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The uniqueness of the Greek text of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D) has been widely acknowledged by New Testament scholars, for no other New Testament manuscript has so many and such remarkable variant readings. In the past, some of the more noticeable variations in D have been examined in detail; however, such investigations have been confined largely to the immediate context of the individual variants.

Eldon Jay Epp, in his work on The Theological Trend of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), broke with the traditional approach to the study of D's text and discovered that by examining the whole text of Acts as a unit definite theological biases could be seen running throughout the variant readings. This approach helps to avoid erroneous conclusions concerning D's alterations by: (1) examining variations in the light of the entire scheme of alterations
within a given book, as well as in the light of the immediate context of each variant, and (2) thus allowing conclusions to be drawn which are consistent with the entire scheme of alterations and, therefore, avoiding the temptation to ignore an isolated variant because no immediate rationale presents itself to explain its presence. The close affinity of the books of Luke and Acts, as evidenced by these books' own introductions, opens the possibility that similar biases may be found running through the variant readings in D's text of Luke.

It is the purpose of this study: (1) to examine the complete text of Luke in D, (2) to isolate its variant readings by comparing D's text against the text of Codex Vaticanus (B) in Luke, (3) to determine whether D's variants alter the accepted textual tradition of Luke by manifesting certain biases, and (4) to ascertain whether these biases appear consistently in the variant readings of D.

The following theological biases would appear to emerge from the D-variants in Luke:

1. Jesus is exalted beyond his portrayal in the normal text of Luke as the Messianic son of David, as the compassionate healer, as one equal with the Father, and as the present Son of Man.
2. An anti-Judaic bias is present. This can be seen in the attempt to set aside Jewish institutions, by advancing in time priestly plottings of Jesus' death, and by portraying the people of Jerusalem as unresponsive to Jesus' ministry and as more hostile to Jesus during the passion.

3. Dominant characters, e.g. Jesus' mother, John the Baptist, and Peter, are elevated beyond their significance in the normal text.

4. The disciples in general are protected from behavior recorded by Luke that is not compatible with their position.

5. Gentiles are more favorably treated than in the normal text.

This examination of D's text in Luke leads to the further conclusion that the copyist functioned as an editor. A remaining question is the extent of D's editorial activity in the other gospels, but this is beyond the scope of the present investigation.
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## I. TEXTUAL WITNESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Codices</th>
<th>Century or Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papyri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P^45 )</td>
<td>Chester Beatty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P^75 )</td>
<td>P. Bodmer XIV, XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X )</td>
<td>Sinaiticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Alexandrinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Vaticanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ephraemi Rescriptus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bezae Cantabriensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Regius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Purpureus Petropolitanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Freer Gospels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Theta )</td>
<td>Koridethi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minuscules</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Codices</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Vercellensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Veronensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Colbertinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Palatinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Bixianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff1</td>
<td>Corbeiensis I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Versions

Coptic
- cop bo: Bohairic III/IV
- copsa: Sahidic II/III

Latin
- vg: Vulgate A.D. 384

Syriac
- sy c: Curetonian V
- sy h: Harclean A.D. 616
- sy p: Peshitta V
- sy pal: Palestinian VI
- sy ph: Philoxenian V/VI
- sy s: Sinaitic IV/V

II. MISCELLANEOUS

- Byzantine manuscripts
- A greater number of manuscripts, also out of other groups
- A greater number of Old Latin manuscripts
- Vulgate and some Old Latin manuscripts
- Complete Latin tradition
- A few other manuscripts
- Most witnesses
- Majority of remaining witnesses
- All witnesses except those enumerated
- Textus Receptus
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE
TEXT OF CODEX BEZAE IN ST. LUKE

The Problem

In pursuit of its ultimate goal of establishing the original text of the New Testament, the work of textual criticism has centered mainly on the task of identifying the place of individual witnesses within families, tribes, sub-text-types and text-types. By collating the variant readings and computing the results, a given manuscript can be identified as being, for example, Alexandrian, Caesarean, Western, or Byzantine in character.¹ As important as this work is for purposes of building a critical text, counting variants does not aid in understanding the degree of difference in meaning between a variant reading and the accepted norm. K. W. Clark says:

Counting words is a meaningless measure of textual variation, and all such estimates fail to convey the

¹The science of manuscript identification has been refined and perfected by such scholars as Ernest C. Colwell. The results of 30 years of labor in perfecting methods of working with manuscripts can be found in a compilation of essays produced for professional publications by Colwell, Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, Vol. IX of New Testament Tools and Studies, ed. by Bruce M. Metzger (9 vols.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969).
theological significance of variable readings. Rather it is required to evaluate the thought rather than to compute the verbiage. How shall we measure the theological clarification derived from textual emendation where a single word altered affects the major concept in a passage? . . . By calculating words it is impossible to appreciate the spiritual insights that depend upon the words.2

Although Westcott and Hort championed the belief that alterations of the text did not result from motives to deliberately create changes,3 the fallacy of this position is now generally accepted.4 For example, after comparing various passages from the Alexandrian and Western texts, Frederic Kenyon makes the following observation:

Anyone who examines the samples given above, which include the more important and characteristic variations between the D and 8 texts, will see that no theory of accidental omissions will account for them. Some of them are omissions and additions of clauses, in which


accident is distinctly less probable than intention; others are paraphrases, of which accident is not even a possible explanation.  

Until recently, however, studies, such as that of Kenyon, have centered in the more obvious variants scattered throughout the various New Testament witnesses. This has helped to affirm the error of Westcott and Hort, but it has not made it possible to understand the contribution that is made by a particular manuscript through its variant readings. This can only be done by a systematic evaluation of variants within their immediate context and within the context of a whole book that is being studied.  

For example, an examination of the Western non-interpolations in the Gospel of Luke will affirm that alterations have been made "... in which accident is distinctly


6 Michael Mees has undertaken a systematic survey of variants in D in the Gospel of Luke. Although his introductory material to each article stresses the problems faced by an investigator of Luke in D, his examination of the variants fails to develop the editorial scheme that gives relatively sure answers for the existence of numerous variants. Indeed, he completely skips over variants that are vital to understanding D's thinking and which help to explain the presence of other variants. Cf. Michael Mees, "Lukas 1-9 in der Textgestalt des Codex Bezae: Literarische Formen in Dienste der Schrift," Vetera Christianorum, V(1968), 89-110; idem, "Sinn und Bedeutung literarischer Formen für die Textgestalt des Codex Bezae in Lukas 10-11," Vetera Christianorum, VII, 1(1970), 59-82; idem, "Jesusworte in Lukas 12 und ihre Komposition nach Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis," Vetera Christianorum, VII, 2(1970), 285-303.
less probable than intention." However, a study of these variants, restricted to their immediate context and isolated from the rest of the text of Codex Bezae (D) in Luke, may lead to erroneous conclusions as to their true nature. Therefore, in order to understand adequately the thinking and biases that may have led to some variant readings that exist in New Testament witnesses, these variants must be viewed from the vantage point of examining all the variants within a particular book.

This has been done by E. J. Epp7 with D in the Book of Acts. His work indicates that throughout the variant readings that appear in this book definite biases can be identified. Because of the close affinity attributed to Luke and Acts by the introduction of the books themselves, it becomes necessary to ask whether D in Luke displays alterations of a similar nature to those found in Acts. In reviewing Epp's work on Acts, Ian A. Moir says of similar phenomena in Luke:

At page 26 Epp quotes Lake for the opinion . . . that 'one who proposed to study the "Western" problems should begin with the Acts, applying the results to the study of the gospels.' It would take too long to test Epp's views here in extenso, but as a rough check, the evidence of the new U.B.S. report of D-variants for Luke was examined (they are, of course, a restricted selection) and . . . they would seem to yield support to Epp's contentions. . . .8

---

7Epp, Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae.

The Purpose

It is the purpose of this work: 9

1. To identify in the textual tradition of St. Luke those points where D presents variants that make a change in the meaning of Luke's tradition.  

2. To see if these variants in Luke indicate a consistent pattern of thought (compared, for example, with the results of previous work on Acts).

3. To endeavor to isolate the reason for the change; whether, for example, it was a simple attempt to harmonize Luke with the other two synoptics, harmonization resulting from a bias, theological or anti-Judaic, or additions or omissions designed to develop a point or bias, etc.

4. To observe whether these alterations in the text were made to change the probable original emphasis of the Lucan tradition or to strengthen it.

A Brief Description and History of D

Codex Bezae Cantabriengiensis is the chief Greek witness to the Western text of our Gospels and Acts. This fact in itself should have accounted for the detailed study of its text in comparison with the other types of texts that have come to us from the earliest years of the church's history. However, D has actually become the one New Testament

10 The text of D in St. Luke was chosen because its variants are more unusual than in Matthew and Mark. For the purposes of this study Scrivener's edition of D will be used: F. H. A. Scrivener, Bezae Codex Cantabriengiensis. Being an Exact Copy, in Ordinary Type . . . (Cambridge: 1864).
manuscript that has received more attention from scholars than any other witness because it contains such unusual readings in so many passages. 11

Produced around the fifth century A.D., D is a bilingual manuscript with Greek on the left and Latin on the right. Each page contains a single column of text with each line divided into χωλα, i.e. lines of varying length so as to make the pauses in sense come at the end of lines. 12 Of its earliest known history W. H. P. Hatch says:

The manuscript was taken to the Council of Trent in 1546 by the Bishop of Clearmont, who had borrowed it from the Monastery of St. Irenaeus in Lyons. When the council was over, the codex was returned to the monastery; and there it was found when Lyons was sacked by a Huguenot army in 1562. About this time the manuscript came into the possession of Théodore de Bèze, the Geneva scholar and reformer; and he presented it to the University of Cambridge in 1581. 13

In 1899 a photographic reproduction was made by Cambridge University. 14 Kenyon believes that the presence of a Latin text is sufficient proof that the manuscript was produced in the West of Europe, where Latin was the

---


12 Ibid., p. 49.


14 Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis Quattuor Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum complectens Graece et Latine Sumptibus Academiae phototypice repraesentatus (Cambridge, 1899).
language of literature and daily life. However, he adds that the manuscript "... seems to have been used somewhere where the Scriptures were publicly read in Greek, for the liturgical directions are all on the Greek pages." Concerning its text, Metzger says: "No known manuscript has so many and such remarkable variations from what is usually taken to be the normal New Testament text."

A Summary of Luke's Textual Tradition

Because this study will concern itself with the textual tradition of St. Luke and how this tradition is dealt with by D, it might be well to survey quickly the major aspects of this tradition as it appears in the normal text. In dealing with his sources Luke has developed an exegetical tradition of the life and activities of Jesus that is uniquely his own. For example:

1. The beginning of Jesus' ministry in Galilee marks the arché ("beginning") in Luke, whereas in Mark the beginning is marked by the appearance of John. The precursor-motif is absent in the main body of Luke's material;

---


16Ibid., p. 209.

17Metzger, p. 50.
John is not the precursor of the Messiah, he is the last of the prophets—the last of the old age.  

2. Luke handles the disciples with gentle hands, especially Peter; "... their faults—ignorance, weak faith, mutual rivalries—are acknowledged, yet touched with sparing hand."  

3. Messiahship and Lordship are acknowledged early by the earthly Jesus in Luke's tradition (4:21); however, this accentuation in no way prevents Luke from stressing Jesus' feelings of sympathy. In Luke, more than in Mark


\[\text{20}\text{Cf. G. W. H. Lampe, "The Lucan Portrait of Christ," New Testament Studies, II(1955/56), 160, who describes Luke as an author who prefers to synthesize his material and does not "... press any one idea to its ultimate conclusion or content himself with drawing out the significance of a single Scripture image. He prefers to hold a large number of threads in his hand at once, introducing first one and then another into a somewhat untidy and ill-defined pattern, without allowing any one of them so to predominate over the rest as to give unity and coherence to the whole. This tendency is perhaps especially marked in his presentation of the person and work of Christ."}\]
and Matthew, Jesus expresses God's love for the despised through his conduct and his message. 21

4. Luke's tradition places the history of Jesus in clearly recognizable connection with the history of his time by connecting narrative events with the political context of Roman history, e.g. the census commanded by the Emperor Augustus and the chronological fixing of the Baptist's appearance.

5. Luke was probably first to represent the history of Jesus as the beginning of the currently-continuing church history. Kümmel believes that Luke's change in the Markan design of the material which they hold in common resulted from a wish "to describe the history of Jesus as the preparation for the activity of the disciples after Easter," i.e. "the place of Jesus' life in God's salvation history." 22

6. An attempt is made to show the political innocence of Jesus in the eyes of the Romans while the Jews unjustly seek to accuse Jesus as a political agitator. 23 Conzelmann makes the interesting observation that in Luke's tradition, "it is the Jews who throw the name of Barabbas

---


22 Kümmel, p. 99.

into the discussion," thus showing their solidarity with the rebels.24

Methodology

The following methodology will be used in this study:

1. D in St. Luke will be collated against a standard text in order to isolate its variants. Codex Vaticanus (B)25 was chosen as a standard for purposes of collation.26 The generally conservative character of B is recognized, thus making it the best representative of the main-line text.27

2. Once the variants are isolated they will be examined to see if there is any possibility that they involve a change in Luke's tradition.

