being judged so grim that it convinced even the pacifistic Hasidim, "who claimed Judaism's most loyal members,"<sup>14</sup> to take up arms in

defense of themselves and their God. When, however, the initial goal of the rebellion had been achieved, namely that of the guarantee of religious freedom, and Judas, "the Hammerer," decided to press on for political autonomy as well, the common folk, tired of war, and the attuned intellectuals, aware of the inevitable outcome, gradually withdrew their unquestioned support. The Jewish conservatives, at first viewing the revolt as the hand of God working to preserve His people, later, in 152 B.C., were aghast when "Jonathan of the House of the Hasmoneans, of no priestly lineage, a war lord whose hands were stained with the blood of his priestly adversaries, became high priest, the anointed of God."<sup>15</sup> The upholders of Jewish tradition and custom had thus defiled the highest office.

It was by no coincidence, then, that during this reign (c. 125 B.C.) there appeared at the northern end of the Dead Sea a community calling itself the True Israel, which extended its segregationist policies to exclude even the Jews of Jerusalem.

Kenneth Kuntz states the generally accepted opinion when he claims that the Essenes probably descended from the Hasidim disenchanted by the outcome of the Maccabean revolt.<sup>16</sup> The Qumran community stayed within the cloistered confines of its teachings and town until it met a violent end in A.D. 68. This time was spent in the editing and interpretation of the Torah, and in the scripting of their own literary works,

outlining the expectations of their society as based on continual revelation.

For the moment, the most important facet of their lifestyle and beliefs is again their concept regarding the necessity to keep the Jewish people apart from the impure (certainly all Gentiles, and, in this community's opinion, most other Jews) in anticipation of the day when, by the grace of God, they should rule over all.

Rules and regulations regarding inter-communal behavior are specified primarily in two texts: the Manual of Discipline and the Zadokite Document. While the Manual is definitely a product of the Qumran community, the Zadokite Document was discovered at the turn of the century in Cairo, presumably the work of a similar Essene establishment. Although geographically separated, the relationship between the two "is immediately apparently as soon as it is read alongside of the Manual; and it has been confirmed by the fact that a fragment of an earlier copy of the Document has actually been found in one of the caves at Qumran."<sup>17</sup>

The relevant stipulations pertaining to the contact with outsiders are as follows: The members of the community

- a) are to keep apart from the company of the froward;
- b) are to extend forgiveness to all among the priesthood that have freely enlisted in the cause of holiness, and to all among the laity that have done so in the cause of truth, and likewise to all that have associated themselves with them.

Manual of Discipline, v, 1-7

- c) are to keep away from men of ill-repute;
- d) are to distinguish between unclean and clean and to recognize holy from profane;
- e) are to keep away from all unclean things, in accordance with what has been prescribed in each case and with the distinctions which God Himself has drawn for them.

Zadokite Document, vi, 11-vii, 6a

The radical extremes as represented by these rules are not apparent so much in the rules themselves, but rather in the interpretation of such terms as "holy" and "froward," adjectives defining the boundaries to which the regulations apply. The Manual goes on to say that those who enter into the community--hence, into holiness--are bound "to abide with all his heart and soul by the commandments of the Law of Moses, as that Law is revealed to the sons of Zadok [emphasis mine]--that is, to the priests who still keep the Covenant and seek God's will--and to a majority of their co-covenanters." Moreover, wicked men are described as those who never seek to discover the more "arcane" points of God's Law, but act "high-handedly" in regard to those which are blatantly obvious (both v, 7-20).

The arbitrary nature governing those this community judged as being worthy or unworthy to be counted among their True Israel becomes apparent. Envisioning themselves the Remnant as described by prophecy, the Qumran community could not help but feel that their interpretations were the correct ones, and that any to the contrary were the work of Belial. Theirs was an "If you are not for us, you are against us" attitude, one

directly contrary to Luke's depiction of Jesus: "For he that is not against you is for you" (9:50).<sup>18</sup> Jealous of their self-appointed role in the end days, they were determined to keep it untainted.

Originally passive, the Qumran community believed that they would triumph over the unrighteous--politically as well as spiritually--but that it would be by the hand of God, and at a time to be hastened by their strict observance of the law. Still, it is easy to understand that such extreme religious exclusivism, once engendered, could cause some of its more impatient adherents to seek to force God's hand. Zealotism was the result.<sup>19</sup>

Zealots were eager not only to throw off the Roman yoke and to win back their Jewish kingdom, but to realize their visions of the chosen ones of God--in their eyes, themselves--ruling over all the earth. Their attempts to do so, while probably heroic, were dismal failures. The First Jewish Revolt ended with the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple in A.D. 70. The racial policies instituted so many centuries before had borne their bitter fruit. The Roman Empire, seeing that the Jews would never integrate themselves into a Gentile world and would forever seize the slightest opportunity to revolt, was forced to obliterate their heart and soul. Indeed, so disgusted were the Romans with the Jews that "the very name of 'Jew' was thereafter an anathema to the Romans. It was banished even from the name of the province, to be



known thenceforth as the land of the Philistines, or 'Palestine.'"<sup>20</sup>

Such being the Jewish attitude, and such being the Roman reaction to that attitude, small wonder that Luke should seek to disclaim any further affiliation with the Jews than was absolutely necessary. Roman acceptance being the desired end, a favorable depiction of Judaism would have been detrimental. With these considerations in mind, about ten years after the destruction of Jerusalem, Luke began to write.

One method which Luke used to separate Christianity from Judaism and the Jews themselves was to contradict deliberately prevailing Jewish legalism. For instance, the Qumran Manual states:

When he has a charge against him, he is to proffer it then and there and not to render himself liable to penalty by nursing a grudge. Furthermore, no man is to bring a charge publicly against his neighbor except he prove it by witnesses (vi, I).

Matthew, who in his Gospel expounds the view that the Law of God as given to Israel is eternally valid and that Jesus is the fulfillment of that Law,<sup>21</sup> is careful to echo this Judaic sentiment:

If your brother sins against you, go and tell him his fault, between you and him alone. If he listens to you, you have gained your brother. But if he does not listen, take one or two others along with you, that every word may be confirmed by the evidence of two or three witnesses. If he refuses to listen to them, tell it to the church; and if he refuses to listen even to the church, let him be to you as a Gentile and a tax collector (18:15-17).

When Luke approaches this passage, though, and uses it in exactly the same context as does Matthew, he makes it simpler, and more truly forgiving, more "Christian" as opposed to "Jewish." His reworking stands as a denial of Judaic legalism:

Take heed to yourselves; if your brother sins, rebuke him, and if he sins against you seven times in a day, and turns to you seven times, and says, 'I repent,' you must forgive him (17:3-4).

As another example of Luke's presenting the Christian ethic as opposed to the Jewish tradition, the moral versus the legal, appears in 14:5-6:

And he said to them, 'Which of you, having a son or an ox that has fallen into a well, will not immediately pull him out on a sabbath day?' And they could not reply to this.

These verses are a composite of two sabbath regulations presented in the Zadokite Document:

- a) No one is to foal a beast on the Sabbath day. Even if it drop its young into a cistern or a pit, he is not to lift it out on the Sabbath;
- b) If a human being falls into a place of water or into a dark place, one is to bring him up by means of a ladder or a rope or some other instrument (xi, 10).<sup>22</sup>

Whereas the Document says never to rescue an animal, and a person only through some mediary instrument, Luke equates man and beast and says that either would most certainly be rescued through direct intervention (i.e., pulling).<sup>23</sup>

The Lucan separation from the Jewish heritage is rendered final at 3:18-22. Here Luke ends the Jewish era, that

of "the law and the prophets," by placing John in the prison of Herod before Jesus is baptized, before the Spirit descends, before the Christian mission is begun. No other Gospel, including John's, does this; in all other versions, the Christ is baptized by John himself.

