

Harvard Divinity School

Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages

Author(s): David Gill

Source: *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 63, No. 2 (Apr., 1970), pp. 199-221

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Harvard Divinity School

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1509025>

Accessed: 27/01/2010 06:42

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and Harvard Divinity School are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Harvard Theological Review*.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE LUKAN
TRAVEL NARRATIVE AND
SOME RELATED PASSAGES

DAVID GILL, S.J.

BOSTON COLLEGE
CHESTNUT HILL, MASSACHUSETTS 02167

IN recent years scholars who have studied the problem have reached what may fairly be called a consensus that the Lukan Travel Narrative is primarily a theological-Christological rather than a geographical entity.¹

The extended journey to Jerusalem is original with Luke, and it makes his Gospel a three-part work (Galilee — the journey — Jerusalem), whereas Mark tells his story essentially in two parts. Luke follows Mark's general scheme up to 9:50; then comes the Great Insertion (9:51-18:14), after which Luke again takes up the Markan thread from 18:15 to 19:44, where the journey actually ends. In the Great Insertion Luke uses material from

¹ As in most matters concerning Luke's theology, cf. H. CONZELMANN, *Die Mitte der Zeit*⁴ (Tübingen, 1962). Also helpful among more recent general studies are: W. C. ROBINSON, JR., *Der Weg des Herrn* (Hamburg, 1964), H. FLENDER, *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas* (Munich, 1965), and S. BROWN, S.J., *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (*Analecta Biblica* 36; Rome, 1969).

On the Travel Narrative in particular, L. GIRARD, *L'Évangile des Voyages de Jésus* (Paris, 1951), has the earlier bibliography. J. SCHNEIDER, *Zur Analyse des lukanischen Reiseberichts*, *Synoptische Studien* (A. Wikenhauser Festschrift) (Munich, 1953), 207-29, summarizes results up to the date of writing. See, too, *ibid.*, 20-52, J. BLENZLER, *Die literarische Eigenart des sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukasevangelium*, with bibliography of monographs on the Travel Narrative since 1910. More recent items of interest are: G. W. H. LAMPE, *The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke*, in *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford, 1955), 159-200, and *ibid.*, 37-53, C. F. EVANS, *The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel*; B. REICKE, *Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative*, *Studia Evangelica* I (1959) (=T.U. 73), 164-69; W. GRUNDMANN, *Fragen der Komposition des lukanischen "Reiseberichts"*, *ZNW* (1959), 252ff.; W. C. ROBINSON, JR., *The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative* (9, 51ff.), *JBL* (1960), 20-31; J. H. DAVIES, *The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel*, *Studia Evangelica* II (1964) (=T.U. 87), 164-69, and *ibid.*, 195-202, M. D. GOULDER, *The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey*; F. STAGG, *The Journey toward Jerusalem in Luke's Gospel*, *Review and Expositor* (1967), 499-512; J. NAVONE, *The Way of the Lord*, *Scripture* (1968), 24-30.

For my own researches Prof. GEORGE MACRAE, S.J., has rendered generous and valuable assistance.

Mark, Q, and his own special source and forms it with occasional mentions of the fact that Jesus is on the way to Jerusalem, the so-called *Reisenotizen*, which for the most part are his own editorial work.²

The didactic-paraenetic tendency of much of the material contained in the Travel Narrative is clear enough and has been pointed out more than once.³ On the further question, of why teaching of this sort should be cast in the context of a journey, opinions are divided. Schneider and Conzelmann speak of Jesus's activity and preaching being under a new sign, that of the predictions of the Passion. The theological necessity of his going to his death and subsequent glorification is expressed symbolically in a journey.⁴ W. C. Robinson, Jr., connects the journey with the *hodos*-concept of the Christian life. The trip to Jerusalem, he says, is a stage on the way of the Lord, and "as such it performed an essential function of Luke's concept of authenticated Christian witness, on which was based the life and work of the Church of Luke's own time."⁵ B. Reicke's answer to the question is in the form of a tentative suggestion: "Considering the fact that the Travel Narrative contains so many traditions intended to be instructive for Christian missionaries, one may ask whether Christ is not described here as being on a pilgrimage toward suffering and glorification, because such pilgrimage is the lot of his messengers on this earth."⁶

The present paper began as a study of the *Reisenotizen*. They are Lukan *par excellence*, and the thought suggested itself that a closer examination of their deployment might lend insight into Luke's methods of composition and his larger purpose in the Travel Narrative. Are the *Reisenotizen* just arbitrarily thrown

² The journey situation is mentioned or alluded to in 9:51; 9:53; 9:56; 9:57; 10:1; 10:38; 13:22; 13:31; 13:33; (13:35); 14:25; 17:11; (18:31); (18:35); 18:36; 19:1; 19:11; (19:28); (19:29); (19:36); 19:37; 19:41; (19:45). The passages in parentheses are not peculiar to Luke. Note that the *Reisenotizen* are particularly numerous at the beginning and end of the narrative.

³ See especially SCHNEIDER, 219ff., and REICKE, 209ff. The latter summarizes the contents: "(1) instruction of the apostles regarded (a) as leaders and teachers of the Christians, i.e., as ministers, and (b) as missionaries; and (2) discussion with adversaries and opponents" (210).

⁴ SCHNEIDER, 216f. CONZELMANN, 56f.

⁵ *JBL* (1960), 27.

⁶ P. 216. My conclusion, arrived at independently and by other means, will agree in part with that of REICKE.

in to remind the reader that Jesus is still underway, to keep things moving, as it were? ⁷ Or is there some pattern in their placing, some significance in the types of pericopes to which they are attached? As far as I know, no one has approached the problem in just this way. I think that a pattern can be demonstrated, and I think that an understanding of it throws some new light not only on the Travel Narrative itself but on some other sections of the Gospel as well, most notably Luke's ordering of events at the Last Supper and the episode of the disciples on the road to Emmaus. Further, it may be suggestive for Luke's understanding of Mark and the early Christian community's understanding of itself.