24 Conzelmann, p. 87.


26 Cf. Epp, p. 33 and Klijn, p. 163. The ideal standard would be the original text which Luke himself wrote, but, since this is an elusive text, some other standard must be chosen. A critical edition, such as Nestle or the United Bible Societies' text, gives a text which never existed in manuscript form. K. W. Clark points out that even "... the best critical text so far achieved now holds little assurance of being the original text." "The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism upon New Testament Studies," The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, W. D. Davies and D. Daube (eds.), (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), p. 30. On the other hand B represents a real text.

27 Metzger, p. 216.
3. If a variant or a group of variants scattered throughout the text shows evidence of altering the meaning of the Lucan tradition on any given subject, Luke's tradition on this subject will be isolated by comparing his text with that of the other two synoptics as they appear in B.

4. The variant readings of D will then be compared with the isolated tradition as it reads in B. At this point an alteration in Luke's tradition made by D should be evident.28

5. Where parallel passages exist in Matthew and Mark they have been examined in D to determine if similar alterations were made in the other two synoptics. One purpose for this is to determine if the alterations made by D will show a consistent theological position or a bias of any other nature. Where such alterations have a direct bearing on D in Luke, they will be noted.

6. The sixth and final step will be an attempt to identify the reasons for the alterations. Although it

should be possible to state the reasons for most alterations in Luke's tradition, it is readily admitted that some changes may defy adequate explanation even though the alterations may be readily identified. K. Lake believes that doctrinal modifications of the text were very early, before the existence of our oldest manuscripts; therefore, it is vain to look for much manuscript evidence of doctrinal modification: "... [a] small amount of evidence is sufficient to establish the claim to consideration of readings which are likely to have been obnoxious to early doctrine." 29

K. W. Clark supports Lake's position:

The amount of textual change that involves theological alteration is a small proportion but it is a nugget of essential importance for interpretation. It is this smaller portion for which textual criticism must search especially. 30

As is indicated by Lake and Clark, we might expect to find some alterations that arise from theological biases. However, this is only one reason for textual changes. In this sixth step it will be discovered that there are various reasons lying behind the alterations made in Luke's textual tradition by Codex Bezae.


CHAPTER II

PROMINENT CHARACTERS AND THEIR ROLE IN D

Within D, one can observe a tendency to magnify the major personalities that are closely connected with Jesus' person and ministry, if this magnification will serve the purpose of exalting Jesus and His earthly mission. This is true of the two predominant characters found in the first three chapters of St. Luke, i.e. Mary, the mother of Jesus, and John the Baptist. The alterations made by D are not necessarily numerous, but they are of such a nature as to indicate the possible presence of an editorial design. Outside of Luke 1-3, it is Peter that receives D's attention. The remaining followers of Jesus figure into D's interest only in a minor way.

Mary, Mother of Jesus

In Luke's tradition, Mary is seen as playing a more prominent role in the early life of Jesus than in Matthew. One can see this by the amount of space Luke allots to Mary in the first two chapters of his gospel. Of the 132 verses, four are devoted to the introduction, 45 to the announcement of John's birth and the birth itself, and 83 verses, or 63% of the total, deal with the
nativity and early life of Jesus, in which Mary figures as a prominent character. In some of this material she is the dominant figure, e.g. in the announcement of Jesus' birth (13 verses); her visit to Elizabeth (7 verses); her song of praise (11 verses), for a total of 31 verses of the 83 in which she plays a prominent role.

The prominence of Mary in Luke's tradition stands out in bold relief when it is compared with Matthew's account of the nativity and infancy of Jesus, which covers a total of only 31 verses. At no time is Mary a dominant figure as she is in Luke's tradition. She is not visited by a heavenly messenger in Matthew as in Luke's account. It would seem that Matthew gives the greater prominence to Joseph in the nativity scenes, for he is visited at least three times by the heavenly messenger, and possibly four if 2:22 were to be counted: e.g. (1) Joseph is told not to hesitate to take Mary as his wife (1:19-25); (2) he is told to take the child and his mother and to go to Egypt to escape Herod's wrath (2:13-15); (3) he is told to return to Israel with the child and mother (2:19-21). A fourth appearance to Joseph may very well be seen in 2:22, for here Joseph is warned in a dream not to settle down in the territory ruled by Archelaus.

Outside of the context of the nativity and infancy, Mary is mentioned twice by Matthew and Mark, and once by Luke:
1. All three synoptics record the episode of the search by Mary and Jesus' brothers to find Jesus and of their desire to speak with him (Matthew 12:46-50; Mark 3:31-35; Luke 8:19-21).

2. Mary figures in Matthew's and Mark's account of Jesus' visit to Nazareth (receiving only passing notice, however). In Mark, the amazed crowd asks, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary . . .?" (6:3). Matthew reads, "Is not this the son of the carpenter? Is not his mother named Mary . . .?" (13:55). Luke's account is as follows, "Is this not the son of Joseph?" (4:22). Although a transition can be seen here from "the carpenter, the son of Mary" in Mark, to "the carpenter's son? Is not his mother named Mary" in Matthew, to "the son of Joseph" in Luke with the mention of Mary being dropped, Conzelmann's comment that Mary "... disappears to a greater extent in Luke than in Mark and Matthew"¹ seems rather strange, for the example given above is the only place where Luke fails to mention Mary when Matthew and Mark have done so.

¹Conzelmann, p. 127. Tatum (pp. 184, 193) agrees that Mary is "... pushed further into the background" after chapters 1-2. However, he maintains that one of Conzelmann's weaknesses is his failure to recognize the role of Mary in what Tatum calls "The epoch of Israel" (Luke 1-2); the same is true of John the Baptist. The reason for failing to recognize the role of Mary is that Conzelmann "... maintains that Luke i-ii preserve a theology different in many respects from the rest of Luke Acts." Thus in his work, Theology of St. Luke, Conzelmann does not treat these two chapters.
The phrase employed by Luke, "Is this not the son of Joseph?" is very close to John; however, the settings in which this question is asked are entirely different. Whereas Luke uses the setting of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth, in agreement with the other two synoptics, John's statement is connected with Jesus' sermon on the bread of life, which also, we must hasten to add, is found in the context of rejection. Whereas in Luke the rejection of Jesus is by his fellow townspeople, in John it is by the multitude in Galilee, plus many of Jesus' disciples: "And they said, Is this not Jesus, the son of Joseph, the father and mother of whom we know? How then does he say, I have come down from heaven?" (John 6:42).

In light of the above, there can hardly be any question that Mary plays a far more prominent role in Luke's tradition than in that of Matthew and Mark, even though Luke does prefer Joseph instead of Mary in one verse.

We will now look at two alterations made by D in the first two chapters of Luke which are intended to magnify the significance of Mary's role.

The first variant is found in Luke's account of the annunciation. Here D preserves a variant that is found in a number of other manuscripts, but one that fits the pattern of his editorial work. This reading is omitted
by X, B, W, f1, copsa, bo--some of the most important Alexandrian and Caesarean witnesses:

**Luke 1:28**

*Codex B*

καὶ εἰσελθὼν
πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπεν χαῖρε
κεχαριτωμένη ο ἡ μετὰ σου

"And when he came to her, he said, Hail! The grace of the Lord attend you."

*Codex D*

καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ ἄγγελος
πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπεν χαῖρε
κεχαριτωμένη ο ἡ μετὰ σου εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξὶν

"And when the angel came to her, he said, Hail! The grace of the Lord attend you. Blessed are you among women."

---

+ ο ἄγγελος post εἰσελθὼν, C Q D al vg (X 69 al it syP)
+ εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξὶν post σου, C Q D Θ pm latt sy

The comment of the angel, "Blessed are you among women," is probably borrowed from Elizabeth's exclamation in v. 42 of the same chapter. However, this proclamation changes in significance when it is spoken by a heavenly messenger as compared with the utterance of a mortal. That Mary should be thus addressed by the heavenly messenger appears to heighten her significance. Concerning this variant and its possible relationship with Elizabeth's words in 1:42, Mees says, "The attentive reader could hardly think that the angel had given less prominence to this woman than Elizabeth."² Although this addition may be

²Mees, "Lukas 1-9," p. 94.
of little consequence when taken by itself--because of the number of manuscripts that have it--it may be an ancient reading that found its way from the Western text into the later Byzantine texts and thus into the TR. When it is placed beside the second variant reading of D, it fits D's emerging editorial pattern of magnifying the personalities who have a close relationship with Jesus' life.

The second variant is an apparent attempt to place Mary in the Davidic line of Kings:

Luke 2:4,5

Codex B

4. ανεβη δε και ιωσηφ απο της γαλιλαίας εις πολεως ναζαρετ εις την ιουδαιαν εις πολιν δαυειδ ητις καλειται βηθλεεμ δια το ειναι αυτον εξ οικου και πατριας δαυειδ
5. απογραφασθαι συν μαρια τη εμνηστευμενη αυτη ουση εγγυνη

"4. And Joseph went up also from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth unto Judah, to the city of David which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and parentage of David, "5. To be registered with Mary his wife, who was pregnant."

Codex D

4. ανεβη δε και ιωσηφ απο της γαλιλαίας εις πολεως ναζαρεθ εις γην ιουδα εις πολιν δαυειδ ητις καλειτε βηθλεεμ
5. απογραφασθαι συν μαρια τη εμνηστευμενη αυτη ουση εν κυψε δια το ειναι αυτον εξ οικου και πατριας δαυειδ

"4. And Joseph went up also from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth into the land of Judah, to the city of David which is called Bethlehem, "5. To be registered with Mary his wife, who was pregnant, because he was of the house and parentage of David."
The Old Latin manuscript e, along with 348 and 1216, read "they" in place of "he" in the phrase as it appears at the end of verse four in the B text, thus saying, "because they were. . . ." F. Blass sees this change as support for the Davidic descent of Mary:

It seems to me an unwarranted supposition that the genealogy given by Luke is that of Mary and not of Joseph, although, by the way, the Davidic descent of Mary is also attested by the Western reading in ii. 4,5, which runs thus: 'And Joseph also went up unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, to be taxed with Mary his wife, because they were of the house and lineage of David.'

Blass suggests that this reading gives the reason for Mary accompanying Joseph instead of remaining in Nazareth, which would have been more suitable for her condition.

---

3Friedrich Blass, Philology of the Gospels, pp. 170-71. Mees (96), sees D simply clarifying an awkward reading. He does not see D as attempting to elevate Mary into a position of royal descent. C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (Vol. II; 2nd ed.: London: Macmillan and Company, 1927), p. 367, makes the following observation, "Joseph, not Mary, is of the royal Davidic house. . . . If Jesus had no human father, it is of no value that Joseph was a descendant of David." In the light of Luke's clear statement that Joseph is not Jesus' father, would Montefiore see D's apparent attempt to establish Mary in David's royal line as a necessary adjustment to keep Jesus' position intact?

Sy$^S$ substitutes "both" for "he" in this phrase and places it at the end of verse five where it appears in D, thus saying, "because both were. . . ." D, being sensitive to the thought that occasioned the alterations appearing in e and sy$^S$, moved the phrase to the end of verse five, yet felt he could retain the original wording while saying essentially what e and sy$^S$ say.

By moving this phrase, D appears to accomplish two things: (1) Mary is tied more intimately to the city of David; the phrase that disrupts the smooth presentation of this thought is transferred to the end of verse five. This in turn emphasizes the position taken by Luke in his normal text, i.e. the Messiah is to be born in Bethlehem in fulfillment of the prophecy of Micah 5:2. (2) By moving the phrase to the end of verse five a possible constructio ad sensum$^5$ results, which would be in agreement with the alterations which appear in e and sy$^S$, i.e. by transferring the phrase and allowing a smooth flow of thought between Mary and the city of David, the registration of Mary along with Joseph now suggests more forcefully Mary's Davidic descent.

Even though Blass speaks in terms of a "Western reading," his translation of Luke 2:4,5 (above) is essentially

---

that of the text of D. If it were that of 348, 1216, and e, the phrase we are discussing would appear after the word "Bethlehem." If Blass were translating sy\textsuperscript{S}, the phrase would be in the correct position but it would read "both were" instead of "they were." This is mentioned merely to show that it would seem that Blass also understood D's \( \alpha \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \nu \) ("he") to include Joseph and Mary, and thus he translated it as a constructio ad sensum—"they."

In Luke's normal tradition, Mary is not to be considered a descendant of David. D's alteration appears to be an attempt to elevate the stature of Mary by implying a direct descent from David. The reason for this may be twofold:

1. Luke is quite clear that Joseph is not Jesus' natural father. If the conception of Jesus was through the supernatural intervention of the Holy Spirit (1:35), Jesus could not establish a direct blood line to the throne through Joseph.

2. By making Mary a descendant of David, D removes any question of Jesus' claim to the throne. The concern of D for establishing a direct blood line for Jesus with the royal house is illustrated by the alterations made in Luke's genealogy (which will be investigated in the following chapter).