This abrupt division between the two eras--the one completely ending before the other truly begins--underlies Norman Perrin's view of the function of the Gospel according to Luke: whereas Matthew wrote to show Jesus as the fulfillment of Israel's expectation, Luke interprets Jesus as "quite simply the first Christian."<sup>24</sup> As one sees an end, the other anticipates a beginning.

The messianic expectations of the Qumran community differed greatly from the reality of the Christ portrayed by Luke. Anticipating two Messiahs--one a priest, the other a king (or lay, as seen by Zad. vii; Levi to Judah)--the community "gave precedence to the Messiah descended from Levi rather than to the Messiah from the house of David."<sup>25</sup> Regarding the majority of Israel as being unworthy, the community was ill-disposed to consider the merits of a restoration of political sovereignty under a Davidic Messiah from outside their sect. Instead, they preferred the promise of a priest who would bring righteousness and salvation to the keepers of the law (themselves). It is this priestly Messiah, not the lay, who is to lead the righteous into final battle against Belial (The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness, vii, 8-ix, 9).

Luke allows no questions as to the Davidic lineage of Jesus: His genealogy (3:23-28) links "Jesus' line with God's original creation Adam, showing Jesus' common humanity, as contrasted with Matthew's emphasis on Jesus' Jewish lineage as descended from Abraham--1:1-17."<sup>26</sup> However, even if the community was prepared to accept Jesus as the Messiah from Judah, they would still be expecting the greater redeemer from Levi.

There has long been debate over the exact relationship among the three synoptics: Even if the priority of Mark is allowed, how do Matthew and Luke relate, if at all? The position I have found most useful is that Matthew and Luke wrote independently of one another, both drawing from a common body of Jewish tradition. Where Luke rejects it, however, Matthew represents it in a form closer to the original. In other words, Luke may be expected to contradict Matthew in outlook on Jewish tradition if Luke's refutation was as thorough and intentional as has been here proposed.

This point may be demonstrated even further than has been above by a comparison of Matthew 23 and Luke 9:37-54. According to the arguments presented thus far, one would expect to find the following: Matthew castigates the Pharisees not because of their emphasis on the law, but because they do not practice what they preach; Luke, on the other hand, would reject the Jewish legalism altogether.

As a case in point, there are the following passages:

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you tithe mint and dill and cummin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law, justice and mercy and faith (Matt. 23:23).

But woe to you Pharisees! for you tithe mint and rue and every herb, and neglect justice and love of God (Luke 9:42).

Luke omits the law as a consideration and says by implication that it is rather an overemphasis of the law which obscures the "justice and love of God." Matthew, however, throughout his chapter instructs his readers to "practice and observe what the Pharisees tell you, but not what they do" (23:3), thereby vindicating the law while condemning these particular practitioners.

Further denial of the law is accomplished by Luke not only by condemning the Pharisees, but also the lawyers (defined by the New Oxford Annotated Bible as being "teachers of the Jewish law"). Consequently, both the propagators and the adherents to the law are severely chastened.

Marvin Harris, in his Cows, Pigs, Wars and Witches, agrees with many of the points in this section of my thesis, but specifically that the Qumran sect was militant in nature (p. 156+). However, he takes this conclusion a step further, saying in fact that Jesus' entire mission was militantly attuned, and that it was not until after the fall of Jerusalem that he was "rewritten" to read as a Prince of Peace. If Harris is correct, then I feel my argument to be strengthened.

It has already been suggested that Luke attempted to dissociate Jesus from the Jews and their militant messianic

expectations through his Gospel. Harris points out that, according to Josephus, the Romans were well acquainted with pretenders to the title of "Messiah"; if Jesus had indeed behaved initially as the typical militant, then Luke's sense of urgency to present Jesus in a new light would have been drastically increased. Indeed, when his Gospel is compared with Matthew's, we find some subtle, yet interesting, differences. Where Luke (12:51-52) writes:

Do you think that I have come to give peace on earth? No, I tell you, but rather division; for henceforth in one house there will be five divided, three against two and two against three. . . .

Matthew (10:34) offers:

Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword.

The disagreement between the two passages comes from Luke's use of "division" where Matthew chooses "sword." Matthew's image is clearly violent, and, whether he intended it to do so or not, the word evokes the very militant messiah that Luke is trying to avoid. "Division" is less offensive, especially when read with an understanding of an alternate meaning from the Greek: dissension, not unreasonably of the kind we have even today, that between the acceptors and the rejectors of the person of Jesus as Christ.

In Matthew's account of the betrayal in the garden, we are told that "one of those who were with Jesus stretched out his hand and drew his sword" (26:51a). While Luke also

has a similar drawing of the sword in his version, Matthew's is unique in that he has no previous mention of such a sword; we are left to conclude that the disciples of Jesus were accustomed to carrying weapons concealed on their persons. Again, this would be an insinuation which Luke would hope to avoid. Consequently, he introduces the passage of 22:35-38, wherein Jesus literally tells the apostles to get a sword. No one is then surprised when a sword is drawn by a disciple; we know where it came from.

As our first section concludes, then, its important points may be summarized thus:

- 1) Due to Israel's political history, Luke chose deliberately to deny any connection with Judaism that was not absolutely necessary;
- 2) To accomplish this end, he favored Christian concepts over Jewish ones, and juxtaposed the two. As a foil to his Christian understanding, he chose contemporary Jewish writings over the canonical Old Testament, namely the Qumran scrolls and the body of knowledge which Matthew faithfully reflects (not necessarily two distinct bodies). Furthermore, Luke took added pains to avoid depicting Jesus as the expected militant Messiah.

Having rejected the Jewish tradition, Luke would have perhaps looked for an alternative to fill the void. The tragic drama may have been one choice, and it is to this possibility that the second part of this thesis looks.

## PART II: LUKE AS TRAGEDY

It has been suggested above that Luke may have set out to deny affiliation with the Jews and their traditions. If he had, he would hardly have lapsed into a thoughtless echoing of literary forms common to the Jewish religion; on the contrary, he would have chosen as model a form alien to the Palestinian native, one which would at the same time reinforce his support for the Roman occupation. I contend that Luke modeled his Gospel after the tragic tradition as he perceived it.

It has already been noted that Israel had been bombarded on all sides with hellenizing influences and that, although stubborn resistance was its usual response, eventually even this last pocket of rejection was forced to conform. Theatre was a vital aspect of that Greek influence, for wherever were Greeks, there were theatres.

If the first thing any group of Greek settlers did was to establish a gymnasium, the next thing they did was to provide a theatre; ruins of Greek theatres have been found in all parts of the hellenized world.<sup>27</sup>

Such being the general rule for the hellenized world, we next see that Palestine was no exception, with Jerusalem in particular having a theatre built by Herod the Great (c. 40 B.C.):<sup>28</sup>

Greek drama enjoyed a great vogue. The great auditoria could not have been filled by Greeks



alone, and there is literary evidence that others attended and knew the classic repertoire. At Miletus a special section of the theatre was reserved for Jews, [and] Philo freely admits his fondness for the theatre.<sup>29</sup>

If even the Jews were beginning to acquaint themselves with the pleasures of Greek drama, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Luke, a well-educated Gentile, also enjoyed exposure.

The last point in this progression is to illustrate that Luke would not have been without precedence in modeling his Gospel after tragedy:

We know of Jews who themselves wrote tragedies in Greek verse and whose plays, like the Exodus by a certain Ezekiel, were no doubt performed in the theatre which Herod built.<sup>30</sup>

Far more pertinent, however, is the observation by Moses Hadas that "the author of IV Maccabees models his whole work on the pattern of tragedy."<sup>31</sup>

Clearly, given the immense popularity of Greek drama in the hellenized world, Rome included, and the fact that not only were the Jews themselves now writing tragedy, but one of their sacred (although non-canonical) texts had been modeled after tragedy, it would seem more surprising had Luke not also been influenced by the same tragic tradition.