The Samaritan Villages: Lk. 9:51-56. With this passage, which only he has, Luke introduces the journey to Jerusalem. C. F. Evans has a good analysis of vv. 51-52 in which he emphasizes their Lukan character, points out the Semitic flavor of the language — especially the expressions with *πρόσωπον* — and concludes: "Stylistically, therefore, the aim of the writer seems to have been to sound an especially solemn note by an unusually strong concentration of biblical idioms." ⁸

Of particular interest is the frequent repetition of the two words *πορεύομαι* (three times in vv. 51-53 and once in v. 56) and *πρόσωπον* (three times in vv. 51-53). Note especially how they appear once each in vv. 51 and 52 and then together as predicate and subject in the key verse 53. There seems little room for doubt that Luke wants to invest these words with some sort of special significance in connection with the journey. *πορεύομαι* does in fact, as we shall see, take on the function of a *terminus technicus* for Jesus' progress toward Jerusalem.⁹ It appears in most of the *Reisenotizen* — and in some other interesting places as well. Even if the word did not have this connotation in itself or in the tradition, the emphasis that Luke puts on it here would be sufficient indication that he wants to make something special of it. He has, as it were, loaded the term. The significance of *πρόσωπον* will become clear presently.

⁷ As ROBINSON, for example, seems to suggest (*JBL* [1960], 29).

⁸ P. 38. Cf. also CONZELMANN, 58f.

⁹ Noted by DAVIES, 166. F. HAUCK and S. SCHULZ, KITTEL, *TWNT*, s.v., see no special significance in Luke's use of the word as against the rest of the N.T.

"It happened, when the days of his taking up were fulfilled, he set his face (*πρόσωπον*) to go (*πορεύεσθαι*) to Jerusalem" (v. 51). That is, the appointed time has come for Jesus to go to Jerusalem to meet his fate, and he determines to go. The necessity of his going is expressed by the verb *συμπληροῦσθαι*. This element of necessity is very important for Luke's whole conception; as is the fact that Jesus goes willingly and in obedience to God's will.¹⁰ This latter is brought out in the Hebraism, "he set his face," which signifies a deliberate direction of will towards (or against) an object.¹¹ The "taking up" (*ἀνάληψις*) to which he goes is probably best understood to mean the whole series of events that await him in Jerusalem — Passion, death, Resurrection, and Ascension — not merely the Ascension.

The episode that follows in vv. 52–56 takes place in Samaria, and, significantly, it is the only one in the Synoptics that does. B. Reicke believes that the story is directed to the early Christian missionaries, "the point being that such as do not receive the messengers of Christ should not be cursed."¹² Also implicit in the story is the supposition that the mission to the Gentiles had already begun during Jesus's own lifetime. The fact that these points are made here, in the solemn introduction to Jesus' trip to Jerusalem, arouses the suspicion that Luke wants to invest them with a more than ordinary emphasis.

But there is more to it than just that. We have seen, above, the element of necessity in Jesus' journey and his determination in undertaking it (v. 51). These two important Lukan themes are joined, in vv. 52–56, with another, that of how Jesus' hearers did not understand why he must go to suffer and die. In the present episode there is a double misunderstanding. In v. 53 the Samaritans refuse to accept Jesus, "because his face (*πρόσωπον*) was going (*πορευόμενον*) to Jerusalem." At first glance this might seem to mean nothing more than that they rejected him because he was a Jew, but the language of the passage clearly indicates

¹⁰ CONZELMANN, 50, 57, 60, 141ff.

¹¹ Cf. DAVIES, 167. The expression can refer to determination in a neutral sense as in Is. 50:7 and Jer. 42:17. The hostile sense is attested especially in Ezekiel (6:2; 13:17; 14:8; 15:7; *et passim*). DAVIES prefers the latter here, i.e., Jesus' journey will have effects which are hostile to the Jews.

¹² P. 211.

that Luke is saying more. V. 53, which is as awkward from a Hebrew as from a Greek point of view, seems deliberately constructed to hark back to vv. 51 and 52, where Jesus' going implies the Passion and his setting of his face refers to his willing acceptance of same. The Samaritans rejected him not merely because he was a Jew, but because they could neither understand nor accept the fact that he had to die. Luke is telling his readers here the same thing that Paul tells his in 1 Cor. 1:23: that the preaching of Christ crucified will be "folly to the Gentiles."

The Samaritans are not the only ones who fail to get the point. The disciples James and John misunderstand too. They want to call down fire from heaven to destroy the unbelievers. They too, in their own way, have rejected the idea of a suffering Messiah. Jesus corrects them, shakes the dust of that village from his feet, and goes elsewhere (v. 56). Luke may be telling the missionaries of his own day to do likewise, as Reicke suggests, but he may as well be warning them against having any false notions of what it means to be a disciple of a suffering Master.

The Claimants to Discipleship: Lk. 9:57-62. The pericope which immediately follows resumes the theme of discipleship. The story is common to Matthew and Luke, except that Luke has three *logia* and Matthew only (the first) two. In addition, Luke prefaces his version with the *Reisenotiz*: "and as they were going (*πορευομένων*) along the road," which is his own redaction. The repetition of the travel word, *πορεύομαι*, so close on 9:51-56, where it appears four times, has the effect of connecting the two passages.

The content of the present passage has the same effect. It takes up and expands the theme of discipleship, with emphasis on the difficulty of following Christ. His claims are hard, but they are based on his own hard experience: "The Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head" (v. 58). Further, this discipleship is not what men imagine it to be; it is even more demanding, as Jesus' correctives in vv. 59-62 demonstrate.