C. S. C. Williams says that the Davidic descent of
Mary is one of the test readings that indicates the influence of the Diatessaron upon our gospel manuscripts. The question here is: (1) whether D is under the direct

6 C. S. C. Williams, Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, p. 21. For a discussion of the possible influence of a gospel harmony on Codex Bezae, cf. Bulletin of the Bezan Club, I (1925), 5-14; V. F. Buchner, "Some Remarks on the Tradition of the Armenian Translation of Ephrem Syrus' Commentary on the Diatessaron," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, V (1928), 34-36; J. Rendel Harris, "The Mentality of Tatian," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, IX (1931), 8-10; C. A. Phillips, "Diatessaron-Diapente," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, IX (1931), 6-8; idem., N. T., Bulletin of the Bezan Club, IX (1931), 12-17; idem., "The Bezan Problem," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, IX (1931), 38-44; idem., "The Pepysian Harmony," Bulletin of the Bezan Club, IX (1931), 14-16; G. Quispel, "The Latin Tatian or the Gospel of Thomas in Limburg," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVIII (1969), 321-30; Heinrich Joseph Vogels, Die Harmonistik in Evangelientext des Codex Cantabriensis (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs' che Buchhandlung, 1910); idem., "Methods zur Textkritik der Evangelien," Biblische Zeitschrift, XI (1913), 376-81. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1966), pp. 145-46; cf. p. 150, believes that controversial readings found in D, which have been traced to Tatian or Marcion for their origin, are really readings that these men found in existence in Rome. His observation is significant enough to warrant its inclusion here: "First, Marcion: When we encounter in a variant reading the combination D it (vet-syr) Marcion, we do not have before us the influence of Marcion upon the text read in the West, but simply that text which Marcion found in Rome c. AD 140. The independent and confirmatory studies by A. Pott and A. von Harnack have definitely established this. This pre-Marcionite Western text is characterized in its text of Luke by numerous assimilations to Matthew (and Mark). Already before Marcion, therefore, there ruled in Rome the tendency to harmonize the synoptic gospels by assimilation; it is no accident that Tatian at that very place had the idea of constructing a harmony of the gospels. With regard to Tatian, what was valid for Marcion can be applied equally to the combination D it (vet-syr) Tat, namely that we do not have before us influences of Tatian upon the text read in Rome, but the text which Tatian found in Rome during his stay (c. 150-72)."
influence of the Diatessaron, or (2) whether D used a reading with which he was familiar to carry out his editorial designs, thus using a Diatessaron reading (possibly taken from a Latin harmony?)\(^7\) as a means to an end. It would appear that the latter is the case, for reasons which will be detailed below.

Luke alone gives the reason for the birth of Jesus taking place in Bethlehem, i.e. the decree of Caesar Augustus that all should be registered in the cities of their ancestors. Because of the decree, Joseph and Mary, who was approaching the time of her delivery, made their way to Bethlehem:

**Luke 2:6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εγένετο δὲ εὖ τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς εἰκῆ εἰπήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν</td>
<td>ως δὲ παρεγεῖνοντο εἰπήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;And it came to pass, while they were there the days of her delivery were fulfilled.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;And as they arrived the days of her delivery were accomplished.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This variant alters Luke's tradition. From the B text one sees Joseph and Mary already settled in Bethlehem for their stay--even though there was no room for them in

\(^7\) Bulletin of the Bezan Club, I(1925), pp. 5-6.
the inn--before Mary begins her labor and gives birth to Jesus. However, in D's account one can imagine the stress and anxiety under which Joseph searched for shelter for Mary. Concerning this variant, Mees says that it was popularly understood that Jesus was born immediately after the arrival of Joseph and Mary in Bethlehem. He suggests that the normal reading does not portray this accurately so D altered the normal text to read, "And as they arrived . . .," thus stressing the immediacy of Jesus' birth in relation to the arrival in Bethlehem.8 There is some evidence that there existed in the early church a tradition that Jesus was either born prior to the arrival in Bethlehem,9 or immediately upon arrival in the city.10

D may be reflecting this early tradition, as Mees suggests, or simply stressing the fulfillment of the words of the prophet (Micah 5:2) by indicating that any delay in Joseph and Mary's journey could very well have nullified the prophecy. We shall see shortly that D is interested in the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy when it

---

8Mees, p. 96.


furthers his editorial scheme; therefore, it seems more probable here that D wished to stress the fulfillment of Micah's prophecy with respect to Jesus' place of birth.

There is one further area that deserves investigation before we leave the place of Mary in Luke's tradition. According to Luke's account, both Joseph and Mary were natives of Nazareth before the birth of Jesus (1:26; 2:4). Matthew does not make either Joseph or Mary residents of Nazareth until the return from their forced exile in Egypt; and even then they would not have gone to Nazareth if it had not been for the divine communication not to reside in Archelaus' territory. Therefore Matthew could say, "Thus what was spoken through the prophets might be fulfilled, He shall be called a Nazarene" (2:23).11

D makes an interesting change in Luke's tradition in this connection:

Luke 1:26,27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. εν δε τῷ μηνὶ τῷ εκτῷ απεσταλῆ ο αγγελὸς γαβριηλ ἀπὸ τοῦ θυ εἰς πολιν τῆς γαλιλαίας η ὄνομα ναξαρεῖτ 27. πρὸς παρθένον εμη- στευμενην ανδρί ψ όνομα ἱωσηφ εξ οικου δαυиде και το ὄνομα της παρθενου μαριαμ</td>
<td>26. εν δε τῷ εκτῷ μηνὶ απεσταλῆ ο αγγελὸς γαβριηλ υπὸ τοῦ θυ εἰς πολιν γαλιλαιαν 27. πρὸς παρθένον μεμη- σιμενην ανδρί ψ όνομα ἱωσηφ εξ οικου δαυиде και το ὄνομα της παρθενου μαριαμ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"26. And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent by God to a city of Galilee which is called Nazareth,
"27. To a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary."

D identifies Mary as a native of Galilee but not necessarily of Nazareth. Luke's tradition concerning Joseph is preserved intact by D, however. Why is D unwilling to identify Mary as a native of Nazareth before the birth of Jesus and yet willing to preserve Luke's tradition concerning the residence of Joseph (cf. 2:4)?

One might suggest that D makes this change in an attempt to harmonize Luke's tradition with Matthew. But if D were attempting to harmonize Luke with Matthew here, it would seem probable that he also would have altered the verse that says Joseph was a native of Nazareth (2:4), for Matthew 2:22 implies strongly that Joseph was a native of Judea.

Hence, it is likely that D's alteration is not an attempt at harmonization. The change may have resulted

12 Mark says nothing of the residence of Joseph and Mary explicitly; he simply says that at the time of Jesus' baptism he came from Nazareth to be baptized, thus implying the residence of Joseph and Mary.

13 Creed, p. 6.
from Nathanael's remark in John 1:46, "Is it possible for any good thing to come out of Nazareth?," which precedes Luke in the so-called "Western" order of the Gospels.\textsuperscript{14} If D is seen as elevating and magnifying the role of Mary, this alteration would remove from her any stigma that might be attached to the name of this town.\textsuperscript{15} The fact that Joseph is retained as a native of Nazareth by D is not inconsistent with D's editorial designs, for Joseph has no blood relationship with Jesus.

D permits Luke to return Joseph and Mary to Nazareth after Jesus' birth because Joseph is a native of this city and Mary, of course, would go with Joseph to his home as his wife. But now, Jesus becomes a native of Nazareth. Hence, D harmonizes Luke 2:39 with Matthew 2:23 for the solution of this problem:

Luke 2:39

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Codex B} & \textit{Codex D} \\
καὶ ως ἔτελεσαν παντα τα & καὶ ως ἔτελεσαν απαντα \\
κατα τον νόμον κυ ἐπεστρεψαν & κατα τον νόμον κυ ὑπεστρεψαν \\
eἰς την γαλιλαίαν εἰς πολιν & εἰς την γαλιλαίαν εἰς πολιν \\
eαυτῶν ναζαρεθ & εαυτῶν ναζαρεθ καθως ερεθη
\end{tabular}


\textsuperscript{15}Cf. Montefiore, who believes that Nazareth was the true birthplace of Jesus, p. 395.
"And when they completed all the things according to the law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own city of Nazareth."  

Thus D allows Jesus to be called, "Jesus of Nazareth" (cf. Luke 4:34; 18:37; 24:19; Matthew 21:11; 26:71; Mark 1:24; 10:47; 14:67), with one exception, Mark 16:6.

Thus far we have noted the following:

1. D allows Mary to be called a native of Galilee, but not of Nazareth.

2. Joseph is allowed to maintain his connection with Nazareth because there are no blood ties with Jesus.

3. Jesus is permitted to be taken to Nazareth after his birth (2:39) and again after his first trip to the temple (2:51), because this is the home of his adoptive father.

4. Jesus' connection with Nazareth is defended by a harmonization with Matthew, which uses fulfillment of prophecy, "he shall be called a Nazarene," as reason for his childhood and early adult life being spent in Nazareth.
5. This now permits D to retain accounts of various occasions where Jesus was referred to as a Nazarene or as being from Nazareth.

Thus far the reasoning lying behind D's editorial work can be followed logically. However, when we come to Luke 4:16 we find an apparent inconsistency. In contrast to B, D retains an alternate reading which omits reference to Jesus' childhood in Nazareth. However, this omission need not pose a problem to D's editorial pattern being developed here:

Luke 4:16

Codex B

ελθὼν δὲ εἰς ναζαρεῖον οπου ἦν κατὰ το εἰσόδος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συν- αγωγὴν καὶ ἀνεστή αναγνώσαι

"And he came into Nazareth where he had been brought up, and he entered the synagogue on the Sabbath day according to his custom and stood up to read."

Codex D

ελθὼν δὲ εἰς ναζαρεῖον οπου ἦν κατὰ το εἰσόδος εν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συν- αγωγὴν καὶ ἀνεστή αναγνώσαι

"And when he came to Nazareth, where it was the custom on the Sabbath to be in the synagogue, he stood up to read."

Some scholars see in these omissions the results of Marcionite influence. Harris says, "It is generally reckoned, therefore, that Marcion omitted the words οὖ
For some reason this Marcionite rendition of Luke 4:16 fits D's thinking and he uses it.

We must ask, of the three "Marcionite" omissions in this verse, which one fits into D's editorial scheme and thus prompted the use of this "Marcionite reading?"

It does not appear that D is interested in this alternate reading because it omits the statement that Jesus was brought up in Nazareth. D is not adverse to having Jesus reared in Nazareth, as we have just seen. Therefore it seems that D used this so-called "Marcionite reading" of Luke 4:16 for a reason other than removing Jesus' place of residence from Nazareth.

Once ὑπὸ τεθραμμένος ("had been brought up") is eliminated as a possible motivation for D's use of this reading, we are left with two alterations that reflect a biased attitude toward the Sabbath as a Jewish institution. D simply carried over the omission of ὑπὸ τεθραμμένος ("had been brought up") into his text along with the other omissions in which he was theologically interested. D has made his position clear concerning Mary's and Jesus' relation to Nazareth in his editorial work prior to 4:16. That the

---


17 D's theological bias on the Sabbath will be dealt with in detail in a later chapter.
omission of τεθραμμένος ("had been brought up") appears to be inconsistent with D's earlier position on Jesus' relation to Nazareth only strengthens an observation made by Eldon Epp in another connection:

Thus one finds that, while a manuscript may show a dissident reading in one synoptic passage, it may not appear in the parallel passage(s). Nor is there always consistency within a single book, and certain emphases present in one place may not be found at other expected points. In the gospels, for example, the 'Western' text often neglects this general consistency, but frequently maintains consistency in the context. 18

**John the Baptist**

As has been pointed out, the second prominent character in Luke's three chapters of material introductory to Jesus' ministry is John the Baptist. Throughout this introductory material D makes several interesting changes in connection with John. Before examining these alterations in detail, it might be well if some of the aspects of Luke's tradition concerning John were pointed out:

1. Luke alone has a detailed account of the "announcement" and birth of John (1:5-25,57-80).

2. Luke alone ties in the beginning of John's ministry, chronologically, with various men in political offices (3:1,2).

18 Epp, p. 38.
3. Luke alone records the questions that are pressed upon John by the conscience-smitten crowd and how John replied to these questions (3:10-14).


5. Conzelmann sees John playing a lesser role in Luke than in the other two synoptics. For example, Conzelmann says: (a) Luke excludes any suggestion that John plays an important part in Jesus' baptism; (b) because Luke does not connect the Elijah motif with John (outside of chapters 1-2), it is John's ministry and not his person that prepares the way for Jesus; (c) the appearance of John marks the end of the old epic and the beginning of the new; but John belongs to the old; he is the last of the prophets.

In Luke's exclusive material dealing with the birth of John, D makes minor alterations in the text. However, each change seems to be designed to heighten the significance of John within the tradition. Again it must be emphasized that the alterations need not be major changes in order for D to accomplish his purposes.

When Gabriel appeared to Zacharias in the temple and announced the coming birth of John, he was very specific

---

in his instructions as to the naming of the child: 
καλέσεις 
to δόνομα αὐτοῦ ἰωάννην ("You shall call his name John"—
1:13). When it was time to name the child, D has Gabriel's 
command quoted as directly as possible. Thus divine au-
thority is appealed to in the naming of John, and moreover 
the threefold repetition of the angel's command (1:60, 61, 
63) emphasizes the uniqueness of John's position in D's 
text.