Others have also recognized that literary pieces are rarely, if ever, penned in ignorance of the streams of current convention. Pope Pius XII (Divino Afflante Spiritu) directed that "scholars must search out the literary form in

which each part of Scripture is written. He admonished scholars to search among the literary remains contemporary with the Bible to find out what was expected of an author in those ancient times."<sup>32</sup>

The following examination of Luke's Gospel is divided into two sections: one based on structure and the other on theme. These are two different considerations for the novice playwright, and while fairly intimate knowledge of structure may be assimilated by the avid theatre-goer, the thematic requirements of tragedy prove to be more elusive, and hence require separate study.

## Section A

However erudite the writer of Luke's Gospel may have been, there is no reason to assert that his skill as a playwright would have been anything better than mediocre. Attempts to identify inviolable structural patterns are frustrated by inevitable incongruities, faults present even in the works of the masters (as Richmond Lattimore points out about Euripides' Medea)

Despite his best intentions, an amateur dramatist such as Luke would have been conscious more of the technical components of a tragic play rather than of the thematic requirements. Certain rules, then, he as an informed spectator would have known not to break: 1) No play can have more than three actors; and 2) A chorus of fifteen members had to be dealt with. These are the first two issues with which this section shall deal.

The first step towards an analysis of the dramatic structure of Luke's Gospel is to divide the text into episodes. We shall treat the term "episode" as meaning that unit of action defined on either side by any one or combination of the following: 1) temporal transition, 2) spatial displacement, and 3) necessary narrative.<sup>33</sup>

Temporal transition, or time unaccounted for, would have been a powerful indicator of division for the ancient tragic audience. They were accustomed to both temporal and spatial unity in a play, meaning that it usually took place

in the course of one day, and all on one site (incidents at other locales being reported by messengers, et al.). An example of such a transition might be the following: 6:1 begins "On a sabbath. . .," while 6:6 picks up with "On another sabbath. . . ." The listener knows that at least one week has passed by unaccounted for and expects something new to begin with verse six.

The accounting for of time need not necessarily be a detailed description of some encounter. It often suffices to make such general, non-specific statements as "And the child grew" (1:80) and "And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature" (2:52). The years are accounted for, although we are told none of the details.

Spatial displacement is easily defined as a shift in locale by the attention of the listening audience, usually as it follows Jesus. Examples might be "And when it was day he departed and went into a lonely place" (4:42) and "Then they seized him and led him away, bringing him into the high priest's house" (22:54).

Sometimes, however, these physical shifts are not so obvious, and only become apparent when compared with the prior episode. For instance, in 9:10, Jesus is with his disciples in Bethsaida. Then, in the next episode, beginning at 9:18, we suddenly find Jesus alone. No verbs of motion cued us, but the displacement has occurred nonetheless. Or, in another example of this subtlety, 20:19 begins "The scribes and chief

priests tried to lay hands on him at that very hour, but they feared the people. . . ." The actual shift is in the point-of-view of the narrator, rather than of any character, but, due to Luke's spotlight effect (see note 33), a change of setting is required.

Of the three division markers, only the last might entail some difficulty in understanding. Although perhaps based on tragedy, by no stretch of the imagination was the Gospel ever intended to be staged. Luke knew fully well that his text would be read aloud from the pulpit (That such was the usual means of propagating religious texts is shown at 4:16-20, where Jesus reads in the synagogue). Even more so, expected recitation of a work went beyond mere synagogue practices. Senecan tragedies (c. A.D. 54) were also produced more to be read than to be produced:

Whether or not the plays were intended for presentation is a moot point; the probability is that they were not, though they were written with the conditions of presentation in mind.<sup>34</sup>

"All literature," Clarence Mendell tells us about works by the time of Nero, "was produced with the audience in mind, a restricted audience who would actually hear the reading and who must be influenced through the ear and not through the eye. This audience therefore becomes of prime importance to an understanding of the character of the literature."<sup>35</sup>

In a truly theatrical spirit, Luke chose to involve the reader of his Gospel in the drama as a narrator of events, fulfilling a role perhaps comparable to the classical

Messenger, who appeared onstage to inform the actors (and the audience) of information otherwise hidden from them. Thus we see the friendly parenthetical asides as in 2:23, 7:29-30, and 8:29b. These, however, are what I term unnecessary narratives, unnecessary in the sense that while they aid in the flow of the story-telling, they are not fundamental to the story.

Necessary narrative is that which furthers the required action without the involvement of the actors, indicated most directly by the lack of character dialogue. Examples would be 3:23-38, 8:1-3, and 19:47-48. These sections, oftentimes no more than a few verses in length, offer necessary information and frequently provide the dramatic fluidity of cause and effect, the prophetic foreshadowing common to tragedy, and a smooth transition between episodes.

In essence, then, anything which disrupts the expected dramatic continuity is a cue for a new episode. Disunities in time, setting and character focus allow a natural segmenting of Luke's Gospel.

The episode/narrative breakdown presented in Appendix I utilizes the first thirteen and the last five chapters from Luke's Gospel.<sup>36</sup> This breakdown, once understood, does not force upon the Gospel a structure incongruent with the proposed purposes of the author.

The listing offered, on the criteria outlined, compares extremely favorably with standard breakdowns of the Gospel

verses. Of the episode/narrative sequence in App. I, sixty-three (63) of the seventy-five (75) divisions match exactly with those incorporated into the original Greek text as presented by the American Bible Society, 3rd edition; of the twelve (12) divisions which do not match with the original Greek, eleven (11) do match with indentations presented in The New Oxford Annotated Bible, RSV (neither text lists the criteria by which it was decided whether to indent the verse, thus setting it apart from what preceded as being somehow different).<sup>37</sup>

It may seem difficult to imagine that the hordes of sick people, disciples, Jewish elders and Roman centurions can be accounted for by three actors, as is indeed the requirement. (Sophocles, the classical Greek playwright [c. 5th C. B.C.], added a third actor to his literary inheritance from Aeschylus. The dramatic tradition in closest proximity to Luke, Seneca, preserved intact this formula.)<sup>38</sup> A careful reading is required, however, to determine exactly who is "onstage" as opposed to merely being mentioned.

At the outset, Luke established a primary rule regarding actors: There are two types of unnamed speakers: A) a speaker from the chorus, a voice that issues from the midst of a crowd, and B) a genuine actor's role. Type B speakers include all the infirms healed; type A, those involved in questioning Jesus.

Taking the character list from App. I, Appendix II successfully apportions all the roles among the three actors. Each time a character appears, it is played by the same actor (e.g., Jesus is always Actor 1; Actor 2 plays all the infirm persons; Actor 3 portrays most of the female roles). There are no contradictions of dual appearances; every role is covered. The closest Luke comes to making a mistake is when he requires Actor 3 to play both the woman with the "flow of blood" and the dead girl's mother (Chap. VIII, ep. d). But Jesus encounters the first on his way to the second, and, as both are women, all that is needed is a simple (imaginary) mask change. The problem is narrowly averted.<sup>39</sup>

Of greater complexity is the resolution of the function of the chorus, which, if the hypothesis is true that Luke modeled his Gospel after tragedy, he must somehow include.<sup>40</sup> At first glance (see Appendix III) the chorus seems to shift in and out of so many roles that it has no personality of its own. While Luke did indeed take many liberties with his chorus, some of which would never work or be accepted on a true stage (e.g., requiring a choral member to hold the mask of Joseph in Chap. II, eps. 3 and 4), he was not as careless as he may appear. The chorus shifts between three personalities: 1) the people (under various names, "multitudes," "shepherds," "mobs," "friends," etc.); 2) the disciples; and 3) the Pharisees and scribes.