Thus, once again Luke deliberately makes the connection between Jesus' progress to Jerusalem and the life and conduct of the disciples. And again he emphasizes the difficult nature of

discipleship and the misunderstandings to which this gives rise.¹³

The Sending Out of the Seventy: Lk. 10:1-16. The episode in its present form seems to be Luke's own invention; its placing at the start of the journey to Jerusalem certainly is.¹⁴ Much of the material can be found scattered in Matthew; Luke has brought it together and put it here. Why he does so becomes clear when we look at the introduction (v. 1): "After this the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them on ahead of him (*πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ*) into every town and place where he himself was about to come." The expression "before his face" is an echo of the thrice-repeated *πρόσωπον* of 9:51-53, and serves to link the mission instructions given there with the present ones to the Seventy. And the *Reisenotiz* in 10:1 makes the connection once again between the Jerusalem journey and the missionary activity of the disciples. Another link between the two passages is given in 10:10-11, where Jesus instructs the Seventy to shake from their feet the dust of any village which will not receive them; the very thing he himself did in the Samaritan village (9:56).¹⁵

If we pause briefly to summarize, we see a pattern beginning to emerge. The first, introductory episode in the Travel Narrative (9:51-56) makes clear the necessity of the journey to Jerusalem and shows what misunderstanding this fact can occasion. Still, it is a key to a proper notion of what it means to follow Christ. It also has implications for the missionary activity of the disciple, especially to the Gentiles. In the next two pericopes Luke hammers home his point by taking up the two themes of the introduction individually. In 9:57-62 he insists upon the very demanding nature of discipleship; the way of the disciple is to be the way of the Lord. In 10:1-16 he returns to the subject of the mission and connects it once again with Jesus' trip to Jerusalem.

The placing of the key words *πορεύομαι* and *πρόσωπον* also indicates that Luke intended these three pericopes to be taken

¹³ The fact that Christ makes these demands "along the road" (*ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*) may also have significance in the discipleship connection. See the discussion in footnote 29.

¹⁴ CONZELMANN, 59.

¹⁵ There is also an allusion to the sending out of the Seventy in 22:35, in a passage on the demands of discipleship.

together as a unit. Through his solemn introduction and his reinforcement of it by the use of *Reisenotizen* with the episodes of the hesitant disciples and the sending out of the Seventy, he forms the three pericopes into a programmatic introduction and places the journey to Jerusalem under the double sign of properly understood discipleship and the mission. We can hardly attribute this pattern to pure chance, especially when we consider the place that Jerusalem holds with relation to the mission in the larger context of *Luke-Acts*, and when we reflect, as we shall have occasion to do *infra*, on Luke's notion of the Christian life as a "way" and a time of trial.

An analysis of the other *Reisenotizen* and the pericopes to which Luke attaches them bears out the validity of these preliminary conclusions.

Martha and Mary: Lk. 10:38-42. The episode in this form is unique to Luke, and he introduces it with a reminder of the journey: "Now as they went on their way (*πορεύεσθαι*), he entered a certain village" John (11:1; 12:1) localizes the house of Martha and Mary in Bethania near Jerusalem. Luke does not know — or would rather not mention at this point — the exact location. In John 12:1ff. Martha serves dinner and Mary anoints Jesus' feet; this leads to Judas' complaint and Jesus's answer to him. In Luke the point of the story is much different. He emphasizes how busy Martha is with her serving (*περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλήν διακονίαν*: v. 40) and how Mary sits at Jesus' feet and does nothing but listen to his *λόγον* (v. 39). Martha complains, and Jesus corrects her: "Martha you worry about many things (*περὶ πολλά*); few things are needful, or only one. Mary has chosen the good portion" (vv. 41-42). The point is that Martha has a false notion about service of the Lord, i.e., discipleship; and Jesus corrects it as he did in 9:51-62. Here the emphasis is on the primacy of single-minded service to the teaching of the Lord. One is reminded of the selection of the Seven in Acts 6:1-6, and the reasoning behind it: "It is not right that we should give up preaching the word (*λόγον*) of God to serve tables" (v. 2). Note too that in Lk. 1:2 disciples are called "ministers of the word."

Thus, once again a *Reisenotiz* serves to link Jesus' journey to Jerusalem with the theme of proper understanding of discipleship.¹⁶

The next clear indication that Jesus is on a journey comes in 13:22. The intervening chapters are mixed in content: controversies with Jewish opponents, prayer, parables, a miracle, and a good deal of instruction for the disciples. The theme of misunderstanding occurs once, in the short incident of the woman who blessed the mother of Christ (11:27-28). The logion about the sign of Jonah, which is ignored by the Jews (11:29-32), is perhaps an indirect reference to the Gentile mission. There is nothing else on the subject in these chapters, however. The theme of the necessity of the Passion and Jesus' willing acceptance occurs once in 12:50 without explicit reference to Jerusalem or the journey: "I have a baptism to be baptized with"

The Condemnation of Israel: Lk. 13:22-30. V. 22 is typically Lukan and has the travel word *πορεύομαι* in two forms: "He went on his way (*διεπορεύετο*) through towns and villages, teaching and journeying (*πορείαν ποιούμενος*) toward Jerusalem." The verse is without a Synoptic parallel. The rest of the pericope is made up of traditional Q material which Luke has rearranged into a condemnation of the Jews and a justification of the mission to the Gentiles. The stress is on the latter as a comparison of Lk. 13:27-30 with Mt. 8:11-12 shows. Matthew has: "I tell you, many will come from east and west and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the sons of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth." Luke reverses the order, putting the condemnation of the Jews first and the acceptance of the Gentiles into the kingdom second. He then adds the logion "the last shall

¹⁶The parable of the good Samaritan (10:29-37) immediately precedes the story of Martha and Mary, and one would expect it to have a *Reisenotiz* in the light of what we have said about the Gentile mission. Also, the episode of the ten lepers (17:11-19), where a Samaritan appears in a good light in comparison with Jews, does have a *Reisenotiz*. Further, the good Samaritan story corrects false notions about discipleship. There are indications, which I hesitate to press too hard, that do seem to tie the parable in with the travel motif. First and most obvious, everyone in the parable is on the road. Secondly, the Samaritan is said to be *ὁδῶν* (v. 33), a *hapax legomenon* in the N.T. (cf. footnote 29); and finally, the travel word *πορεύομαι* appears in v. 37.

be first, and the first shall be last.” Through this shift he gives the acceptance of the Gentiles an emphatic position in the pericope, and makes clear once again the link between the Jerusalem journey and the Gentile mission.