Luke informs us that on the eighth day, when the 
child was to be circumcised, "they" named him after his 
father Zacharias. Elizabeth's reaction was immediate:

Luke 1:60, 61

Codex B

60. καὶ ἀποκριθείσα αὐτὴν ἀπείπεν οὐχὶ ἄλλα κλῆ-
θησεται ἰωάννης.
61. καὶ ἐπον ἐπὶ ἀϋτὴν ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ἐπὶ τῆς 
συγγενείας σου ὡς καλείται τῷ ονόματι 
tουτῷ.

"60. And answering, his 
mother said, No, but he 
shall be called John.
"61. And they said to her, 
there is no one of your 
relatives who is called 
after this name."

Codex D

60. καὶ ἀποκριθείσα αὐτὴν ἀπείπεν οὐχὶ ἄλλα κλῆ-
θησεται τῷ ονόμα οὗ 
τουτῷ.
61. καὶ ἐπον ἐπὶ ἀpływ 
ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ἐπὶ τῇ 
συγγενείᾳ σου ὡς καλεῖ 
tαι τῷ ονόμα τουτῷ.

"60. And answering, his 
mother said, No, but his 
name shall be John.
"61. And they said to her, 
there is no one among your 
relatives who is called 
this name."

v. 60 + το ονόμα αὐτοῦ post κληθήσεται, C* D 213 corbo 
syραλ
v. 61 ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας] εν τῇ συγγενείᾳ, D 
tῷ ονόματι οὕτῳ] τῷ ονόμα τουτῷ, D
In v. 60, D puts the command of the angel into Elizabeth's mouth, τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἴωάνης ("his name . . . John"). Thus, Elizabeth is made to appeal directly to divine authority in the naming of her child, and by so doing emphasizes the divine commission of John.

In v. 61, a perfectly allowable grammatical change is made. In v. 59, when those who were present to circumcise John called him Zacharias, the normal text reads, καὶ ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ζαχαρίαν (And they called him after the name of his father, Zacharias). In v. 61, B drops the preposition ἐπὶ but retains the dative case for the noun. D changes the dative case to the nominative. Arndt and Gingrich says that καλέω, in the passive, "... approaches closely the meaning to be."\(^{21}\) In Kittel, we are told that καλέω, in the passive form, "... is linked with a nominative subject and predicative nominative."\(^{22}\) The question is, of course, Why is D the manuscript to make this change?

---


Before an answer is suggested, we must observe one more minor addition which fits a developing pattern:

Luke 1:63

Codex B
καὶ αὐτήσας πεινακείδιον εγραψεν λεγων ἰωάννης εστίν ὄνομα αὐτοῦ . . .

Codex D
καὶ αὐτήσας πινακίδα εγραψεν ἰωάννης εστίν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ . . .

"And when he asked for a writing tablet he wrote saying, John is his name . . ."

om. λεγων, D 4 273 e syS + τὸ ἀντὶ ὄνομα, X C Ῥ D Θ πl

We may now safely ask, What was D's purpose in making the changes we have noted? As nearly as possible, D uses the original command of Gabriel as a sacred formula to emphasize the uniqueness of John's divine command. In each place thereafter the formula has been used in such a way as to bring Gabriel's words to mind. A simple listing of the variants will make D's pattern in naming John clear:

Codex B
τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ 1:13 τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
1:60 τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
τῷ ὄνοματι τουτῷ 1:61 τὸ ὄνομα τουτο
ὁ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ 1:63 τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

It appears to the eye that this formula is set at τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, with τὸ τοῦτο ("this") replacing αὐτοῦ ("his") in one case. 23

23 That the original command of the angel is one part of a double accusative and the restatement of the command
Because of Zacharias's unbelief at the announcement of John's birth, he was stricken dumb and remained silent according to the word of Gabriel. Not only were the people at the temple amazed at Zacharias's inability to speak when he emerged from its sacred precincts, but also the acquaintances of Zacharias and Elizabeth must have wondered at this strange silence and the events surrounding it.

We have already dealt with a portion of what follows, but it must now be repeated in order to understand the background for the next alteration made by D. In Luke's normal tradition, those who came to circumcise John called him Zacharias; we have seen Elizabeth's response; now these people turn to the father as a final source of appeal:

Luke 1:63,64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63. καί αἰτησάς πεινακεῖ-</td>
<td>63. καί αἰτησάς πινακιδα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίον εγραφέν λεγών ἰωάννης</td>
<td>εγραφέν ἰωάννης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐστίν ὦνομα αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>ἐστίν τὸ ὦνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are in the nominative case would not seem to detract from D's scheme. That is to say, if we take the formula in 1:60,61 as predicate nominatives, which seems to be the case. This would then make all three restatements agree in case usage. If we take the formula in 1:60,61 as a double accusative this would make these two restatements agree with the angel's original command, as far as case is concerned, but would then put the formula in 1:63 out of harmony with the restatements in 1:60,61. In any case, it is impossible to harmonize all four statements as far as case is concerned. The important thing is that D alters Luke's normal text to obtain a relatively harmonious formula for the naming of John that emphasizes above the normal text the divine commission of this child.
καὶ εδαυμασαν πάντες
64. ἀνεωχθῇ δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ η ἡ γλώσσα αὐτοῦ καὶ ελαλεῖ εὐλογών τὸν δὲν

"63. And when he asked for a writing tablet he wrote, saying, his name is John,
and
they all marvelled.
"64. And immediately his mouth was opened and his tongue loosed and he spoke, praising God."

According to Luke's normal tradition, those present on this occasion were amazed at Zacharias's desire to name his son John and not Zacharias, after himself. Once Zacharias had fulfilled the instruction of Gabriel and consented to the name of John, he could speak once again. In the text of D, the loosening of Zacharias's tongue is moved into a position immediately following the commitment to the name of John. In doing this D heightens the significance of Zacharias's silence and the miraculous loosening of his tongue. The people now marvel and are amazed, not so much at the choice of John for a name, but at the miraculous
event that is connected with the naming of this unusual child. 24

D now intensifies the reaction of the people:

Luke 1:65

Codex B

καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος τοὺς περιοικοῦντας αὐτοὺς. . . .

"And awe came upon all those living around them. . . ."

+ μεγας post φοβος, D 50 b c αὐτοὺς] αὐτὸν, D

Codex D

καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μεγας ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς περιοικοῦντας αὐτον. . . .

"And great awe came upon all those living around him. . . ."

By the addition of μέγας ("great"), D accentuates the effects of the supernatural upon those who lived in the surrounding area. Plummer and Meyer take the αὐτοὺς ("them") of B to be Zacharias and Elizabeth. 25 D changes αὐτοὺς ("them") to αὐτὸν ("him"). There is little question but that D used αὐτὸν ("him") for John and not Zacharias, thus placing the child at the center of community "awe."

This change in pronoun would arise from D's editorial

24 Mees essentially agrees with this position (p. 95), but he fails to tie this variant into an editorial pattern that could reveal a consistent scheme behind many of D's variants.

scheme to magnify the role of John, which would, in turn, be supported by the next verse in St. Luke:

Luke 1:66

Codex B

καὶ εὕεντο παντες οἱ ακούσαντες εν τῇ καρδίᾳ εαυτῶν λέγοντες τι ἀρα τὸ παιδίον τούτῳ εσταὶ καὶ γὰρ χείρ ἡν ἦν μετὰ αὐτοῦ

 Codex D

καὶ εὕεντο παντες οἱ ακούσαντες εν ταῖς καρδιαῖς αυτῶν λέγοντες τι ἀρα τὸ παιδίον τούτῳ εσταὶ καὶ γὰρ χείρ ἡν ἦν μετὰ αὐτοῦ

"And all those who heard stored up these things in their heart, saying, What sort of child shall he be? For the hand of the Lord was with him."

om. ἡν, D 59 it syS

Concerning this omission Metzger says:

Not noticing that the last clause of the verse is an observation made by the evangelist (such occasional remarks are characteristic of Luke: cf. 2.50; 3.15; 7.39; 16.14; 20.20; 23.12) several Western witnesses (D itd,ff2, 1, q, 26 syrs) omit ἡν, thus bringing the clause within the question of those who had heard about Zechariah ("What then will this child be for the hand of the Lord is with him?").

From the point of view of D, the alterations in vv. 65,66 support each other and thus this appendage to the question ("for the hand of the Lord is [not was] with him") is asked by those who heard about John and not Zacharias.

By following the developing pattern of variants, there is a serious question as to whether the omission of ἡν in v.

66 was really accidental on the part of D, as Metzger suggests. That the last clause of this verse is an observation by Luke and not intended to be part of the question posed by John's neighbors is clear in the normal text. But it is equally clear that the omission fits nicely into D's editorial pattern. For now the people who have been "greatly awed" by this unusual child not only ask the question, "What sort of child shall he be?," but also bear testimony that John's uniqueness stems from God's own hand, being evident in all the preceding events.

D seems to lessen further the role of Zacharias in his attempt to elevate the significance of John's role. Gabriel had previously identified John as the chosen instrument of God when he originally talked to Zacharias in the temple. D guards this unique position assigned to John by God and minimizes as much as possible the prophetic gift given to Zacharias. It appears that D wishes to preserve this honor for John, although D will allow John's father to be filled with the Holy Spirit:

Luke 1:67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ Ζαχαρίας ο πατήρ</td>
<td>καὶ Ζαχαρίας ο πατήρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτοῦ ἐπλησθῇ πνευμάτος</td>
<td>αὐτοῦ ἐπλησθῇ πνευμάτος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αγίου καὶ ἐπροφητεύσεν</td>
<td>αγίου καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγων...</td>
<td>εἶπεν...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"And Zacharias, his father, was filled"
Tatum points out that the role of the Holy Spirit in Luke 1-2 "... lies in the realm of prophecy"; thus Zacharias is filled with the Spirit and "... immediately he prophesied." 27 Mees recognizes that the alteration made by D is significant, but attributes the change from "prophesied" to "said" to the fact that the Benedictus immediately follows and D did not recognize it as prophecy in the fullest sense. 28 It seems more consistent with D's text to say that D permits Zacharias to be filled with the Spirit but minimizes the activity so as not to overshadow the position given to his son by divine commission.

Leaving Luke's exclusive material on John's birth, we will now observe that D continues his editorial scheme by making alterations in the material Luke holds in common with Matthew and Mark.

The beginning of the ministry of John is introduced by Mark with a quotation from Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3, identifying John as the promised messenger who would precede the coming of the Lord and prepare his way.

Before Matthew quotes Isaiah 40:3, he introduces

27 Tatum, p. 187.  28 Mees, p. 95.
John's ministry by saying, "And in those days John the Baptist came preaching . . ." (3:1). Luke's introduction to John's ministry expands Matthew's simple statement, "In those days . . .", by pinpointing the time of John's appearance by listing the men who were in prominent offices, including the year of the emperor and the name of the high priest in Jerusalem.

Matthew briefly touches upon the heart of John's message in his introduction, "Saying, repent, for the kingdom of heaven in near" (3:2). Luke follows Mark at this point by indicating that John's message was a call to repentance for the forgiveness of sin: "Proclaiming the baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sin" (Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3).

D now carries the theme of John's preaching into the quotation taken from Isaiah 40, which Luke holds in common with Mark and Matthew. Luke modifies Mark's introduction to this Old Testament quotation, but follows Matthew's chronological order in presenting it. Luke's quotation of Isaiah is expanded by two verses over that of Mark and Matthew. Because all three synoptics agree exactly in quoting Isaiah 40:3, only the text of Luke, as seen in B, will be presented in contrast to D:

Luke 3:4

Codex B

Codex D
"A voice crying in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord, make straight his paths."

That all three synoptics apply the words of this prophecy to the ministry of John indicates that this was a primitive Christian interpretation of Isaiah 40:3. Also, that all three synoptics substitute αὐτοῦ ("his") for τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ("of our God") of the LXX indicates that αὐτοῦ ("his") was taken as referring to the Messiah in the primitive tradition. 29

The alteration presented by D makes Isaiah's prophecy apply specifically to the message of John's preaching. The call to prepare the way of the Lord by having the people straighten out their own paths appears to be a direct call to repentance and the forsaking of sin. Thus D again heightens the significance of John by tying this Old Testament prophecy directly to the message being preached by John.

D in Matthew retains the primitive church's interpretation of Isaiah 40:3 by reading "his." D in Mark

29Plummer, pp. 86-87.
alters the original LXX reading, writing "of your God" instead of "of our God." The question immediately arises, did D also intend to write "of your God" in Luke as well, or did D drop the τὸῦ ἡκοῦ ("God") of Mark intentionally, thus leaving ὑμῶν ("your"), and thereby altering the sense of Isaiah's prophecy? The fact that Nestle-Aland questions Mark's ὑμῶν ("your") in D only points out the uncertainty of the origin of this variant in Luke. However, as it stands in D's text, ὑμῶν ("your") supports his redactional intentions. B. S. Easton describes this variant as "obviously moralizing." Mees says that John the Baptist predicted the atonement at the Jordan and D viewed the quotation taken from Isaiah as a summons to repentance in the preaching of John and accordingly altered the pronoun so that the quotation read, "Make straight your paths." Although we may not be able to settle conclusively the origin of this variant, its presence strengthens D's concept of the ministry of John.