These classes are not nearly so distinct as we have perhaps been led to believe. The disciples were chosen from among the people, and the people eventually allow themselves to further the ends of the Pharisees. An intermingling of these three is not only to be expected, but is necessary in the same sense as are the below-mentioned reminders that Jesus himself is of the family of man. In truth, there can be no distinction among any of the Gospel characters; they are all sprung from the same root, as Luke's genealogy amply points out. Adam is the father of all men. Any attempt to segregate these people into classes would be antithetical to the purpose of Luke. The chorus can then easily handle this change of titles, reiterating that the basic character of man remains the same throughout.

To have maintained the continuity of his chorus would have also had far-reaching implications for Luke's work, in fact rendering it impossible. Traditionally, the chorus bounded the temporal-spatial uniformity of a play; the action took place within the span of a single day and usually at one locale. Since Luke was presenting the story of Jesus' entire life, obviously this function of the chorus would have to be eliminated. This he accomplished by eliminating the continuity (of phenotype, at least) of the chorus itself.

Of a more practical concern is the handling of numbers, especially when two, or sometimes all three, of these classes appear onstage simultaneously.

Only three of the twelve apostles are consistently used throughout: Peter, John and James (Levi is "onstage" by name once. We hear about the others only from one narrative). The presence of these three among the chorus, or any part of the chorus, designates that group as "the disciples." Of these three, only Peter speaks; he is the choral leader.

With only three members necessarily involved in the "disciples" designation, the remaining twelve are free to become either indistinctive disciples themselves, or Pharisees, or a general crowd.

In true choral fashion, the chorus is "onstage" in one identity or the other throughout, save for only four episodes (I, b; I, c; IV, a; X, c). By contrast, only Actor 1 is consistently "onstage."

The only other major structural device one might expect to find had Luke indeed modeled his Gospel after tragedy is the division of the entire work into five acts. This technique was one given final sanction from Seneca and is one to which the customary, although not required, three episodes, plus prologos and exodus, of Greek tragedy correspond (as I have defined and used the word "episode" elsewhere, I shall hereafter use the technically less accurate term "act" in this context to avoid confusion).<sup>41</sup>

The prologos, the device traditionally used to "set the stage," to bring the audience up to date, and to prepare them for the story to follow, is that four verse introduction

at the beginning of the Gospel, wherein Luke sets the tone for the work to follow. The Gospel is to be self-consciously a recounting of information from first-hand sources, directed towards a specific individual. The reader, then, has in a sense become privy to a private correspondence. In a different light, the name "Theophilus" can be translated literally into "God-lover," and then the Gospel would seem to be addressed to the convert. The reader thus views the Gospel as laden with all kinds of hidden knowledge into which he, as a new member of the community, will be initiated. Either way, Luke is telling someone that here is something he ought to know; fulfilled expectation and unveiled truth become watch-words for Luke.

The first act, then, commences at 1:5 and runs through 3:17. Following this section is an extended narrative in which Jesus is baptized and his genealogy is recorded. This transition from Act I to Act II is probably Luke's finest moment as a playwright; Act I, which formally ends after 3:17, is followed by the longest narrative of the Gospel, wherein is recounted Jesus' genealogy. Its placement here emphasizes the separation of the first three chapters in all senses (Jewish/Christian, old/new, Act I/Act II) and prepares us for what is to follow; Act II begins with Jesus now "full of the Holy Spirit."

Act II (4:1-21:38) ultimately involves little real action, instead defining the characters, reiterating prophecy and generally setting up the circumstances which will culminate

in the rapid action of Act III. It is in this last act that everything "happens." Satan, who, at the beginning of Act II, had "departed until an opportune time" (4:13), reappears at last to work his will, "entering into Judas called Iscariot" (22:3)--Jesus' inevitable betrayal had been prophesied three times in Act II (9:21-27, 9:43b-45, 18:31-34).

The exodus (24:50-53) fulfills its literal function, that of getting everyone "out of the way." Jesus ascends to heaven, and the disciples go off to the temple. At the end of Luke's Gospel, after twenty-four chapters of describing the life and sayings of Jesus the Christ, the stage is empty.

To this point it has been argued that due to historical considerations Luke chose to reject the Judaic tradition, whereas Matthew embraced it, and that Luke, in his rejection, favored a tragic format. It stands to reason, then, that there should be striking differences between the two Gospels should this hypothesis be plausible. Focusing on the first five chapters of Matthew and comparing them with Luke should serve to illustrate these differences.

Most obvious of all the contrasts between Matthew and Luke is the lack of dialogue in Matthew. Not until 3:15 does one character respond verbally to another; previously, imperatives had been issued and unquestioningly obeyed. Compare, for instance Mt. 4:18-22 and Lk. 5:1-11 (the calling of Simon Peter). Matthew's account is dry and flat: Jesus sees them, calls them, and they "immediately left their nets and followed him."

Luke's, on the other hand, is more interesting. First Jesus works his miracle of catching the fish, and then Simon Peter, in understandably human awe, falls to his knees, pleading with Jesus to depart (all original Lucan material). Only then does Jesus call him; only then is Simon Peter so eager to go. With Luke we understand Simon Peter's motivation; not so with Matthew.

Without verbal exchange, the same criteria for dramatic sectioning applied to Luke requires that the first three chapters of Matthew be categorized as strictly narrative. This fact would render a dramatic interpretation of Matthew extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Sometimes Luke's dramatization of his Gospel requires merely rearranging, and not completely rewriting, the material. Matthew orders his temptations in the desert as follows: 1) stone into bread; 2) throwing self down from pinnacle of the temple; and 3) kingdoms of the world. Luke presents the same temptations, but in order of 1-3-2. This rearrangement is suitable for Luke's purposes, for do not all heads turn toward Jerusalem ("for it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem" [13:33])?

The structure of Luke's Gospel, then, bears scrutiny under light of the dramatic expectation of his day and is unique from the contemporary Gospel of Matthew in this regard. A work can look like tragedy, however, without being tragedy; certain circumstances, problems and resolutions were expected of a tragedy. It is at these considerations that the next section looks.

## Section B

To this point we have managed to discuss some aspects of tragedy without presenting a working definition of tragedy; now that we know from Section A what tragedy looks like, we can study what tragedy is essentially and how it applies to Luke's Gospel.

Brian Vickers proposes this interpretation of tragedy:

Greek tragedy is essentially a representation of human suffering, and of the causes and effects of it; and that within and without the play this suffering produces in humane characters or in humane spectators the feeling of sympathy for the sufferer.<sup>42</sup>

However, the essence of tragedy may be more succinctly illustrated by looking at what Aristotle considers to be the perfect plot for a tragic play:

The perfect Plot, accordingly, must have a single, and not a double issue; the change in the hero's fortunes must be not from misery to happiness, but on the contrary from happiness to misery; and the cause of it must lie not in any depravity, but in some great error on his part, the man himself being either such as we have described (i.e., at least as good morally as we are ourselves), or better, not worse than that.<sup>43</sup>

The first question to ask, then, is "Who is the hero?" Jesus, certainly, is the response. But who is Jesus?

Luke's genealogy (3:23-38) establishes Jesus' descent from Adam, a common ancestor to all men; hence, Jesus is related to all men. This blood-tie allows for the tragic device of hamartia, which Vickers defines as harm done by

blood relations to other relations through ignorance-- often extending to knowledge of the familial ties themselves-- and sometimes without evil intent.<sup>44</sup> Classical examples are the times when Agave kills her son in a spell of frenzy (Euripides, Bacchae) and when the maddened Heracles murders his wife and son (Euripides, Heracles). Some other instances are more subtle: Aegisthus' discovery of Orestes under his roof (Aeschylus, Libation Bearers) and Theseus' incorrect belief in Hippolytus' accused seduction attempt on Phaedra (Euripides, Hippolytus) are yet further instances of hamartia.