As if to underline the point, he literally overloads the next pericope with references to the journey.

The Departure from Galilee: Lk. 13:31-33. The pericope is unique to Luke, and it is emphatically joined to the preceding by the opening words: “At that very hour” A group of Pharisees warn Jesus to leave Galilee (*πορεύου ἐντεῦθεν*) because Herod is seeking to kill him. Jesus tells them to go (*πορευθέντες*) and tell Herod: “Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I finish my course. Nevertheless, I must go on my way (*πορεύεσθαι*) today and tomorrow and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem.”

The threefold repetition of the key word *πορεύομαι* is reminiscent of 9:51-53, as is the mention of Jerusalem. The theme is the same too. Jesus must go to meet his fate, and he goes willingly. How strictly determined this fate is is shown by Jesus’ contempt for the threat of Herod; he must die in Jerusalem, and no human agent can do anything to prevent it. The length of the journey is determined too, at least to the extent that it cannot be cut short.¹⁷ Here it is the Pharisees who fail to understand.

The lament over Jerusalem follows (13:34-35) with a reference in v. 35 to Jesus’ triumphal entry into the city on Palm Sunday.

There follow three pericopes without *Reisenotizen*.¹⁸ Luke reminds us of the journey situation next in 14:25.

The Cost of Discipleship: Lk. 14:25-35. The passage opens with the Lukan introduction: “Now great multitudes accompanied (*συνεπορεύοντο*) him; and he turned and said to them” Then come the very severe requirements for discipleship: “If any one comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother he cannot be my disciple. Whoever does not bear his own cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple Who-

¹⁷ CONZELMANN, 60.

¹⁸ We might have expected *Reisenotizen* with the teaching on humility (14:7-14) and the parable of the great supper (14:15-24).

ever of you does not renounce all that he has cannot be my disciple."

As in 9:57-62, Luke's *Reisenotiz* links the hard life of the disciple with the sufferings of the Master, but here the intention is made even more explicit. The parallel passage in Matthew (10:37-38) says: "He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me" In Luke's version the demands are harsher ("If any one does not *hate* father and mother")¹⁹ and more numerous (Luke adds the renunciation of all possessions); and the connection with discipleship is made more emphatic by the substitution of the phrase "cannot be my disciple" for "is not worthy of me."

Between 15:1 and 17:10 there is no mention of the journey situation and nothing on the themes of the Gentile mission or the peculiar demands of Christian discipleship.²⁰

The Healing of the Ten Lepers: Lk. 17:11-19. The pericope appears only in Luke and is prefaced by the notice: "On the way (*ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι*) to Jerusalem he was passing along between Samaria and Galilee." The vagueness of the mention of Samaria and Galilee, plus the fact that Luke localizes the episode simply in "a certain village," is one more indication that he is concerned in the Travel Narrative less with geography than with theology. The theological point is that, of the ten who were healed, only the Samaritan returned to thank Jesus. One is reminded of the episode in the Samaritan village (9:51-56) and its connection with the Gentile mission. Lest there be any doubt, Luke makes himself quite clear in v. 18: "Was no one found to return and give praise to God except this foreigner?" This seems a harsh thing for Jesus to say with the grateful Samaritan prostrate at his feet.

¹⁹ Luke's version of the logion, being harsher, may represent the original; leaving it unchanged serves his purposes better. On the other hand, the phrase "cannot be my disciple" looks like a Lukan alteration.

The "going with" in the compound *συμπορεύομαι* (v. 25) may contain a further hint of the connection between discipleship and the journey to Jerusalem. Recall 9:57, where similar harsh demands are made "along the road" (cf. footnotes 13 and 29).

²⁰ Chapter 15 is wholly taken up with the three parables on God's mercy to sinners. 16 has the parable of the unjust Steward (1-13), an attack on the Pharisees (14-15), the law on divorce (16-18), and Dives and Lazarus (19-31). 17:1-6 is a series of short admonitions on the subjects of scandal, forgiveness and faith, followed in vv. 7-10 by the parable of the servant's wages.

But Luke is less concerned here with the dramatic niceties than with demonstrating the healing powers of faith (v. 19), even for non-Jews. In all, the travel word *πορεύομαι* appears three times in the pericope (vv. 11, 14, 19).²¹

The Great Insertion ends at 18:14 with the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, and in 18:15 Luke resumes Mark's scheme again at the "Suffer the Little Children" logion (Mk. 10:13-16/Lk. 18:15-17) and the parable of the rich young man (Mk. 10:17-31/Lk. 18:18-30). There is no mention of the journey in these sections, and no break in it; the situation remains as it has been, with Jesus still on the way to Jerusalem. Curiously enough, Luke actually suppresses a *Reisenotiz* in Mark's introduction to the parable of the rich young man. The parable has to do with the demands of discipleship, and Mark (10:17) begins it: "And as he was setting out (*ἐκπορευομένου*) on his journey, a man ran up and knelt before him, and asked him" Luke (18:18) omits any reference to Jesus' going anywhere and begins simply: "And a ruler asked him" The problem becomes even more intriguing when we compare Lk. 18:24 with the parallels (Mt. 19:23/Mk. 10:23). Luke says: "How hard is it for those who have riches to enter (*εἰσπορεύονται*) the kingdom of God." Mark's version is identical except for the final verb where he has *εἰσελεύσονται*. Matthew's wording is somewhat different, but he too has a form of *εἰσέρχομαι*. Thus, Luke has apparently edited in the journey/discipleship word here, while avoiding it in 18:18.²²

The Third Prediction of the Passion: Lk. 18:31-34. Once again Luke suppresses a Markan *Reisenotiz*, Mk. 10:32: "And they were on the road, going up (*ἀναβαίνοντες*) to Jerusalem." Here the problem is less perplexing, however, since Mark repeats the notice in the next verse and Luke takes it up verbatim from there (18:31): "Behold, we are going up (*ἀναβαίνομεν*) to Jeru-

²¹ The word *πρόσωπον*, important in 9:51-53 and 10:1, occurs in v. 16: "he fell on his face." The expression is common enough (cf. Mt. 17:6), and should not be pressed for special significance here.