As the fame of John spread, large crowds gathered to hear him preach and to be baptized by him. Luke and Matthew draw upon a common source that presents John's

---

30 Nestle-Aland, p. 84.


32 Mees, p. 97.
message to those who came to hear him. However, in Matthew's account John's scathing message is addressed to the Pharisees and Sadducees; in Luke it is addressed to the crowds. In this context D makes a change concerning the mode of baptism:

Luke 3:7

Codex B

ελεγεν ουν τοις εκπορευ-ομενοις οχλοις βαπτισθηναι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. . . .

Codex D

ελεγεν δὲ τοις εκπορευ-ομενοις οχλοις βαπτισθηναι ενωπιον αὐτοῦ. . . .

"He said, therefore, to the crowds that came out to be baptized by him . . . ."

"And he said to the crowds that came out to be baptized before him . . . ."

This alteration ("before" for "by") is not held by D alone, but it also receives support from Old Latin manuscripts. The immediately obvious solution is that which is offered by a number of scholars, i.e. the people stood in the water and immersed themselves at John's bidding. 33 Hatch also suggests a second alternative: it was thought that John could not possibly baptize all of the people that came to him, therefore, he had assistants to help him perform the rite. 34

33 Creed, p. 51; Easton, p. 37; Hatch, pp. 30-31; and Montefiore, p. 7.

34 Hatch, pp. 30-31.
Both points might have something said about them. First, when a Gentile accepted Judaism as his religion and showed himself sincere in his request to become a proselyte, he was required, after circumcision, to immerse himself completely in water while two men stood by and informed him of some of the light and some of the heavy aspects of the law. In chapter six numerous examples will be given that illustrate what seems to be an anti-Judaic bias in D in Luke. In view of this apparent anti-Judaic bias, it seems rather unlikely that D would replace a reading that would favor the personal baptism of each candidate by John with a reading that would suggest the Jewish mode of baptism.

Or, secondly, John may have baptized through the use of assistants. This reminds one of the method followed by Jesus, as reported by the evangelist John: "When, therefore, the Lord knew that the Pharisees heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, although Jesus himself did not baptize, but his disciples . . ." (4:1-2). It seems that Paul followed the example set by Jesus, at least in Corinth. He preached and ministered spiritually to the people, but left the rite of baptism to be completed.

---

by the aid of his assistants. After chastizing the Corinthians for their senseless quibbling over the origin of their spiritual rebirth, Paul said:

I am thankful that I baptized none of you, except Crispus and Gaius; so no one could say that you were baptized in my name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas; I am not aware that I baptized any others. For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel (I Corinthians 1:14-17).

Of course, the question then immediately arises, is it possible that Jesus was not baptized personally by John in D's account of Luke's tradition? In the light of the alteration presently under consideration and with the absence of a specific statement in Luke's tradition telling us that Jesus was baptized by John, as is found in Matthew 3:13-16, one can conclude that he was not. Without taking into consideration D's alteration, Conzelmann says:

According to iii.21f Jesus is baptized as one of the people, like everyone else. Luke excludes any suggestion that John plays an important part in the incident. This is in keeping with his whole conception of the significance of John.37

---

36 Cf. G. O. Williams, "The Baptism in Luke's Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIII (1944), 34, who says of Luke's normal text that the imprisonment of John preceded the baptism of Jesus, thus he is removed from the scene. "John's significance is therefore not that he baptized Jesus but that in the course of his ministry he bore witness to the approach of a Greater One who was destined to eclipse his own fame."

37 Conzelmann, p. 21.
It would appear that D, by this alteration in 3:7, is strengthening a position like that of Conzelmann, that John the Baptist fills a lesser role in Luke than in the other two synoptics. However, we have seen enough of D's editorial scheme thus far, as it relates to John, to make this idea unlikely. What is the reason for the alteration? Two possibilities offer themselves: (1) it may not have mattered to D if John personally baptized or whether the people were baptized by assistants, as long as the significance of John's role is clearly seen through other means. (2) There is always the possibility that the reading in Luke was affected by John 4:1-2 (Jesus did not personally baptize), which preceded it in Codex Bezae, and D wished to present the Messiah and his forerunner as using the same methods in ministering to the people. If the latter is the case, and there is no reason why it could not be, the ministry of John is again heightened by its similarity in methods with that of Jesus.

Luke alone reports the reaction of the people to John's preaching. Three groups are represented as responding, the people (3:10), the publicans (3:12), and the soldiers (3:14). D here makes three additions that markedly increase the significance of John's ministry and thus the importance of John himself:

Luke 3:10, 12, 14
The three significant changes in verses 10, 12, and 14 are the addition of ἵνα σώθωμεν ("that we might be saved"). In order for us to appreciate properly D's motives in making these additions, we must return to an earlier observation. We have already seen that Luke begins the ministry of John, as do the other synoptics, by quoting from Isaiah 40, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness,"
etc. However, Luke extends the quotation from Isaiah 40:3 to verse 5, and concludes with the final clause of verse 5: καὶ διψῶσα πᾶσα χώρα τὸ σωτηρίων τοῦ θεοῦ ("And all flesh shall see the salvation of God"—Luke 3:6). We here see Luke directly linking John, as the forerunner of the Messiah, to the salvation that is to be made manifest to the world through the Messiah by the presence of Isaiah 40:5 in Luke's normal tradition. However, this tie between God's messenger and the coming salvation is only implicit, but D alters the text to make it explicit.

Putting the words, ἵνα σώσωμεν ("that we might be saved"), into the mouths of the people was a natural addition to τί ποιήσωμεν ("what should we do") if the normal text of Luke is followed to its logical conclusion. First, because Luke follows Mark (1:4) in saying that John's preaching was a call to repentance for the forgiveness of sins, as opposed to Matthew (3:2), who simply says that John's message was a call to repent. Secondly, because Luke ties John, as God's chosen messenger, into the coming Messianic salvation by quoting Isaiah 40:5. Therefore, when John begins to warn the people in the next verse (v. 7) of God's coming wrath and concludes (v. 9) by saying that those who do not produce the fruits of repentance in their lives will be "cast into the fire," D uses the inquiry of the people, τί ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σώσωμεν ("what
should we do that we might be saved"), to say explicitly what he evidently believes Luke is saying implicitly, that John and his message have a direct connection with God's plan of offering salvation to πᾶσα σὰρξ ("all flesh"). So again, D has heightened the significance of John.

These additions would seem to show an anti-Judaic bias. Luke has already substituted δῆμος ("people"—3:7) for Matthew's φαρισαῖοι καὶ σάδδουκαί ("Pharisees and Sadducees"—3:7) as those who heard and responded to John's preaching and were baptized. Although surely there were religious leaders in the crowds that heard John, Luke does not present any indication of a favorable response on their part. In Luke's normal tradition those who ask, τι ποιήσωμεν ("what should we do") are the δῆμος ("people"), τελώναι ("publicans") and στρατευόμενοι ("soldiers").

Conzelmann says:

He [Luke] creates a further discrepancy by introducing a motif of his own: in place of Pharisees and Sadducees he puts the δῆμος. This might be derived from Mark 1,5, but with variations. Verses 7, 10 and 20 show how consistently this has been done, and in vii, 29 Luke attributes to Jesus the statement that 'all' were baptized.

In other words, all the people are baptized but their leaders without exception refuse to be baptized. 38

Taken in the light of D's emphasis, the leaders' 

refusal of John's ministry now becomes much more serious, for their rejection of John indicates a rejection of the salvation that will be extended through the one John is preparing the people to receive.

In the following alteration we again see D identifying John's ministry with that of Jesus:

Luke 3:15,16

Codex B

15. προσδοκώντος δὲ του λαοῦ καὶ διαλογίζομενων παντῶν εν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ ἱωάνου μηποτε αὐτος εἰη ο ΧΣ
16. ἀπεκρείνατο λεγὼν πασίν ὁ ἱωάνης . . .

"15. And the people were in a state of anticipation and thought all these things through in their hearts concerning John, whether he was the Christ, or not.

"16. John answered, saying to all, . . ."

Codex D

15. προσδοκώντος δὲ του λαοῦ καὶ διαλογίζομενων παντῶν εν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν περὶ ἱωάνου μηποτε αὐτος εἰη ο ΧΣ
16. εἰπγνυς τα διανοηματα αὐτων εἰπεν . . .

"15. And the people were in a state of anticipation and thought all these things through in their hearts concerning John, whether he was the Christ, or not.

"16. Knowing their thoughts he said . . ."

There was probably little doubt in John's mind concerning what the people were thinking as they came to the Jordan to hear him. Luke indicates that John was sensitive to their messianic expectations when he made John answer the unspoken question. However, D sees another opportunity to take what Luke implies and to present it in such a way that John is once again made to remind us of
Jesus' ministry. Throughout the synoptics we are periodically informed that Jesus was aware of the thoughts that raced through the minds of the people he confronted (Matthew 12:25; Mark 8:17; Luke 6:8; 11:17, etc.). Then by various methods he would lay bare their thoughts and use them as vehicles for spiritual lessons. Here, D gives John the ability to know the thoughts of his listeners and to use these thoughts for the basis of instruction, much the same way as Jesus does.

This incident, coupled with the alteration made by D concerning John's mode of baptism, may indicate that D wished to present John as ministering in a similar manner as Jesus, thus bringing the forerunner closer, in spirit, to the one he was preparing the people to receive. This, of course, would make John more significant and tie his ministry closer to the ministry of the Messiah.

Peter and the Close Followers of Jesus

The apostles of Jesus play a major role in the gospel tradition, as well as in the establishment of the primitive church in Acts. Epp has noted two things in particular concerning the apostles as a result of his investigation of D in Acts: (1) the leading apostles are accentuated, "Peter and John, as well as Paul, Barnabas, and Silas, etc.," (2) Paul is the predominant figure in Acts, but D endeavors to secure a balance between him and Peter
by heightening the latter.\textsuperscript{39} In Luke's gospel, however, a dominant personality like Paul is not present among the apostles to challenge the position of Peter; therefore, while D's alterations are intended only to support his prominent position the remaining apostles are virtually ignored as individuals in D's editorial changes (with the call of Levi being a single exception); they figure into his interest as a group in a minor way only.

Luke introduces us to the roster of apostles in chapter six. We shall begin our investigations here by giving the variants in this roster as they appear in D, but noting only the one that deals with Peter; then we shall pursue several variants concerning Peter and, finally, note the changes that have been made in connection with the apostles as a group and in connection with the topic of discipleship in general:

**Luke 6:14-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. σιμώνα ου και ωνομασεν πετρον και ανδρεαν τον αδελφον αυτου και λακωδον και ιωανην και φιλιππον και χαρθολομαιον</td>
<td>14. πρωτον σιμωνα ου και πετρον επωνομασεν και ανδρεαν τον αδελφον αυτου και λακωδον και ιωανην τον αδελφον αυτου ους επωνομασεν βοανηριες ο εστιν υιοι βρον-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. και μαθαιον και δωμαν</td>
<td>15. και μαθαιον και δωμαν τον επικαλουμενον δυθυμον και λακωδον τον του αλφαιου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{39}Epp, p. 163.
καὶ σιμώνα τον καλουμένον ζηλωτήν
16. καὶ οὐδαν λακωβοῦ καὶ οὐδαν ισκαρίωδος οὐκ εγένετο προδοτής.

"14. Simon, whom he also named Peter, and Andrew his brother, and James and John,
Philip, and Bartholomew,
"15. And Matthew, and Thomas,
James, the son of Alphaeus, and Simon, who is called Zealot,
"16. And Judas the son of James, and Judas Iscariot, who became a traitor."

It is obvious that D harmonizes Luke's roster of the apostles with that of Matthew, Mark and John. The addition that interests us most is πρωτος ("first"), taken from Matthew 10:2. Although Matthew identifies Peter with the adjective "first," it does not have the same connotation in his context as it does when D adds it to Luke's

40πρωτος ("first") is taken from Matthew 10:2, the sons of thunder is taken from Mark 3:17, the added information about Thomas is from John 11:16, the two definite articles in the genitive of relationship construction in v. 15 are taken from Mark 3:18, and the addition of καί ("also") in v. 16 is from Mark 3:19.
context. A comparison of the background for each roster will show how πρῶτος ("first") takes on added meaning in Luke's context:

**Matthew 10:2**

των δὲ δώδεκα αποστόλων
ta onomata estin tauta
πρῶτος σιμών...  

"And the names of the twelve apostles are these, first, Simon. . . ."

**Luke 6:13,14**

13. καὶ οτε εγενετο ημερα
prosephwneon touz mahtaz
αυτου καὶ εκλεξαμενος απ
auton dωδεκα ouz και αποστο-
λους ωνομασεν
14. (πρωτον=D) σιμωνα...  

"13. And when day had come, he called his disciples and selected twelve from among them, whom he also named apostles.
"14. (First) Simon. . . ."  

In Matthew's account Simon is identified as "first," being first in a list that is being given and not necessarily being first in station. In Luke's account, Jesus had called a large number of disciples together after a night of prayer and from this group he selected 12, the "first" selection being Simon. The addition of πρῶτος

---

41D reads practically the same as the normal text in these verses except for πρωτον.

42Although this meaning could be inferred. However, reasons for understanding it this way are not as forceful as in D's account.

43Schuyler Brown, Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), p. 95. Brown's observation that the apostle list stands in apposition to ἀποστόλους ("apostles") and is not the object of ἐκλεξάμενος ("selected") does not essentially change the impact of D's variant. He correctly points out that the object of ἐκλεξάμενος ("selected") is δώδεκα ("twelve"). "The result is that the object of the election
("first") in this context would seem to lay emphasis on rank or position. That D intended to present Peter as the leading apostle becomes obvious through additional editorial changes.