Not only is Jesus connected to Adam by being the son of his mother, his function is that of being a new Adam, by being the son of his heavenly Father (In the genealogy, Jesus seems to inherit his lineage through Joseph, whom we know not to have been Jesus' real father. The true genealogy should have been matrilinear, but would nevertheless have begun with Adam and Eve: As Jesus is the second Adam, so too is Mary the new Eve.) The Jews' failure to recognize Jesus as the son of their God, whose mission was to lead the way to their common Father, and their subsequent (unjust) murder of him amounts to acts of hamartia. The combined effect is interesting, for while the readers know the hidden identity of Jesus from the outset (a device common in Greek drama), the Jews never learn, and therefore never repent of their crime.

As will be suggested below, the "tragic-ness" of this Gospel stems from a failure of the Jews to recognize Jesus for who he is: the son of their God, the new and perfect Adam. Who do they think he is, then? The first response to this question is nothing more than the obvious: "Is this not Joseph's son" (4:22b). When eventually it begins to dawn on them that perhaps he is something more than this, the Jews speculate as to who he might be. The question, however, is further clouded for them by Luke's original usage of two Old Testament passages.

The New Oxford Annotated Bible, RSV parallels the account of Jesus' resurrecting the widow's son at Lk. 7:11-17 with that of I Kings 17:17-24. The O.T. version ends with a revealed truth concerning Elijah: "Now I know that you are a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in your mouth is truth." The revelation concluding Luke's account, though, is a less accurate description of Jesus: "A great prophet has risen among us." The next statement is closer to the truth, but, when coupled with the other, it loses the impact it might have had as revealing Jesus' identity: "God has visited his people."

It is not without reason, then, that in the minds of some of the Jews Jesus is linked to Elijah, and that, when he asks "Who do the people say that I am," one of the replies is "Elijah" (9:18-19). Jesus denies that this is so, however, when, at 9:54-55, he forbids his disciples to "bid



fire come down from heaven and consume (the Samaritans)," an act Elijah did not hesitate to perform at II Kings 1:9-16.

If Jesus is clearly more than Joseph's son, but not Elijah, who is he? This question remained a prime concern in Luke's Gospel. Three times during the Passion he is asked to reveal his identity (22:67, 22:70, 23:3), each time cryptically answering. In the end, all they definitely know is that, whoever he was, "this man was innocent" (23:47).

Having now a clear idea of who the hero was and of who he was thought to be, we can look at the next requirement for Aristotle's perfect tragic plot: The hero must be involved in a change of fortune from happiness to misery (peripeteia). Many readers of the Gospel according to Luke might off-handedly comment that this peripeteia is certainly not true in Jesus' case--he does, after all, succeed in overcoming death itself. But what has failed to be realized is that Jesus was not contending against death; Jesus, the hero, was being oppressed by the Jews.<sup>45</sup> Why did Jesus come? To save men's lives, we are told (alt. reading, 9:55). True, this deed could only be accomplished through his personal victory over death, but even then only if the Jews (and the rest of the world) recognized him as the son of God.

Most classical tragedies have the hero striving to overcome his particular destiny, but always in vain. Oedipus, for example, goes to great lengths to avoid the prophecy that he would kill his father and marry his mother; in his

attempts to evade this destiny, he inadvertently fulfills it. It is through this innocent suffering, which, as Aristotle says, must be through no fault of the hero, that a play qualifies as tragedy. Jesus, however, is as one with the Providence which dictates his crucifixion; consequently, he does not seek to avoid it.

Rather, in Jesus' case, the tragic engagement is between himself and the people he has come to redeem. The perfect man seeks to save his brothers; time and again he reveals to them the marvels of his heavenly kingdom. Blinded, however, by the same faults which tainted the original Adam, they reject him and his kingdom, crucifying him. The unthinkable has occurred: God has failed, for while Jesus' death was preordained, the Jews' acceptance/rejection was left to their free will. The death and resurrection of Jesus was for naught unless the Jews recognized and accepted him, which they did not.

Jesus' peripeteia, then, is from a state of a man/deity whose birth is heralded by angels, to a man who, although he is raised from the dead, has failed to redeem his people. Jesus' suffering and death are consequently pointless, and, by definition, tragic. (Obviously, Luke could not leave the state of affairs in such a defeated condition and therefore proceeded to write the Acts of the Apostles, wherein Jesus' plan is finally realized.)

The remaining conditions for Aristotle's plot are fairly obvious: Jesus is certainly at least as good morally as we are ourselves, and his failure to redeem his people comes not from any depravity of his own, but rather from the obstinance of the people he came to save. The one error which necessitated the failure of his plan comes from a refusal on his part to manifest himself outright and to force even the most resistant of Pharisees to acknowledge him as the Messiah.

At 16:31 Jesus states through a parable that "if they do not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced if someone should rise from the dead." Doubting, then, that any such manifestation would even be effective (as further demonstrated at 22:67: "'If you are the Christ, tell us.' But he said to them, 'If I tell you, you will not believe.'"), he was restricted from any attempt to do so because it would have interfered with the free will of the people involved or the element of faith.

Jesus freely chooses to accept his destiny (that he apparently has a voice in the matter may be seen at 22:42, where he consciously subordinates his will to that of his Father); likewise, the people he was to have saved are free. They can choose whether or not to accept Jesus. This act of faith is also the impetus of redemption and is vastly different from a mere yielding to empirical observation. God could have spared the original Adam from his fall in a

similar way: After explaining the results of eating the fruit, surely Adam would have not yielded to temptation as readily. Instead, all he received was a command not to eat, emphasized by an admonition which would have had little meaning to the first man: "In the day that you eat of it you shall die" (Gen. 2: 17). Since death did not enter into man's world until after the fall, how was Adam to have known what the consequences truly were? Jesus' error, then, seems to have been presuming to save a people who, on all counts, did not seem to want to be saved, and he is powerless to save them in spite of themselves.

## CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to describe the historical events which might have made Luke's use of a tragic model for his Gospel plausible, and then to examine the Gospel text to see whether it indeed bears scrutiny under light of dramatic formulae. I believe that it does. Although this suggestion might influence any theological reading of Luke, I have left such a detailed reading aside as being outside the scope of this paper.

I understand that the argument presented herein only scratches the surface of my topic; I was told once that to do the subject justice would require a five-volume series. I am also aware that there may be many counter-arguments. Most of these, however, strike me as attacking one particular facet or the other of the thesis without undermining the general point. One argument, though, I have found to require a closer look, for should it go uncontested, it would destroy entirely the validity of my suggested reading of Luke.

D.D. Raphael argues that "religion, as understood in our Biblical tradition, tends to be inimical to Tragedy."<sup>46</sup> Specifically, he states that

The religion of the Bible is inimical to Tragedy, first because it is optimistic and trusts that evil is always a necessary means to greater good, and secondly because it abases man before the sublimity of God. Tragedy, on the other hand, treats evil as unalloyed evil; it regrets

the waste of human worth of any kind, and does not think that innocent suffering can be justified.<sup>47</sup>

I would be forced to concur with Raphael if his reading of the relation of religion and tragedy did indeed fit all classical tragedy. For example, it seems to me not inconceivable that tragedy, too, can work its way to a greater good. In the Oresteia of Aeschylus, the stories fashion themselves around a skeletal framework wherein one evil act leads to another; innocents are slain mercilessly in order to requite some former act, and that act in turn demands a future one (e.g., the death of Iphigenia requires the death of Agamemnon, which requires the death of Clytemnestra). The greater good achieved could be viewed as being an awareness that evils are ultimately avenged, and that those who undertake acts of requital at the directive of the gods will be spared, thereby ending what is potentially an eternal chain of retribution: The good will out. Thus, while the waste may be justifiably lamented, the plays reinforce the universal balance.