²² Luke may not have felt the need of a *Reisenotiz* here. The three episodes in 18:9-30 form a group on the theme of the demands of discipleship, and they are immediately followed by the third prediction of the Passion in 18:31-34, which does mention the journey and Jerusalem. Further, it stresses the disciples' lack of understanding and leads over to the cure of the blind man. See *infra*.

saalem." The third prediction of the Passion follows, with some Lukan editing to bring it into line with the larger conception of the journey. In v. 31 Luke stresses, over against Matthew and Mark, the necessity of the Passion: "and everything that is written of the Son of Man by the prophets will be accomplished." At the end of the pericope he adds a verse of his own (18:34) on the theme of misunderstanding: "But they understood none of these things; this saying was hid from them, and they did not grasp what was said." The point could hardly have been made with more emphasis; it is repeated three times, each time in different words.

Luke omits here the discussion between Jesus and the sons of Zebedee on the question of greatness among the disciples (Mk. 10:35-45/Mt. 20:20-28). He handles it instead in the context of the Last Supper, as we shall see.

The Healing of Bartimaeus: Lk. 18:35-43. The opening words recall the journey situation, though there is no direct mention of Jerusalem: "As he drew near (*ἐγγίζειν*) to Jericho, a blind man" (v. 35). Only Luke has the cure on the way *into* Jericho; both Matthew (20:29) and Mark (10:46) have Jesus meet the blind man/men (Matthew has two) as he is *leaving* the city (*ἐκπορεύεσθαι*). This is explained by the fact that Luke follows this episode with the story of Zacchaeus (19:1-10), which only he has and which takes place as Jesus is passing through Jericho. The travel word, *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*, which he had to drop out because of this, he gets back in v. 36, which he edits and expands to read: "And hearing a multitude going by (*διαπορευομένου*), he inquired what this meant."

But what has this pericope to do with the general thrust of the Jerusalem journey as we have described it up until now? I. de la Potterie suggests that the two cures of blind people which Mark records (8:22-26; 10:46-52) have symbolic significance.²³ Each comes at a place where people have misunderstood the mystery of Christ, and each serves as a transition to a fuller revelation of that mystery. The first cure, the blind man of Bethsaida (8:22-26), follows Jesus' discourse on the leaven (8:14-21) in which he

²³ De compositione evangelii Marci, *Verbum Domini* (1966), 133-41.

tries to reveal himself to the disciples at a higher level and which ends with the question: "Do you not yet understand?" The cure is followed by the confession of Caesarea Philippi (8:27-30) which answers the question "Who is Jesus?" and concludes the first part of the Gospel. The second cure, that of Bartimaeus (10:46-52), is preceded by the misunderstanding of the sons of Zebedee (10:35-45) and followed by Jesus's entrance into Jerusalem (11:1-10), where the final revelation of the mystery of Christ is to take place. The symbolism of sight and blindness, understanding and incomprehension, seems clearly intended.

If this is the case with Mark, it is even more so with Luke. I have stressed above how strongly Luke emphasizes in 18:34 the disciples' misunderstanding of the fact that Jesus must suffer. By omitting the scene with the sons of Zebedee here, Luke brings 18:34 into direct contact with the cure of the blind man (18:35-43), and thereby makes the symbolism all the more striking.²⁴

The pericope does not have the transitional function for Luke that it did for Mark, but it does fit with the theme of misunderstanding in the Travel Narrative. Here Luke offers, for the Christians of his own day, a cure for the blindness of heart which prevents people from accepting the suffering Christ: faith. Jesus' words to the blind man here (18:42) are exactly the same as his words to the Samaritan leper in 17:19: "Your faith has made you well."

The Parable of the Pounds: Lk. 19:11-27. Jesus tells the parable "because he was near to Jerusalem and because they supposed that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately." The parable is paralleled by that of the talents in Matthew (25:14-30), but Luke's editing gives it a wholly different significance. The point here is that Jerusalem has nothing to do with the establishment of the Basileia and the Parousia; it is, rather, the place for the Passion and Resurrection. It is a key time and place, but not the time or place for the end.²⁵ The travel word appears in v. 12: "A noble man went (*ἐπορεύθη*) into a far country to take a Basileia for himself and return."

²⁴ This is also a confirmation of DE LA POTTERIE's interpretation of Mark; Luke interprets him the same way.

²⁵ CONZELMANN, 66f.

Luke has, therefore, used the parable to correct a false notion of discipleship. The fact that Jesus has gone away to take his *Basileia* does not mean that the disciples can relax and simply wait around until he returns. There is no knowing when he will come back, and the time while he is away is a time for "trading" (v. 15), i.e., for the hard work of the Christian life.

That this work includes mission activity is shown by the parallel passage in Acts 1:10-11: "And while they were gazing into heaven as he went (*πορευομένου*), behold two men stood by them in white robes, and said, 'Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into heaven? This Jesus, who was taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go (*πορευόμενον*) into heaven.'" Just before this, in 1:6, the disciples had asked Jesus if he were going to restore the *Basileia* to Israel now. He answers (1:7-8) that it is not for them to know the time; he promises them the Holy Spirit, and predicts "you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judaea and Samaria and to the end of the earth." Thus, in both passages the exhortation not to sit around waiting for the *Basileia* is implicitly a commission to go out and preach the Gospel "to the ends of the earth."

The parable of the pounds, coming as it does at the close of the Travel Narrative, has special significance; and it is comforting for our interpretation of the whole that it contains the two themes of proper discipleship and the mission. One might almost say that it identifies them, i.e., missionary activity is the work of the good disciple.