In the preceding chapter of Luke the author presents the account of the miraculous catch of fish which leads to Peter's call to discipleship. This pericope opens with Jesus being pressed by a crowd on the shore of Lake Gennesaret. He got into a small fishing boat, owned by Peter, and asked him to push away from shore a short distance; and from the boat Jesus taught the people. Upon completing his instruction, Jesus ordered Peter to go out into the lake and to lower his nets:

**Luke 5:5,6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς σιμών εἶπεν επίστατα δὶς ὅλης νυκτὸς κοπιασάντες οὐδὲν ελαβόμεν επὶ δὲ τῷ ῥηματὶ σου χαλασώ τὰ δικτυά</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. καὶ τοῦτο ποιησάντες συνεκλίσαν πλῆθος ἵχθυων πολὺ διερησεῖτο δὲ τὰ δικτυά αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;5. And Simon answered and said, Master, we labored through the whole of the earthly Jesus is not so much specific individuals or even 'the Twelve' in the sense of a definite group as it is the number twelve, the institution of 'twelve apostles' as such.&quot; The variant in D still lays stress upon the fact that in his text Peter is the &quot;first&quot; in the &quot;number twelve.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
night and caught nothing, but at your word I shall lower the nets. "6. And when they had done this they enclosed a great multitude of fish, and their nets were breaking through."

v. 5 καὶ αποκριθεὶς σιμών εἶπεν] ο δὲ σιμών αποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, D + αὐτῷ post. εἶπεν, C R D Θ π1 εἰπτάτα] διδάσκαλε, D a corrig. bo + τῆς ante νυκτος, C R D Θ π1 χαλάσω τα δικτυα] οὐ μὴ παρακούσομαι, D e

v. 6 καὶ τοῦτο ποιησάντες] καὶ εὐθὺς χαλάσαντες τα δικτυα, D e διερησότο δε τα δικτυα αυτων] ωστε τα δικτυα ρησεσθαι, D e f r1

We are primarily interested in two of the above variants, the first being the change from ἐπιστάτα ("master") to διδάσκαλος ("teacher"). Before we investigate the meaning of these two words, it might be well to note that ἐπιστάτης ("master") is used in Luke alone: once by the apostle John (9:49); once by the disciples as a group (8:25); once by the ten lepers requesting healing (17:13); and three times by Peter (5:5; 8:45; 9:33). It would seem that the alteration of Peter's first use of the word might be significant. On the other hand, διδάσκαλος ("teacher") is used by Luke 17 times. Of these 17 appearances it is used by the disciples only once in addressing Jesus (21:7). 44

44 The term κύριος ("Lord") is used most frequently by the disciples in addressing Jesus, appearing 13 times.
Opinion is divided as to the significance of ἐπιστάτης ("master") in comparison with other forms of respectful address, such as διδάσκαλος ("teacher") which is substituted by D in Luke 5:5. Thayer tells us that ἐπιστάτης ("master") is to be understood as a sort of superintendent or a master, used in the sense of rabbi when used by the disciples in addressing Jesus, not necessarily from the fact that he was a teacher, but rather because of his authority.\footnote{Joseph Henry Thayer, 
*Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Associated Publishers and Authors Inc.), p. 243.} J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel feel that ἐπιστάτης ("master") emphasizes an intimate, though respectful, relationship rather than authority.\footnote{J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel, 
*A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), p. 228.} Geldenhuys says that ἐπιστάτης ("master") is merely a synonym for διδάσκαλος ("teacher"), and both are traced back to rabbi.\footnote{Norval Geldenhuys, 
*Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), p. 184.} Albrecht Oepke says that ἐπιστάτης ("master") is a translation for rabbi, and it is not an equivalent for διδάσκαλος ("teacher") or κύριος ("Lord").\footnote{Albrecht Oepke, 
"ἐπιστάτης," 
έπιστάτης ("master") is used by the disciples, while non-disciples use διδάσκαλος ("teacher"). This would indicate that Gilmour did not view these two words as being synonymous, έπιστάτης ("master") being more intimate. However, Godet and Plummer take the opposite view. 'Επιστάτης ("master") refers to any kind of oversight; it is more general than ῥαβbanana ("rabbi") or διδάσκαλος ("teacher").

It would seem that D did not see έπιστάτης ("master") and διδάσκαλος ("teacher") as being synonymous. As we have noted earlier, Jesus, prior to this pericope in chapter five, had worked in Galilee and had built a reputation as a teacher and healer. However, Luke gives no indication that Jesus had collected around him a body of disciples. Jesus had spent some time in Peter's home, but this does not seem to indicate to D that he was a disciple of Jesus (4:38-41). In chapter five, when Jesus concluded his teaching and ordered Peter out into the deep


for a catch of fish, D could conceive of Peter addressing Jesus as "teacher" but hardly as "master." There are as yet, in Luke, no grounds upon which Peter could use this term for Jesus; the call to discipleship is to follow.

After the miraculous catch, Luke changes Peter's form of address, "Depart from me, because I am a sinful man, Lord (κύριε)" (5:8). In calling Jesus "Lord," Luke indicates that Peter now sees Jesus in a different light than he did earlier. Although κύριε ("Lord") need not mean more than "sir," it seems that it must carry its full force of "Lord" here, at least for the author of Luke.

When D alters ἐπιστάτης ("master") to διδάσκαλος ("teacher") in v. 5, the change in Peter's view of Jesus by v. 8 is made more dramatic. Perhaps D is endeavoring to contrast the ready acceptance of Jesus on the part of Peter with the slowness of heart on the part of his fellow countrymen. Certainly Peter's acknowledgement of Jesus' authority stands in contrast with the reception he received just prior to this pericope at Nazareth, where the town's

51 Although the word διδάσκαλος ("teacher") is used of men who have gathered about them a body of disciples, it is also used by non-disciples when addressing or referring to someone who indicates the way of God from the Torah. Luke uses the word in this latter context 14 out of 17 times, 2:46; 3:12; 7:40; 8:49; 9:38; 10:25; 11:45; 12:13; 18:18; 19:39; 20:21, 28, 39; 22:11. Cf. Kittel, pp. 152-53.

52 Creed, p. 75.
people tried to take Jesus' life by throwing him off a cliff.

The second variant that is of interest is at the conclusion of verse five. In the normal text Peter simply says, "I shall lower the nets," although he protests that such an action will be futile in view of the results of their night's work. D makes an interesting alteration. Although he may not be able to conceive of Peter calling Jesus "master" at this point, yet by this alteration he shows a changing attitude on Peter's part that culminates in Peter addressing Jesus as "Lord."

The statement, "... at your word I shall lower the nets," of the normal text displays a willingness by Peter to be obedient to the direction of Jesus. D's alteration, "... to your word I shall surely not be disobedient," places this thought in more explicit language. D's use of the double negative lends strength to the contrast between Peter's willingness to obey and the rejection experienced by Jesus at Nazareth.

Carrying through his editorial scheme for this pericope, D takes advantage of another opportunity to intensify Peter's response to Jesus:

Luke 5:8,9

Codex B

Codex D

53Cf. Robertson, pp. 1174-75.
8. Ἰδὼν δὲ σιμών πέτρος προσεπεσεν τοῖς γονασίν ἐξελθε απ' ἐμοῦ στὶ συν αὐτῷ ἀνήρ αμαρτάλως εἰμι ἐπὶ τῇ άγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων ὑν συνελάβον

"8. And when Simon Peter saw, he fell at the knees of Jesus saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, Lord."

9. θαμβός γαρ περιεσχεν αὐτοῦ καὶ παντας τοὺς συν αὐτῷ επὶ τῇ άγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων ὑν συνελάβον

"9. For amazement had gripped him and all those with him at the catch of fish which they had taken."

v. 8 Ἰδὼν δὲ σιμών πέτρος  ὑν λέγων, D W 13 it syς τοῖς γονασίν ἐξελθε απ' ἐμοῦ στὶ συν αὐτῷ τοῖς ποσίν, D λ 579 e sy + παρακαλώ ὑπὲρ λέγουν, D it syς Tatian.

v. 9 om. καὶ παντας τοὺς συν αὐτῷ, D

Again in v. 8, D intensifies the demonstration of Peter's feelings. By prostrating Peter at Jesus' feet, instead of falling at his knees, and by adding, "I beseech you," D paints a vivid picture of Peter being under the conviction of Jesus' authority. It appears that D uses prostration at Jesus' feet as an expression of awe and a recognition of authority approaching that of worship.

In the account of the ten lepers, the one who returned to Jesus was a Samaritan. In Luke's normal tradition (17:16) this cleansed leper fell at Jesus' feet "thanking him." D omits the phrase "thanking him," simply saying
the man threw himself at Jesus' feet. The question is, What did D understand this gesture to mean? Because Jesus assured the leper that his faith had "saved" him, it is possible that D conceived of this gesture as an act of worship, an act that reveals a recognition of Jesus' Lordship. We will deal with the pericope of the ten lepers later, but in our present pericope the sight of Peter on his face at Jesus' feet is certainly a more vivid picture of Peter's recognition of Jesus' authority than falling at Jesus' knees.

By omitting the phrase, "and all those with him," and by altering the following verse, Peter is made the central figure in this experience of awe and expression of unworthiness. There is the possibility that D wished to set Peter forth as a type of all the others who were to become disciples with him, his reactions to Jesus and his relationship with him typifying the feelings and thinking of his partners, James and John. This seems to be the intent of the alteration of v. 10:54

Luke 5:10,11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. ομολογεῖ δε καὶ τάκωβος καὶ ιωάννης υίοις ζεβεδαίου οι ήσαν κοινώνοι τῷ σίμωνι καὶ εἰπέν πρὸς τὸν σίμωνα ἵπτε καὶ μὴ γείνεσθε</td>
<td>10. ήσαν δε κοινώνοι αὐτοῦ τάκωβος καὶ ιωάννης υίοι ζεβεδαίου ὁ δὲ εἰπέν αὐτοῖς δευτε καὶ μὴ γείνεσθε</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54 Cf. a similar position taken by Mees, p. 107.
"10. And likewise James and John, sons of Zebedee, were partners with Simon; and Jesus said to Simon, Fear not, from now on you will be a catcher of men.

"11. And when they had beached the ships upon the land, forsaking everything, they followed him."

In the normal text of Luke, James and John share in Peter's astonishment at the catch of fish (5:9); in D's alteration they do not. Yet, in D Jesus extends the call to become fishers of men to James and John as well as to Peter, whereas in the normal text the call is given to Peter alone. It would seem that the expression of Peter's feelings is taken by D as an expression of the feelings of the other two men, thus putting Peter forward in a place of prominence. In the normal text, the element of fear is
attributed to Peter in the words of Jesus. In altering the text and making Jesus address James and John, as well as Peter, this element of fear is removed by D; thus establishing an attitude of respect and awe on the part of these future disciples, and not one of fear.

Peter is later shown to be the leader and spokesman of this favored group of three apostles by a harmonization that is made in D. The setting is the transfiguration and the alteration occurs in Peter's reaction to the scene:

Luke 9:33

Codex B

. . . ἐπι τὸν καλὸν εὖ ἐπι τὴν ποιησίαν τριῶν
. . .

". . . Peter said to Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here, let us also build three booths. . . ."

Codex D

. . . ἐπι τὴν ποιησίαν τριῶν
. . .

". . . Peter said to Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here, if you wish, I shall build here three booths. . . ."

Both alterations are harmonizations with Matthew 17:4, the second being lifted intact except for the omission of εἰ ("if"), which must be understood when translating D's alteration. The three parallel passages in D (Matthew 17:4; Mark 9:5; Luke 9:33) present an interesting puzzle. In the normal text of each passage, Luke follows
Mark and they both read "let us make" as opposed to Peter's self-assertion in Matthew, "if you are willing, I shall make." D alters Matthew to the reading of Mark and Luke while retaining the condition, "if you are willing, let us make." On the other hand, D alters the reading in Mark and Luke to the self-assertiveness of Matthew, "if you are willing, I shall make." Interestingly, in both Mark and Luke D omits the particle εἰ ("if") that is found in Matthew's normal text.

The reason for the change in Luke emerges clearly from D's editorial design, i.e. the desire to picture Peter as the leader of the apostolic group. D's similar alteration in Mark may arise from the same desire; if so, D is being consistent in his editorial scheme. The puzzling question is, Why did he alter Matthew's "if you wish, I will make, . . ." which pictures Peter as the leader, to read as the normal text of Mark and Luke "let us make . . ."?55

By D's alteration in Luke Peter is set forth as the leader and the dominant personality of the three apostles. This is underscored by the change from the

---

55This question is only illustrative of the need for a comparative study of the variants in Matthew and Mark to see if there is an editorial scheme behind their appearances that is similar to the one found in Luke, or whether variants appear in these two books stemming from conflicting interests.
hortatory subjunctive to first class conditional.