The other reason by which Raphael argues the incompatibility of Christianity and tragedy is based on the fact that a tragic hero must be more sublime than the forces against which he contends; this stipulation is difficult if the mortal hero is pitting himself against the Christian God. As has already been pointed out, one must not be too quick to associate elements of oracular (divine) manifestation

with conflict. Ronald Bohrer states that "I conclude. . . that within certain limitations there is free will in Aeschylus and in Greek tragedy in general."<sup>48</sup> Tragic heroes are free (generally) to choose the course of their actions, even as it has been mentioned that Jesus and the Jews are free. Just because one must do something (within the context of a certain myth cycle), does not mean that one cannot willingly choose to act accordingly. The tragic conflict may just as easily arise other than with the play's resident god.

One play which seems to be an exception to both of these arguments by Raphael might be Sophocles' Antigone. The greater good achieved is the reassertion of unwritten divine law over written secular law and the demonstration that acts of hubris breed their own bitter rewards. In this case, the heroine (Antigone) is more sublime than the antagonist, Creon, for although there is no escaping her fate, she does not resist it, going so far as to rush headlong into death in order to prove her point.

Consequently, a classical tragedy may be read to exhibit the very qualities which Raphael excludes for tragedy, reserving them for biblical religion and specifically Christianity. His general point remains valid, but he fails to argue his sweeping generality as inviolable law.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Norman Perrin, The New Testament (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1974), p. 200.

<sup>2</sup> The Interpreter's Bible cites examples where Luke, when basing his Gospel upon that of Mark, properly corrects Mark's use of the imperfect with the gnomic aorist.

<sup>3</sup> Norval Geldenhuys, Commentary on the Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), p. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 17-18.

<sup>5</sup> Notes from Dr. Robert C. Mildram's New Testament course (Religion 212), University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Spring 1980.

<sup>6</sup> Even though the canon of the Hebrew Bible was not finalized until A.D. 90, at Jamnia, that debate was over which books were authentic, rather than over the contents of the books, per se.

<sup>7</sup> The Essene community of Wadi Qumran ceased to exist in A.D. 68, whereas Luke and Matthew both were written A.D. 80-90.

<sup>8</sup> The New Oxford Annotated Bible, Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 1270.

<sup>9</sup> John M. Allegro, The Chosen People (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972), p. 274. More succinctly, he states that "Some scholars have from the beginning identified the Scrolls as 'Zealot' in origin, against the trend of opinion that designated them as 'Essene.' In fact, the rigid division that historians have tended to erect between the two parties of Judaism was probably never justified. Both stem from a common source. Their differences are rather in degrees of emphasis than in radically divergent religio-political outlooks" (p. 287).

<sup>10</sup> "Hellenization," while used in other contexts usually referring to a particular culturalization, when used in terms of Judaism was regarded as an attack on the religious as well as the social customs. As Allegro points out, "Judaism was not just the worship of Yahweh and the observance of certain cultic laws and customs; it was an exclusive way of life" (The Chosen People, p. 78). An attempt to reform the social, then, became necessarily a threat to the religious.



<sup>11</sup> Carl Roebuck, The World of Ancient Times (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), p. 148.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 161.

<sup>13</sup> Moshe Pearlman, The Maccabees (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1973), p. 18.

<sup>14</sup> J. Kenneth Kuntz, The People of Ancient Israel (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1974), p. 493.

<sup>15</sup> Allegro, p. 103.

<sup>16</sup> Kuntz, p. 493.

<sup>17</sup> Theodore H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1956), p. 33. This observation is of paramount importance in that it partially validates the theory of Luke's use of Essene literature by indicating that it was, indeed, in circulation.

<sup>18</sup> Luke 9:50 might at first glance appear to contradict 11:23a ("He who is not with me is against me"). This is not necessarily true. 9:50 implies that if the non-converts are not actively opposing, then they could be said to be following Thomas More's "Silence implies consent"; 11:23a, however, makes an entirely different claim. He who is not with Jesus (does not follow him) is to be regarded as beneath him. In Greek, it becomes a weighing of nuances: καθ' ὑμῶν ὑπερ ὑμῶν; μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ.

<sup>19</sup> This argument is not intended to imply necessarily a direct cause-and-effect relationship between the Essenes and the Zealots, but rather that they both embraced the same vision of a Jewish kingdom, dominating the Gentiles.

<sup>20</sup> Allegro, p. 300.

<sup>21</sup> Mildram's lectures.

<sup>22</sup> Gaster, in his footnote to this verse, states that "the text seems to say: 'If a human being falls into a place of water or into a place of . . . let no man bring him up. . . .' But this would be against the universal Jewish rule that Sabbath laws may be broken in cases of life and death" (p. 104). Making the proper emendation, he corrects it to read as presented. Still the original text, sans correction, makes the point of Luke's refutation all the stronger.

<sup>23</sup>It may be of some interest to note that both these examples from Luke have parallels in Matthew, but that neither appears in Mark. The second example, Luke 14:5-6, is paralleled by Matt. 12:11-12. The same story of the withered hand in Mark, however, omits these verses. Consequently, the Qumran literature may have had some influence also on the hypothetical source Q, one which was available to both Luke and Matthew, but not included by Mark.

<sup>24</sup>Perrin, p. 218.

<sup>25</sup>Lucetta Mowry, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 65. To see more clearly the tradition, this also from Mowry, p. 162:

The inferred superiority of the priestly Messiah is explicitly clarified by testaments of other patriarchs. According to the relevant passages, God appointed messianic figures from both the tribes of Judah and of Levi. Although Judah received the promise that he would be a king in Israel forever and that the king from his family would be like a rising star, the sun of righteousness, and a life-giving fountain, he was also told that the Messiah from Levi would be greater, for God has given him the priesthood. In his testament to his sons, therefore, Judah admits that God gave to him a kingdom and the things of the earth but to Levi he gave the priestly office and the things of heaven. Since heaven is higher than earth, the priesthood of God is higher than the earthly kingdom. The revealing angel declared, therefore, that God had chosen Levi rather than Judah to draw near him, to eat at his table, and to offer him the first fruits of the choice things of the sons of Israel. Furthermore, the Messiah from Levi would deserve a great expression of Israel's gratitude, for Levi and his descendants would devote themselves to the instruction of Israel in the laws and ceremonies and would intercede on their behalf and even die in wars, visible and invisible, to save the people of God's covenant.

<sup>26</sup>New Oxford Annotated Bible, p. 1246.

<sup>27</sup>Moses Hadas, Hellenistic Culture (Morning Heights: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 40.

<sup>28</sup>D.S. Russell, Between the Testaments (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), p. 37.

<sup>29</sup>Hadas, p. 40.

<sup>30</sup>Russell, p. 20.

<sup>31</sup>Hadas, p. 40.

<sup>32</sup>Macrina Scott, O.S.F., "The Christmas Gospels," St. Anthony Messenger, December 1980, p. 33. The importance of this passage has been questioned, and while certainly not pivotal, I feel that the directive of Pius XII is relevant, if only to suggest that my own search among literary forms contemporary to Luke's Gospel for influences is not necessarily novel.

<sup>33</sup>One suggestion that is necessary for the defense of this argument is that Luke seems to have envisioned the action with something of a spotlight effect rather than with a concept of a full stage. This idiosyncrasy first appears in 1:24-25. After the appearance to Zechariah, Elizabeth announces her pregnancy. A good tragedian could easily have had Elizabeth emerge from the house, after having Zechariah finish at the temple, encouraging some feel for simultaneous events, engendering a three-dimensional stage. Unfortunately, this interpretation is impossible with Luke, as the same actor must play both Gabriel and Elizabeth, and Gabriel is already in the scene, having spoken with Zechariah. Consequently, these two verses require division as a separate episode, as opposed to concluding the one immediately before.