As if to underline its importance, Luke also concludes the parable with a *Reisenotiz*: "And when he had said this, he went on (*ἔπορεύετο*) ahead, going up (*ἀναβαίνων*) to Jerusalem" (19:28).

The Entry into Jerusalem: Lk. 19:28-38. This is actually the final stage of the trip *toward* Jerusalem, as it brings Jesus only to the outskirts of the city (v. 37) and combines with the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem in 19:39-44 to prepare Jesus's entry into the temple.²⁶

In vv. 29-38 the travel word *πορεύομαι* occurs twice; once in common with Mark (11:2) in v. 30, and once in v. 36, where Luke

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 68ff.

adds it to his source: "And as he rode along (*πορευομένου*), they spread their garments on the road." In v. 38 Luke stresses once again that Jerusalem is not the place for the establishment of the *Basileia* — as in 19:11–27 and Acts 1:6–8 — by editing out Mark's mention of it (Mk. 11:10). The editing, however, illustrates Luke's respect for the traditional wording, even when he is altering its meaning. In Mark the crowds shout: "Blessed is the *Basileia* of our father David that is coming." Luke alters this to read: "Blessed is the *King* (*βασιλεύς*) who comes in the name of the Lord." Christ is indeed King, but his Kingdom is not now in Jerusalem.

In 19:39–44, a passage peculiar to Luke, Jesus weeps over Jerusalem. We are reminded of the journey situation for the last time in v. 41: "And when he drew near (*ἤγγισεν*) and saw the city" In v. 42 Jesus laments the incomprehension of the Jews. Because of this blindness Jerusalem will be destroyed: "because you did not know the time of your visitation" (v. 44). And so, the cycle is complete; first the Samaritans misunderstand the purpose of Jesus' journey, then the disciples, and now the Jews. Jerusalem is to be not only the place where the Gentile mission begins, but also, in a way, where the mission to Israel terminates.²⁷

With this pericope the journey ends, and in 19:45 Jesus enters the temple to begin "the days of his taking up."

Thus, the themes which we observed in the introduction to the Travel Narrative are carried through, by the deployment of the *Reisenotizen*, to the end. The necessity of the journey is re-emphasized in 13:31–33 and 18:31. The connection between the journey and the proper understanding of discipleship is made very forcefully in the pericope on the cost of discipleship (14:25–35); Luke's versions of the parable of the pounds (19:11–27) and the Martha and Mary story (10:38–42) make the same connection. The theme of incomprehension comes out strongest in

²⁷ The rejection of Jesus by the Jews is connected with the Gentile mission in the journey context in 13:22ff.; 17:11ff. (the ten lepers) and possibly in 10:29ff. (the good Samaritan). On the other hand, individual Jews are saved on the journey; Bartimaeus (by faith) in 18:35ff. and Zacchaeus ("also a son of Abraham") in 19:1ff. On Luke's attitude toward Israel and the Jews, see CONZELMANN, 135ff.

18:34 at the third prediction of the Passion, where the corrective is given in the healing of the blind Bartimaeus (18:35-43); for the disciple faith is the answer.

The mission theme is linked with Jesus' journey by Luke's editing in 13:22-30 (the condemnation of Israel), 17:11-19 (the ten lepers), and in 19:11-27 (the parable of the pounds), where discipleship and missionary activity are combined.

It should be noted that not every discussion of proper discipleship has a *Reisenotiz* affixed to it. Recall especially the story of the rich young man in 18:18-30. Further, there are pericopes, most notably the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:29-37), which may be taken as referring to the Gentile mission and which make no mention of the Jerusalem journey. On the other hand, it is remarkable that none of the other material treated in the Travel Narrative — discussions of God's mercy, prayer, miracles, controversies with Jewish opponents, etc. — does have a *Reisenotiz*. They are, to be sure, included within the scope of the journey, but they simply do not get the same emphasis.

But — to return to our original question — why emphasize precisely this teaching on true discipleship and the mission in the context of the Jerusalem journey? B. Reicke's suggestion that there is a parallelism between Jesus' pilgrimage toward suffering and glorification and the pilgrimage of the Christian is valid as far as it goes. The analysis of the *Reisenotizen* has brought us further. It has shown how Luke lays special stress on the difficulties of true discipleship and how he connects discipleship in his own time with Jesus' suffering. Jesus' journey is indeed a type of the Christian life, but, more than that, as a journey toward suffering it gives a rationale for the difficult things in the living of the Christian life, the things that are the biggest stumbling blocks and causes of misunderstanding for the community here and now. Jesus went his way in obedience to God's will. His way was the way of the cross. We too, says Luke, must go the way of the cross. The way does indeed end in glorification for the Christian as it did for Christ, but this aspect is only implicitly there in the Travel Narrative; suffering is stressed more. For Luke the Parousia is in the unknown future. The present reality for the Christian community is struggle.

Another present reality is the mission to the Gentiles, and by linking it with the Jerusalem journey Luke makes Jesus's own going the type of and the first step in the mission which will ultimately lead to the ends of the earth. This too is a necessity ordained by God. Jerusalem is the starting point and Jesus' reaching Jerusalem the condition for the working out and proclaiming of God's plan.²⁸

Three other passages outside of the Travel Narrative demonstrate the validity of the above analysis.

Luke's Account of the Last Supper: 22:14-38. Abstracting for the moment from their content, let us consider briefly the ordering of the pericopes in Luke and the other two Synoptics. Matthew (26:20ff.) and Mark (14:17ff.) both have the same sequence of events: the unmasking of the traitor, the institution of the Eucharist, singing of a hymn, and exit to the Mount of Olives. Luke has more pericopes, but, more important, he reverses the order of the first two so that the institution of the Eucharist comes first (22:15-20) and the unmasking of the traitor second (22:21-23). He then inserts here (22:24-30) the dispute about greatness in the Basileia which, it will be recalled, he omitted above in Ch. 18. Next he places the prophecy of Peter's denial (22:31-34), which Matthew (26:33-35) and Mark (14:29-31) both have on the way to Gethsemane, i.e., *after* Jesus and the apostles have left the cenacle. Luke closes his account with the episode of the two swords (22:35-38), which only he has.