We have noted in Chapter One that one of the characteristics of Luke's gospel is the way in which he handled the apostles with gentle hands. D, by his editorial changes, tends to go one step beyond Luke and to protect them from some of the negative aspects that Luke was willing to recognize. In the two variants of the following verses, D appears to make omissions in order to preserve the reputation of the disciples. Jesus had just remarked that the Son of Man was to be delivered into the hands of men. The disciples were at a loss to understand his words. Luke's account will be picked up at this point:

Luke 9:45,46

\begin{align*}
\text{Codex B} & \\
45. & \text{οἱ ἐξ ἡγυσταν τὸ ρήμα τουτο καὶ ἐν παρακαλομενον} \\
& \text{σαὶ αὐτῶν ἡ τις αὐτὸς καὶ ἐφοβοῦσται} \\
& \text{αὐτὸ περὶ τοῦ ῥηματος τουτού.} \\
46. & \text{εἰσηλθεν ἐν διαλογίσμος} \\
& \text{ἐν αὐτοῖς το τις ἄν εἰνη} \\
& \text{μειζων αὐτών.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Codex D} & \\
45. & \text{οἱ ἐξ ἡγυσταν τὸ ρήμα τουτο καὶ ἐν παρακαλομενον} \\
& \text{σαὶ αὐτῶν ἡ τις αὐτὸς καὶ ἐφοβοῦσται} \\
& \text{αὐτὸ περὶ τοῦ ῥηματος τουτού.} \\
46. & \text{ἐν αὐτοῖς το τις ἄν εἰνη} \\
& \text{μειζων αὐτών.}
\end{align*}

"45. And they did not understand this saying and it was concealed from them in order that they might not perceive it, and they were afraid to ask him concerning this saying. "46. And a dispute entered in among them as to which of them was the greatest."

"45. And they did not understand this saying and it was concealed from them in order that they might not perceive it, and they were afraid to ask concerning this saying. "46. as to which of them was the greatest."

\text{56 Cf. Brown, p. 72 for an opposing view.}
The omission of εἰσήλθεν δὲ διαλογίσμος ἐν αὐτοῖς ("And a dispute entered in among them") makes the transition between v. 44 and v. 46 very awkward and the thought sequence in vv. 44 through 46 confusing. One possible explanation of the omission is that it is a homoeoteleuton, the αὐτοῖς ("them") at the end of the omitted phrase being confused by the eye of the copyist with τοῦτο ("this") just prior to the omission. However, the confusion of these two words does not seem too likely, especially if the copyist was reading what he was copying. It would seem that the copyist omitted this phrase to protect the apostles against the slander of allowing disputes to exist among them.57

The awkwardness of the thought transition from v. 44 to v. 46 can be partially eliminated by dividing the thought content of v. 45. The meaning of the Son of Man being handed over to men (v. 44) would remain hidden to the apostles in v. 45. The fear they felt about asking "concerning this word" would be connected with "who was to be the greatest" in v. 46. This is the way F. H. A.

57Although 22:24-27 is altered by D, he does not attempt to protect the apostles from the charge of having contentions among them in this passage.
Scrivener understands and solves the problem created by the omission in the text of D.\textsuperscript{58}

\textit{D} again comes to the aid of the apostles by temporarily removing the thought that Jesus' betrayal would come from their midst:

\textbf{Luke 22:22,23}

\begin{verbatim}
Codex B
22. οτι ο υιος μεν του ανθρωπου κατα το ωρισμενον πορευεσαι πλην ουαί τω ανθρωπω εκεινω δι ου παραδιδοται
23. και αυτοι ηρξαντο συνζητειν προς εαυτους το τις αρα ειη εξ αυτων ο τουτο μελλων πρασσειν

"22. Because the Son of Man goes, as predicted, however, woe to that man by whom he is betrayed.
"23. And they began to enquire among themselves, who it was from among them that should do this thing."
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Codex D
22. οτι μεν ο υιος του ανθρωπου κατα το ωρισμενον πορευεσαι πλην ουαί εκεινω δι ου παραδιδοται
23. αυτοι δε ηρξαντο συνζητειν προς εαυτους τις αρα ειη ο μελλων τουτο πρασσειν

"22. Because the Son of Man goes, as predicted, however, woe to that man by whom he is betrayed.
"23. And they began to enquire among themselves, who it was that should do this thing."
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{58}Scrivener, p. 202.
Luke they began to discuss among themselves which one of them it would be. D's alteration causes the disciples to look beyond themselves for the betrayer, thus endeavoring to turn the eye of suspicion away from this favored group.

D also endeavors to place the general body of disciples, as well as the twelve, in a more favorable light. That his death caught all completely unprepared, in spite of the number of times Jesus referred to his coming passion, is a fundamental element in the gospel tradition. D tries to soften the reproach that this unpreparedness was the result of unbelief:

Luke 24:25

Codex B

καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ ἀνοικτὸς καὶ ἐπὶ πασίν οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφηταὶ

"And he said to them, Oh foolish and slow in heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken."

Codex D

οὗ ἐπὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ ἀνοικτὸς καὶ ἐπὶ πασίν οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφηταὶ

"And he said to them, Oh foolish and slow in heart with respect to all that the prophets have spoken."

om. τοῦ πιστευέν, D

D is content to allow Jesus to reproach these two doubting disciples for being dull and slow in understanding the Old Testament prophecies that point to the events that caught everyone unprepared, but he endeavors to protect the disciples from the charge of unbelief. Omitting τοῦ
πιστεύειν ("to believe") minimizes this thought as much as possible without rewriting the entire verse.

The desire of D to protect the disciples from anything that might militate against their office and calling is again seen in an attempt to protect Levi against the charge of being a "sinner." The pericope begins with the call of Levi to be a close follower of Jesus, where Luke identifies Levi as a τελώνης ("publican"—5:27). The new associate of Jesus prepared a feast at which his new "master" was the honored guest. To this feast were invited "a great crowd of publicans and others" (5:29). It is the alteration made in the accusation of the religious leaders that we are here primarily interested in:

Luke 5:30

Codex B
καὶ εὐγγυζαν οἱ
φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ
γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν
πρὸς τοὺς μάθητας
αὐτοῦ λεγοντες διὰ τι
μετὰ τῶν τελώνων
καὶ αμαρτωλῶν ἐσθιετε
καὶ πείνετε

"And the Pharisees and their Scribes murmured to his disciples, saying, Why do you eat and drink with publicans and sinners?"

Codex D
καὶ οἱ
φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ
γραμματεῖς
ἐγογγυζόν
πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς
αὐτοῦ λεγοντες διὰ τι
μετὰ τῶν τελώνων
καὶ αμαρτωλῶν ἐσθιεται
καὶ πείνεται

"And the Pharisees and Scribes murmured to his disciples, saying, Why do you eat and drink with publicans?"
There are three things that must be noticed here:

(1) in the B text the definite article τῶν serves the two nouns τελωνίαν ("publicans") and ἀμαρτωλῶν ("sinners"), thus equating the two. Levi being a publican (5:27) is thus identified as a sinner in the B text. (2) The phrase "publicans and sinners" appears twice more in Luke (7:34; 15:1) and D makes no attempt to alter these passages, because these phrases are not identified with the disciples. (3) D does not alter the parallel passages to Luke 5:30, but allows "publicans and sinners" to stand together. Therefore it becomes apparent that D was concerned with the image of the disciples in Luke and does what he can to minimize their faults and to picture them as men who deserve the respect of later generations.

It appears that D may have wanted to keep the privilege and rewards of discipleship exclusively for the twelve and 72. Yet he is somewhat freer than the normal text of Luke in allowing others to share in the benefits of Jesus' instruction.

In Chapter Six is found the pericope in which Jesus sets aside the twelve for their special work. After their


60 This again points out the necessity of a careful study of D in Matthew and Mark to determine if there are similar editorial concerns present that explain such apparent inconsistencies.
selection Jesus and the newly chosen apostles, with the larger group of disciples from which the apostles had been taken, went down off the mountain, where Jesus had spent the night praying, and met a large number of people on a level place. In the presence of the multitude Jesus instructed the disciples. D is careful to limit the number of disciples who were present to a group comparable in size to those who were conceivably with Jesus on the mountain, and from whom he selected the twelve:

Luke 6:17

καὶ καταβας μετ’ αυτων εστιν επι τοπου πεδινου και οχλος πολυς μαθητων αυτου και πληθος πολυ του λαου. . . .

"And when he had descended with them, he stood upon a flat place with a great crowd of his disciples and a great multitude of people . . . ."

om. πολυς, D

The "crowd" of disciples in D, from whom Jesus had just chosen the twelve, could conceivably have been, in D's thinking, the larger group that now numbered 72. The assembling of the 72, plus the twelve just selected, could be δοχλος μαθητων ("a crowd of disciples"), but hardly δοχλος πολυς μαθητων ("a great crowd of disciples") when they are placed beside πληθος πολυ του λαου ("a great multitude of people").
D shows his tendency to think of the disciples as an exclusive group in another way. On one occasion, when the multitude that had gathered to hear Jesus was so large that they trod on one another, Jesus spoke of the rewards of discipleship. In 12:37 the faithful disciple is pictured as having a place at a banquet at which the Lord personally serves him. Inspired by the thought, Peter spoke for the assembled disciples:

Luke 12:41

Codes B

εἰπεν δὲ ο ἡμιος κε
προς ἡμιας την παραβολην
ταυτης λεγεις η και προς
παντας

"And Peter said, Lord, do you speak this parable to us or to all men also?"

Codex D

και εἰπεν ο πετρος κε
προς ἡμιας λεγεις την
παραβολην ταυτην

"And Peter said, Lord, do you speak this parable to us?"

om. η καί προς παντας, D

One could conclude that the omitted phrase, "or to all men also," is implied by the shortened form of Peter's question. However, because the phrase is present in the normal text and is omitted by D alone, and homoeoteleuton does not seem to be a possibility, the reader is left with the impression that D favored the disciples as an exclusive group. Peter addresses his inquiry to the issue of whether the disciples ought not to have exclusive right to being served by "the Lord" at the banquet, since they will play
the chief part in his kingdom. 61

Jesus' answer to Peter's question is a parable about faithful and unfaithful stewards. In the normal text Jesus' parable would imply that Jesus is addressing all his hearers, and that the rewards of the marriage supper are available to all men. But D's alteration of Peter's question changes the meaning of Jesus' answer. It would appear that in the context of Peter's question in D, Jesus' parable applies only to his immediate disciples.

Luke also presents a number of other occasions when Jesus gave specific instruction to his disciples in the presence of a multitude of people, 62 thus allowing all his hearers to benefit from the instruction. There were other occasions when Jesus communed with the disciples in


62 Cf. 6:20-49; 8:9-16; 9:23-27, 43-45; 12:1-59, etc. There are several long passages of instruction addressed to the disciples, in which no mention is made of the multitude; however, this instruction is interrupted by questions from and remarks by Jesus to non-disciples; therefore, it is assumed that this instruction was also given in the presence of the multitude. Cf. 16-17:10; 17:22-18:14.
private. D opens one of these intimate occasions to the public ear:

**Luke 10:23, 24**

**Codex B**

23. καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ ἰδίαν εἶπεν μακαριοὶ οἱ οφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλεποντες α βλεπετε

24. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφηταὶ καὶ βασιλεῖς ηδελησαν ἰδεῖν α ὑμεῖς βλεπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν καὶ ακουσαὶ μου α ἀκουετε καὶ οὐκ ἠκουσαν

"23. And turning to the disciples he said privately, Blessed are the eyes that see what you see.

"24. For I say to you that many prophets and kings desired to see what you see and they saw not, and to hear what you hear, and they heard not."

**Codex D**

23. στραφεὶς δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶπεν αὐτοὶς μακαριοὶ οἱ οφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλεποντες α βλεπετε καὶ ακουοντες α ακουετε.

24. λέγω γὰρ ὑμεῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφηται ηδελησαν εἰδεῖν α ὑμεῖς βλεπεται καὶ οὐκ εἶδον καὶ ακουσαὶ α ὑμεῖς ακουετε καὶ οὐκ ἠκουσαν

"23. And turning to the disciples he said to them, Blessed are the eyes that see what you see and hear what you hear.

"24. For I say to you that many prophets desired to see what you see and they saw not, and to hear what you hear, and they heard not."

---

v. 23 om. κατ ἰδιαν, D 157 1424 lat sy\textsuperscript{sc} + αὐτοῖς post εἶπεν, D 1 131 209 e cor\textsuperscript{sa,bo} + καὶ ακουοντες α ακουετε post βλεπετε, D

v. 24 om. καὶ βασιλεῖς, D it Marcion

om. μου, rell, ꞌϸ5 B 0124 + υμεῖς ante ακουετε, D it

Although D is somewhat exclusive in wanting to keep some aspects of the Messianic banquet for the disciples only, in the first variant in the above verses he shows a universalism. The blessing that Jesus pronounced upon

---

those who heard his words and saw his deeds should be shared by all who were eyewitnesses, according to D. Therefore, he omits καὶ τῶν ἄνω ("privately") and includes the multitude as Jesus speaks to the disciples.