<sup>34</sup>Moses Hadas, A History of Latin Literature (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), p. 248.

<sup>35</sup>Clarence W. Mendell, Our Seneca (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), p. 59.

<sup>36</sup>Chapters XIV-XIX were omitted for the sake of manageability of the text to be examined. Since every new idea required a thorough checking and rechecking of the text, to have worked with the entire Gospel would have been unfeasible. Nevertheless, as eighteen of the twenty-four chapters are examined, any conclusions based on the portion chosen will be valid as representing the vast majority of the text.

<sup>37</sup>Having provided reasonable results, the criteria for dramatic sectioning of the Gospel, to be given more credibility, ought to offer some explanation for the divisions between chapters. The closest I could come to any formula was that the beginning of a new chapter was signaled by either a necessary narrative, or by a simultaneous temporal/spatial displacement of one character, usually Jesus. Unfortunately, even the most liberal rationalizing could only

account for fourteen out of twenty-four chapters; although this was a majority, I felt the margin to be too slim to consider my argument valid.

Further research, however, yielded the following information concerning the history of the Gospel:

As has been already mentioned, the text of these codices was continuous, without spaces between words. However, marginal signs indicated the beginnings of new sections. It was not until 1226 that Stephen Langton, a professor at the University of Paris and later Archbishop of Canterbury, divided the text of the Bible into chapters. What he did was to combine a number of sections or pericopes into single consecutive chapters (Richard T.A. Murphy, O.P., Background to the Bible [Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1978], p. 28).

Even if the marginal signs were Luke's (which is highly doubtful), the chapters themselves are later amendments to Luke. Consequently, there is no reason to require them to fit neatly into any dramatic patterns suggested in this paper.

<sup>38</sup>Mendell, p. 82-83.

<sup>39</sup>It may serve well to reiterate that while the Gospel was not written to be produced, it was written "with the conditions of presentation in mind." Such a staging difficulty as presented here may seem ludicrous with something intended to be recited only, but that would be overlooking the state of the tragic art as Luke knew it.

<sup>40</sup>Whereas the number of actors is limited to three, so too is the number of choral members. Originally, there were twelve, but again Sophocles inherited a slightly altered Aeschylean tradition: fifteen became the established number.

<sup>41</sup>Mendell, p. 83.

<sup>42</sup>Brian Vickers, Towards Greek Tragedy (London: Longman Group Limited, 1973), p. 52.

<sup>43</sup>Richard McKeon, ed., The Basic Works of Aristotle (New York: Random House, 1941), p. 1467. The question has been raised concerning the exact connection between Luke and Aristotle's definition of tragedy. It is very unlikely that Luke was familiar with the Poetics, but this admission should not render invalid the introduction of Aristotelian material. The definition presented here should be recognized for what it is: the distilled essence, although idealized, of the best tragedy that Aristotle knew. Aristotle is not dictating

here standards for tragedy, but rather summarizing the tradition as he knew it, a tradition with which, as has been discussed, Luke was probably familiar. The tradition closest to Luke in time (Senecan) preserved very much the integrity of Aristotle's definition when it based itself on the Greek tragedies: hence, the general plot was required to remain intact, the Roman playwright free only to stylize the speeches.

<sup>44</sup>Vickers, p. 61-62.

<sup>45</sup>This distinction is not wholly dissimilar to the case of Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus, wherein Oedipus, after a trying and difficult life, has his ability to endure rewarded.

But in what manner  
Oedipus perished, no one of mortal men  
Could tell but Theseus. It was not lightning  
Bearing its flame from God that took him off;  
No hurricane was blowing.  
But some attendant from the train of heaven  
Came for him; or else the underworld  
Opened in love the unlit door of earth.  
For he was taken without lamentation,  
Illness or suffering; indeed his end  
Was wonderful if Mortal's ever was.

(Robert Fitzgerald,

trans., ll. 1655-1665)

<sup>46</sup>D.D. Raphael, The Paradox of Tragedy (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1960), p. 41.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 51.

<sup>48</sup>Ronald Bohrer, "The Concept of Pollution in Athenian Forensic Oratory," Diss. University of Colorado, 1969, p. 42.

## APPENDIX I

This Appendix demonstrates the dramatic sectioning of the first thirteen and the last five chapters of Luke's Gospel into their component episodes. The number at the left indicates which device of dramatic discontinuity is used: 1) temporal transition; 2) spatial displacement; or 3) necessary narrative. To the right of the episode number are the verses through which the episode runs, followed by the characters involved.

Sample entry: (1,2) ep. VIa 1-5  
 Jesus  
 disciples  
 Pharisees

Episode VIa begins with both a temporal transition and a spatial displacement and involves the first five verses of Chapter VI. Jesus, the disciples and the Pharisees are the characters "on stage."

Chapter 1

## Prologos

1 - 7, Narr.

## Act I

4	ep. Ia	8 - 23 multitude Zechariah Gabriel
1	ep. Ib	24 - 25 Elizabeth
1	ep. Ic	26 - 38 Gabriel Mary

2 ep. Id 39 - 79  
 Mary  
 Elizabeth  
 neighbors  
 Zechariah  
 80, Narr.

### Chapter II

4 ep. IIa 1 - 7, Narr.  
 8 - 15  
 shepherds  
 angel

2 ep. IIb 16 - 20  
 shepherds  
 Mary  
 Joseph

4 ep. IIc 21 - 24, Narr.  
 25 - 38  
 Simeon  
 Mary  
 Anna  
 (Joseph)

2 ep. IID 39 - 52  
 teachers  
 Jesus  
 Mary  
 (Joseph)

### Chapter III

4 ep. IIIa 1 - 6, Narr.  
 7 - 17  
 John  
 multitudes  
 soldier (type A)  
 tax collector (type A)  
 18 - 38, Narr.

### Chapter IV

#### Act II

2 ep. IVa 1 - 13  
 Jesus  
 devil

2 ep. IVb 14 - 30  
 Jesus  
 worshippers

2 ep. IVc 31 - 37  
 man with unclean spirit (type B)  
 Jesus  
 observers

- 2 ep. IVd 38 - 41  
 Jesus  
 Simon's mother-in-law  
 sick mobs
- 2 ep. IVe 42 - 44  
 Jesus  
 people

#### Chapter V

- 1,2 ep. Va 1 - 11  
 Jesus  
 mob  
 Simon  
 (James and John)
- 1,2 ep. Vb 12 - 16  
 man full of leprosy (type B)  
 Jesus  
 multitude
- 1 ep. Vc 17 - 26  
 Pharisees  
 men carrying paralyzed man  
 Jesus
- 2 ep. Vd 27 - 39  
 Jesus  
 Levi  
 tax collectors  
 Pharisees and scribes

#### Chapter VI

- 1,2 ep. VIa 1 - 5  
 Jesus  
 disciples  
 Pharisees
- 1 ep. VIB 6 - 11  
 Jesus  
 man with withered hand (type B)  
 Pharisees and scribes
- 3 ep. VIc 12 - 16, Narr.  
 17 - 49  
 Jesus  
 disciples  
 multitudes

#### Chapter VII

- 2 ep. VIIa 1 - 10  
 Jesus  
 Jewish elders  
 friends



2	ep. VIIb	11 - 17 Jesus disciples crowds dead man (type B) mother
2	ep. VIIc	18 - 35 John's disciples Jesus crowds tax collector (type A) Pharisee (type A)
2	ep. VIId	36 - 50 Jesus Pharisee prostitute (type B)