A closer look at the contents of these passages in the light of what we have already seen explains this reordering of events and some, at least, of the additions. Both Matthew (26:24) and Mark (14:21) quote Jesus as saying: "The Son of Man goes (*ὑπάγει*) as it is written of him." Luke alters this to read: "The Son of Man goes (*πορεύεται*) as it has been determined" (22:22). The expression *κατὰ τὸ ἄρισμένον* puts more strongly than *καθὼς*

²⁸ ROBINSON (*JBL* [1960], 30) sees the connection between the journey and the mission in terms of authentic witness; "For Luke God's revelation is the revelation of a way . . . and so witnesses of God's revelation are witnesses of this *ὁδός*, from Jesus' *εἰσόδος* to his *ἔξοδος*. Thus Christian witness was based on the testimony of those constituted as witnesses by (1) their presence during Jesus' Galilean ministry, (2) their following Jesus on the trip to Jerusalem, and (3) their witnessing the resurrection." See also CONZELMANN, 32, 40, 41.

γέγραπται, I think, the element of necessity in the betrayal; it is foreordained in God's plan for salvation. The substitution of the travel word πορεύομαι makes the statement equivalently a *Reisenotiz*; and once again, as in the Travel Narrative, Luke joins it with a pericope on the peculiar nature of Christian discipleship. In 22:24–27 Jesus has to correct false notions about what it means to follow him; his standard of greatness is the opposite of the world's. By placing the unmasking of the traitor (in its revised form) *after* the institution of the Eucharist and thus bringing it into contact with the dispute on greatness Luke again achieves the connection: necessity of Jesus' going to suffer — misunderstanding — corrective on discipleship.

He maintains the effect by placing the prediction of Peter's betrayal next. Only Luke (22:33) records Peter's valiant but empty claim: "Lord, I am ready to go (πορεύεσθαι) with you to prison and death." This is exactly the point that Luke has been making all along; these are precisely the things that are demanded of a true disciple. Note the key word πορεύεσθαι in Peter's claim. But Peter too misunderstands. He can say the right things, but he is unable to do them. That is, he does not see fully what following Christ will involve, or else he does not take it seriously. Before the cock crows thrice, he will prove it.

The story of the two swords follows (22:35–38), in which Jesus stresses again the necessity of the Passion (v. 37) and the disciples apparently misunderstand and must be corrected (v. 38). Interestingly enough there is also a reference to the mission in v. 35: "When I sent you out with no purse or bag or sandals, did you lack anything?" (cf. Lk. 10:4).

The Disciples on the Road to Emmaus: Lk. 24: 13–35. Several points in the pericope are relevant to the present discussion. First, there is the journey motif; the travel word πορεύομαι appears four times, in vv. 13, 15, and twice in v. 28. Note too the double occurrence (vv. 15 and 28) of the word ἐγγίζω, which is frequent in *Reisenotizen* toward the end of the Travel Narrative (18:35; 19:11; 19:37; 19:41).

The necessity of Jesus' suffering occurs with misunderstanding on the part of the disciples. "O foolish men, and slow of heart to

believe all that the prophets have spoken! Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" (vv. 25–26). The blindness of the disciples in not recognizing Jesus (v. 16) is an important element in the story, and their remark that their fellow disciples had not seen him at the tomb (v. 24) provokes Jesus' complaint about their lack of faith in vv. 25–26. One is reminded of the juxtaposition in 18:34ff. of the disciples's incomprehension and the cure of the blind man near Jericho.

The fact that this discussion takes place in a Eucharistic context is reminiscent of the Last Supper and tends to confirm our analysis of Luke's reasons for rearranging the sequence of events in his version.

The Emmaus episode is, in fact, not merely about the Eucharist; it is about discipleship too, though the two are of course connected. The life of the disciple is beset with doubts, misunderstandings, and disappointments. But the Lord too had to suffer. Further, he remains with his followers in their troubles, and with the eyes of faith he can be seen in the "breaking of the bread." V. 35 sums up the pericope in its double aspect: "Then they told (a) what had happened on the road (τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ) and (b) how he was known to them in the breaking of the bread."²⁹

The Close of Luke's Gospel: 24:36–49. The Emmaus episode, then, summarizes the points about discipleship that Luke has been making since the beginning of the Travel Narrative in 9:51. The present passage concerns itself with his second main theme, that of the Gentile mission. The first part of the passage (vv. 36–43) is an apparition, which naturally takes place in Jerusalem. The second part (vv. 44–49) is a speech where Jesus explains once again the necessity of his suffering (and rising) and connects it with the mission to the nations. "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be

²⁹ Does the expression τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ here anticipate Luke's use of the word ὁδὸς in Acts to mean the Christian life and teaching? It is impossible to say with full certainty. There are, however, indications to that effect. ὁδὸς refers to doctrine in the expression τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ in 20:21, and we have seen above (footnote 13) the possible connection between ὁδὸς and discipleship in the demands Jesus makes on his followers in 9:57ff. Recall also the occurrence of the unique ὁδεύων in the parable of the good Samaritan (10:33, and footnote 16).

preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things" (24:46-48).

The presence of the themes of discipleship and mission and the emphasis they receive at the outset of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and throughout the Travel Narrative is indication enough in itself of their central role in Luke's conception, but the fact that he uses them to close — and indeed to sum up — his whole Gospel really clinches the matter.

Mk. 8:27ff. and Lk. 9:18ff. If we ask where Luke got the idea for the development of the Travel Narrative which we have been describing, we need look no further than the eighth and ninth chapters of Mark. They are Luke's source for the section leading up to the Great Insertion (Lk. 9:18-50), and he follows his source quite closely. Where he does make alterations, it is in line with his larger conception.