#### Chapter VIII

3	ep. VIIIa	1 - 3, Narr. 4 - 21 Jesus disciples crowd
1,2	ep. VIIIb	22 - 25 Jesus disciples
2	ep. VIIIc	26 - 39 Jesus disciples possessed man (type B) herdsman people
2	ep. VIId	40 - 56 Jesus crowd disciples Jarius woman with flow of blood (type A) mother

#### Chapter IX

1,2	ep. IXa	1 - 6 Jesus disciples
3	ep. IXb	7 - 9, Narr. 10 - 17 apostles Jesus crowds

2	ep. IXc	18 - 27 Jesus disciples
2	ep. IXd	28 - 36 Jesus Peter, John, James (Moses, Elijah)
2	ep. IXe	37 - 50 Jesus Peter, John, James crowd man (type A) boy (type A)
3	ep. IXf	51 - 56, Narr. 57 - 62 Jesus disciples three men (type A)

#### Chapter X

0	ep. Xa	1 - 16 followers Jesus
1	ep. Xb	17 - 37 followers Jesus disciples lawyer (type A)
2	ep. Xc	38 - 42 Jesus Martha Mary

#### Chapter XI

1,2	ep. XIa	1 - 13 Jesus disciples
1	ep. XIb	14 - 36 dumb man (type A) Jesus people woman (type A) + people
2	ep. XIc	37 - 52 Jesus Pharisees lawyers 53 - 54, Narr.

2	ep. XXIIc	39 - 53 Jesus disciples (Judas) crowd slave (type A)
2	ep. XXIIId	54 - 62 Peter maid (type A) two speakers (type A)
3	ep. XXIIe	63 - 65, Narr. 66 - 71 Jesus elders

#### Chapter XXIII

2	ep. XXIIIa	1 - 5 Pilate Jesus multitudes chief priests and scribes 6 - 12, Narr.
3	ep. XXIIIb	13 - 25 Pilate chief priests and scribes people Jesus
2	ep. XXIIIc	26 - 49 two criminals Jesus centurion (type A) soldiers, crowds 50 - 56, Narr.

#### Chapter XXIV

3	ep. XXIVa	1 - 12 women two men (type B)
2	ep. XXIVb	13 - 32 two disciples (Cleopas) Jesus
2	ep. XXIVc	33 - 49 disciples Jesus

#### Exodus

50 - 53, Narr.

## APPENDIX II

This appendix catalogues what part each actor plays (if any) in each episode. To the right of the chapter number are the parts each plays; if a particular actor is not "on stage," this is indicated by a hyphen (-).

Sample entry: Actor 1: XXII Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; -;  
Jesus

Actor 1 is present in the role of Jesus during the first three episodes of Chapter XXII, but absent during the fourth. He reappears for the fifth.

Actor 1:	I	Zechariah; -; -; Zechariah
	II	-; Joseph; Simeon; Jesus
	III	John
	IV	Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; Jesus
	V	Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; Jesus
	VI	Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; Jesus
	VII	Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; Jesus
	VIII	Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; Jesus
	IX	Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; Jesus
	X	Jesus; Jesus; Jesus
	XI	Jesus; Jesus; Jesus
	XII	Jesus
	XIII	Jesus; Jesus; Jesus
Actor 2:	I	Gabriel; Elizabeth; Gabriel; Elizabeth
	II	angel; -; Anna; -
	III	-
	IV	devil; -; man with unclean spirit; -; -
	V	-; man full of leprosy; -; -
	VI	-; man with withered hand; -; -
	VII	-; dead man; -; Pharisee
	VIII	-; -; possessed man; Jarius
	IX	-; -; -; Moses
	X	-; -; Martha
	XI	-; -; -
	XII	-
	XIII	-; -; -

Actor 3:        I    -; -; Mary; Mary  
                  II   -; Mary; Mary; Mary  
                  III -  
                  IV -; -; -; Simon's mother-in-law; -  
                  V   -; -; -; -  
                  VI   -; -; -; -  
                  VII -; mother; -; prostitute  
                  VIII -; -; herdsman; woman with flow of blood,  
                          mother  
                  IX   -; -; -; Elijah  
                  X   -; -; Mary  
                  XI   -; -; -  
                  XII -  
                  XIII -; -; -

### PASSION

Actor 1:        XX   Jesus; Jesus  
                  XXI   Jesus  
                  XXII Jesus; Jesus; Jesus; -; Jesus  
                  XXIII Jesus; Jesus; Jesus  
                  XXIV -; Jesus; Jesus

Actor 2:        XX   -; -  
                  XXI   -  
                  XXII -; -; -; -; -  
                  XXIII Pilate; Pilate; criminal  
                  XXIV man; Cleopas; Cleopas

Actor 3:        XX   -; -  
                  XXI   -  
                  XXII -; -; -; -; -  
                  XXIII -; -; criminal  
                  XXIV man; -; -

## APPENDIX III

This appendix uses the same method to designate roles for the chorus as App. II used for the actors.

- Chorus:
- I multitudes; -; -; neighbors
  - II shepherds; shepherds; (temple bystanders, one holds mask for silent Joseph); teachers, one holds Joseph mask
  - III multitudes, two type A speakers
  - IV -; worshippers; observers; sick mobs; people
  - V mob, three hold Simon, James and John masks; multitudes;  $\frac{1}{2}$  Pharisees,  $\frac{1}{2}$  men with paralyzed man;  $\frac{1}{2}$  Pharisees,  $\frac{1}{2}$  tax collectors, including Levi
  - VI Pharisees/disciples; Pharisees; disciples; disciples/multitudes;  $\frac{1}{2}$  elders,  $\frac{1}{2}$  friends
  - VII disciples/crowd; John's disciples/crowd, two type A speakers
  - VIII disciples/crowd; disciples; disciples/people; crowd/disciples
  - IX disciples; crowds/disciples; disciples; three disciples; disciples/crowd, two type A speakers; crowds/disciples, three type A speakers
  - X followers; disciples/followers, one type A speaker; -
  - XI disciples; people, two type A speakers; Pharisees and lawyers
  - XII disciples/multitude, one type A speaker
  - XIII multitude; crowd, two type A speakers; crowd/Pharisees, one type A speaker

## PASSION

- XX people/scribes; scribes/Sadducees
- XXI people, one type A speaker
- XXII disciples; apostles; disciples/crowd; crowd, Peter and three type A speakers; elders
- XXIII scribes/multitudes; rulers/people; soldiers/crowds, one type A speaker
- XXIV women; -; disciples

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allegro, John M. The Chosen People. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1977.
- Bohrer, Ronald G. "The Concept of Pollution in Athenian Forensic Oratory." Diss. University of Colorado, 1969.
- Gaster, Theodore, The Dead Sea Scriptures. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1956.
- Geldenhuis, Norval. Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.
- Hadas, Moses. Hellenistic Culture. Morningside Heights: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Hadas, Moses. A History of Latin Literature. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Harris, Marvin. Cows, Pigs, Wars and Witches. New York: Vintage Books, 1976.
- Kitto, H.D.F. Form and Meaning in Drama. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1959.
- Kuntz, J. Kenneth. The People of Ancient Israel. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1974.
- McKeon, Richard, ed. The Basic Works of Aristotle. New York: Random House, 1941.
- Mendell, Clarence W. Our Seneca. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.
- Mowry, Lucetta. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Murphy, Richard T.A.O.P. Background to the Bible. Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1978.
- The New Oxford Annotated Bible, RSV. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Perrin, Norman. The New Testament: An Introduction. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1974.
- Peters, F.E. The Harvest of Hellenism. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970.

- Raphael, D.D. The Paradox of Tragedy. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1960.
- Roebuck, Carl. The World of Ancient Times. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.
- Russell, D.S. Between the Testaments. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Scott, Macrina, O.S.F. "The Christmas Gospels." St. Anthony Messenger. December, 1980.
- Vickers, Brian. Towards Greek Tragedy. London: Longman Group Limited, 1973.