The general outline of the Markan account — which is basically the same as Matthew's (16:13ff.) — is as follows. The confession at Caesarea Philippi (8:27-30), the first prediction of the Passion (31-33), conditions for discipleship (8:34-9:1), the Transfiguration (9:2-8), the coming of Elijah (9-13), the healing of an epileptic child (14-29), second prediction of the Passion (30-32), discussion of greatness in the Basileia (33-37), and the story of the strange exorcist (38-41).

As noted, Luke's framework is the same, but there are interesting differences of detail. Peter's confession (9:18-21) is not in Caesarea Philippi; Luke omits the whole wandering outside Galilee. After the first Passion prediction (9:22) Peter's objection drops out (Mk. 9:32-33), most likely because of the mention of Satan, whom Luke excludes from the public life until the Passion. In the conditions for discipleship he follows Mark almost word for word (especially in 9:23-24 = Mk. 8:34-35) except for some small but significant points. In Mk. 8:34 Jesus' remarks are addressed to "the multitude with his disciples"; Luke says simply: "And he said *to all*" (9:23). The reason for this becomes clear at the end of the same verse, where Mark has: "let him take up his cross and follow me"; and Luke: "let him take up his cross *daily* and follow me." In the first instance Luke gives the state-

ment a more universal application than just the crowd and disciples in Jesus' time. He wants it to apply to all disciples at all times. The addition of the word "daily" in the second instance confirms this; cross-carrying is the daily lot of the Christian here and now. And Christ himself is the model. This last is underlined by Luke's editing of the next verse (Mk. 8:35 = Lk. 9:24). Mark's version reads: "For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it." Luke's wording is exactly the same except that he omits the phrase "and the gospel's." He wants to make perfectly clear the personal reasons for which the Christian is to lose his life.

The most interesting alteration of the Transfiguration account is in 9:31, where Luke connects it with the events in Jerusalem. Moses and Elijah speak of Jesus' "departure (*ἔξοδον*) which he was to accomplish (*πληροῦν*) at Jerusalem." The verb *πληροῦν* looks forward to the opening of the Jerusalem journey in 9:51: "When the days of his taking up were fulfilled (*συνπληροῦσθαι*)" The theme of necessity again. In v. 32 Luke adds that "Peter and those who were with him were heavy with sleep" during the conversation with Moses and Elijah. One is reminded of the recurring dullness of perception on the part of the disciples with regard to what was to happen in Jerusalem.

Luke omits the passage on the coming of Elijah (Mk. 9:9-13), probably because of its mention of John the Baptist, who exits early in the Gospel. He takes up the thread again with a shorter version than Mark's of the healing of the epileptic child (9:37-43a) and the second prediction of the Passion (9:43b-45). He adds emphasis and solemnity to the prediction with his own introduction (v. 44a): "Let these words sink into your ears." And in the next verse he lays extra stress on the disciples's incomprehension by adding to Mark's version (9:32) the sentence: "and it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it."

To the discussion about greatness in the Basileia (Mk. 9:33-37) Luke adds (9:48c) the logion: "for he who is least among you all is the one who is great." The pericope involves a misunderstanding about discipleship, and the logion makes a point which

Luke makes again in a similar context at the Last Supper (22: 24–27), also in connection with Jesus' going to his Passion.

Luke (9:49–50) and Mark (9:38–41) both have the pericope about the strange exorcist, after which Luke begins his Travel Narrative. When he rejoins Mark (Lk. 18:15), he does so at Mk. 10:13ff. (the little children), thus omitting Mk. 9:42–10:12 (scandal, salt, marriage, and divorce). The effect of the omission is to begin the journey to Jerusalem shortly after the second Passion prediction and the discussion of greatness in the Basileia (9: 43b–48); only the short pericope of the strange exorcist intervenes (9:49–50). This fits well with what we have seen about the themes that Luke wants to emphasize in the Travel Narrative: Passion and proper discipleship. Likewise, by omitting the material at the end of the journey, he rejoins Mark on the theme of discipleship (misunderstood), at the story of the little children. In 10:1 Mark notes the start of the Jerusalem trip; Luke drops this too, since, as we have seen, he has his own plan for an introduction to the journey.

Thus, we have in Luke's source — or rather in the Synoptic tradition before Luke, as both Matthew and Mark have them — the themes of the necessity of Jesus' Passion, the misunderstanding that this hard fact evokes, and the connection between the Passion and the difficult and unusual demands of Christian discipleship. Yet, even while following his source, Luke edits it in the light of what is to come. The necessity is there in Mark, but Luke gives it added stress by mentioning it at the Transfiguration too (9:31). The incomprehension of the disciples also gets added emphasis at the Transfiguration (9:32), and in two other places as well (9:45 and 9:48c). The very placing of the pericopes in Mark makes the connection between the Passion and the demands of discipleship: first prediction/conditions for discipleship (8:31–9:1); second prediction/discussion on greatness in the Kingdom (9:30–37).³⁰ Luke further explicitates the connection by his editorial work in 9:23–24 and hints at it again by the addition of the logion 9:48c. His omission of Mk. 9:42–10:12 serves the

³⁰ This raises for students of *Gemeindetheologie* the interesting question of whether Matthew and Mark intended to make the connection which Luke read in their order of events.

same purpose. Luke then takes this theme of discipleship and develops it, principally by his deployment of the *Reisenotizen*, into a central motif of the last two-thirds of his Gospel.

The second major theme of the Travel Narrative, the Gentile mission, is more purely Lukan. That is, the connection between the Jerusalem journey and the mission is not in the sources, and it fits so well with the conception of *Luke/Acts* as a whole that it must be Luke's own. The discipleship theme looks back, as it were, to the Synoptic tradition, while the theme of the mission looks forward to Acts. This places Luke just where most commentators would like to have him, in the "time of the Church" but still in contact with the earlier apostolic tradition.