Among the gospel writers it is Luke who informs us that there was a group of women who joined the company of disciples and played a significant supporting role in Jesus' life and ministry.64 In a society where women were not emancipated, the role that they play in the Gospel of Luke is quite significant. On one occasion Martha invited Jesus to stay at her home. Her busy activity and much serving indicate that at least the twelve apostles were also present. However, Jesus gently rebukes her for turning her attention to mundane things instead of taking advantage of the spiritual instruction as her sister Mary was doing. The copyist of D was evidently touched by Martha's ministry and softens Jesus' gentle rebuke:

Luke 10:41,42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. αποκρίθης δὲ εἶπεν</td>
<td>41. αποκρίθης δὲ ο Ιης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτὴν τὸ καθά μαρὰ μαρὰς</td>
<td>εἶπεν αὐτὴ μαρὰ μαρὰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεριμνάς καὶ δορυφορίης</td>
<td>δορυφορίης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περὶ πολλὰ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. ολίγων δὲ χρεία</td>
<td>42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εστὶν ἡ ἐνὸς μαρίαμ</td>
<td>μαρία</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

γαρ τὴν αγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο ἡ σὺ καὶ αφαιρεθησαίται αὐτης.

"41. And answering, the Lord said to her, Martha, Martha, you are anxious and troubled over many things, "42. But only one thing is needful. For Mary has chosen the good portion which shall not be taken away from her."

Μετσγερ feels these two clauses were omitted from it and sy⁵ because they were incomprehensible, or an accident, or because of homoeoarcton (μάρθα . . . μαριάμ).⁶⁵

The fact that D uses θορυβάζῃ ("troubled") indicates his source contained the normal text. Metzger says that θορυβάζεσθαι ("to be troubled") is rare and troublesome and is frequently replaced by τυρφάζεσθα ("to trouble").⁶⁶

By retaining θορυβάζῃ of the normal text while omitting the remainder of the clauses, D shows that he wished Jesus to deal gently with Martha.

This gentleness would seem to grow out of D's alteration in v. 42. The normal text points out that Martha is lacking something that Jesus considers very important, i.e. the spiritual instruction that Mary is.

receiving. In D's text the statement of this need by Jesus is omitted, thus implying that Martha was not lacking in this important area and again softening Jesus' dealing with this woman.

Although D shows evidence of being touched by Martha's ministry to Jesus and the apostles, he proves to be more of a male chauvinist than Luke. Where Luke is willing to include these dedicated women within the privileged circle of Jesus' chosen disciples, D is not. As Jesus walked with two of his disciples to Emmaus after his resurrection, the disciples spoke of what these women had witnessed at the tomb that very morning:

Luke 24:22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αλλα και γυναικες τινες εξ ημων εξεστησαν ημας γενομεναι ορθηναι επι το μνημειον</td>
<td>αλλα και γυναικες τινες εξεστησαν ημας γενομεναι ορθηναι επι το μνημειον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;But certain women also from among us amazed us, being at the tomb early in the morning.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;But certain women also amazed us, being at the tomb early in the morning.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


68 "The Emmaus disciples refer to the women, who were also distinct from the apostles, as 'some women of our company' . . . but they designate the apostles as 'some of those who were with us' . . ., not 'some of our company.' . . . This differentiation points to their awareness of their status as 'associate members' in the circle of Jesus' disciples." Brown, p. 76.
om. εξ ημῶν, D 157

By the omission of εξ ημῶν ("from among us") D indicates that he is not willing to number these women among the disciples; however their role as close followers of Jesus is firmly established in Luke's tradition,⁶⁹ as has already been pointed out.

In the normal text of Luke, discipleship is treated as a serious matter.⁷⁰ Luke alone records the admonition of Jesus that if anyone is to follow him, he is to deny himself, taking up his cross daily (9:23). It is Luke also who reports the reaction of Jesus to a man who expressed a desire to follow him but felt obligated to take care of personal business before he joined the disciples:

Luke 9:62

Codex B

εἰπεν δὲ οὗτος οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χειρὰ εἰς ἀροτρὸν καὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ οπίσω εὐθετὸς εστὶν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θύ

"And Jesus said, No one, when he has placed his hand upon the plow and looking back,

Codex D

ο δὲ ἦς εἰπεν αὐτῷ οὐδεὶς ἐς τὰ οπίσω βλεπὼν καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χειρὰ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ ἀροτρὸν εὐθετὸς εστὶν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θύ

"And Jesus said to him, No one, while looking back and placing his hand on the plow,

⁶⁹ Cf. Creed, pp. 293-94.

Concerning the change in word order of the longest variant in this verse, Metzger says:

The curious variation in the order of the participles (εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω βλέπων καὶ ἐπιβάλλων τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ᾽ ἄροτρον) in several witnesses (p75, v, l, b, c, d, e, (1), q, al) is probably due to scribal inadvertance; in any case, the reading scarcely makes sense.71

L. Cerfaux, however, disagrees with Metzger and accepts the reading of D as the best of three possibilities.72 He sees the normal text of Luke as picturing the man, with the plow handle in hand, looking behind him; as a result the worker has taken his eye off of his fixed target ahead of him and the result will be sloppy, inferior work, i.e. crooked furrows. The man in D's variant is seen by Cerfaux as looking behind him while he gropes

71 Metzger, p. 149.

72 L. Cerfaux, "Variantes de Lc. IX, 62," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, XII (1935), 326-328. The three possibilities are as follows: a. ἐπιβάλλων
  I. οὖθεις b. ἐπιβάλλων τὴν χείρα ἐπ᾽ ἄροτρον καὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω a. having placed the hand upon the plow and looking back"), and II. οὖθεις εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω βλέπων καὶ ἐπιβάλλων τὴν χείρα ἐπ᾽ ἄροτρον ("No one b. placing the hand upon the plow and looking back"), and II. οὖθεις εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω βλέπων καὶ ἐπιβάλλων τὴν χείρα ἐπ᾽ ἄροτρον ("No one looking back and placing the hand upon the plow"). According to Cerfaux, reading Ia is supported by S, B, C, Origen, fams. 1, 13, and T. R. Reading Ib is supported by L, A, W, Θ; and reading II by D, a, b, c, e, q, and Cyprian.
for the plow handle with his hand, "... the second has not even begun."73

Commenting on the idea of discipleship contained in the normal text, Brown says:

Discipleship requires an immediate, total, and undiverted commitment to Jesus and the gospel. Not even a temporary abandonment of Jesus in order to perform an act of filial piety is permitted (Lk. 9:59-60).74

The variant in D underscores the unfitness for work in God's kingdom of one who is not totally committed to the task by making Jesus' statement in the normal text apply more directly to the man he was addressing; for this man had not, as yet, laid his hand to the plow and already was asking leave of Jesus for personal reasons.

Conclusion

That D shows special interest in the New Testament characters that are close to Jesus can be pointed out by editorial alterations made by D in connection with Mary, Jesus' mother, John the Baptist, and the disciples. The following points have been noted in connection with Mary:

1. Mary's significance is heightened by the angel's proclamation, "Blessed art thou among women," and by an alteration that places Mary in the Davidic descent.

2. Because Mary was chosen to be the earthly mother of Jesus, D apparently regarded her as fully worthy

73 Ibid., pp. 327-28. 74 Brown, p. 82.
of the honor; therefore he removes her from the stigma that is borne by the name Nazareth. However, Jesus' connection with Nazareth is not eliminated because it fulfills Old Testament prophecy and supports the Christian belief that Jesus was the promised Messiah.

Concerning John we have noted the following:

1. D makes the angel's statement on the naming of John a sacred formula, thus emphasizing the divine commissioning of John.

2. The loosening of Zacharias's tongue is reported in such a way that the supernatural is emphasized in connection with John.

3. D heightens the reaction of the people to these strange events and centers this reaction in John, not in Zacharias and Elizabeth as Luke does in his normal text.

4. D guards John's calling by not following Luke in saying that Zacharias "prophesied." The position of prophet is reserved for John.

5. The prophecy of Isaiah 40:3 is altered by D so that it ties in more directly with the preaching and ministry of John.

6. Luke's normal tradition is followed to its logical conclusion by D putting into the mouth of John's audience the question, "What shall we do that we might be saved?" By so doing, D again ties John into the prophecy
of Isaiah 40:3 and endeavors to show that John and his ministry have a direct connection with God's plan of offering salvation to all mankind.

7. By altering John's method of baptism and making him read the unspoken thoughts of the crowds who came to hear him, D ties the ministry of the forerunner closer to the Messiah than Luke does. This results in making both John and his ministry of more significance than we find in Luke's normal tradition.

From what has been presented with respect to the disciples, we may conclude the following:

1. Peter is identified as the "first" of the twelve apostles and made the spokesman and leader of the three who were favored above the other nine.

2. D endeavors to preserve the image of Jesus' close followers in four ways by: (1) eliminating, at least once, the fact that there was a spirit of contention among the apostles over who was to be the greatest, (2) temporarily removing suspicion from the twelve as the group from which Jesus' betrayer would appear, (3) allowing Jesus to rebuke the two disciples on the road to Emmaus for their slowness in grasping the prophecies that pointed to his passion, but eliminating Jesus' rebuke that they were also slow to believe, and (4) omitting the word that would identify Levi as a sinner.
3. The immediate followers of Jesus are viewed as an exclusive group. Although D shows evidence of being moved by Martha's ministry, he does not allow the women who followed Jesus and ministered to him and the apostles to be numbered as a part of this group.

4. D emphasizes the seriousness and the sacredness of the call to discipleship.
CHAPTER III

THE GLORIFIED JESUS

As we have seen in the previous chapter, there is a tendency in D to magnify the significance of prominent characters who are closely associated with Jesus and have a prominent role to play in the narrative. As we shall see in this present chapter, D also tends to magnify and glorify the major personality in Luke's tradition, Jesus Christ.

The variants within this chapter will be divided according to their subject content. This division will not be absolute, for the nature of some of the variants requires some flexibility in the subdivisions in order to allow their evidence to make a contribution.

The Child Jesus

The first variant in this present series seems to be the result of confusion caused by Luke's normal text. We shall consider it here because of the amount of interest it has created:

Luke 2:22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οτε ἐπλησθησαν αἱ ημέραι καθαρίσμου</td>
<td>καὶ οτε ἐπλησθησαν αἱ ημέραι του καθαρίσμου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88
According to the Mosaic law, only the mother was to undergo a period of purification. After 40 days (in the case of the birth of a male child) the mother was to present an offering at the temple to complete the rite of purification (Leviticus 12:1-18). The problem presented by the normal text is this: whom does αὐτῶν ("their") refer to? Some commentators feel it refers to Mary and the child.¹ Others believe it refers to Joseph and Mary.²

The question of the necessity of Mary's purification has been raised by some scholars. Williams says that Luke may well have written this verse somewhat loosely. Therefore, the pronoun αὐτῶν ("their") was altered to αὐτοῦ ("his") intentionally to indicate a belief in the

¹Cf. Geldenhuys, pp. 117-18; Creed, p. 39.

virgin conception,\textsuperscript{3} i.e. Mary was not defiled by a man; therefore, she would need no purification; and the \(\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\) ("his") would apply to Jesus.

This position, of course, raises a question about the proper understanding of the original Mosaic instruction in Leviticus 12:4-6. Is the purification required because of the act of conception or because of giving birth? Also, one might add, the law does not require the purification of the child.

Arndt tells us that there are some writers such as Hauck who believe that originally "her" purification was spoken of, but "her" was changed to "their" because it seemed offensive to speak of the purification of the Mother of God.\textsuperscript{4} However, Plummer points out that no uncial and perhaps only one cursive (76) supports \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\) ("her"), and that "her" probably spread from the Complutension Polyglott to a number of editions.\textsuperscript{5}

W. H. P. Hatch believes the first two chapters of Luke are based on a Semitic source.\textsuperscript{6} The source of Luke

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{3}Williams, Alterations, p. 29.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Arndt, p. 90. \textsuperscript{5}Plummer, p. 63.
\item \textsuperscript{6}W. H. P. Hatch, "The Text of Luke II,22," Harvard Theological Review, XIV(1921), 379. The question of Semitisms in D, and the 'Western' text in general, has been a hotly debated issue. The literature on this question is voluminous; only a representative listing is given here. Matthew Black; S. P. Brock, "A Note on Luke IX.16 (D)," Journal of Theological Studies, XIV(1963), 391-93; C. C.
probably had נכרתת. The suffix נכרתת was intended to read feminine, meaning "her purification"; however, Luke, or whoever translated the source into Greek, took it as a masculine and wrote αὐτόν ("his"), no doubt being influenced by the account of the circumcision and the naming of Jesus in the preceding verse.  

Paul Glaue has offered a solution similar to that of Hatch, without appealing to Semitisms. He suggests that many variants in the New Testament arose from an abbreviation of αὐτός, which was written αὐτ', thus a copyist was left to write the pronoun to fit his understanding of the verse, either αὐτόν, αὐτής, or αὐτῶν. Glaue feels that 76 is correct in reading αὐτής ("her").  

If the basic theory of Hatch and Glaue is correct, i.e. the gender of the pronoun was misunderstood, what led D to write αὐτόν ("his")? In this passage two regulations

---

7 Hatch, p. 379.

of the Mosaic law are being dealt with, the purification rites of the mother (Leviticus 12:1-18) and the redemption of the firstborn male child (Exodus 13:1-2; Numbers 18:15, 16). Gilmour suggests that Luke may have confused the two.\(^9\) If Luke did confuse the two, thinking that the purification of the mother and the redemption of the infant son was one rite, this would account for αὐτῶν ("their").

The central theme of this pericope is the finding of the infant in the temple by Simeon and Anna, and the subsequent presentation of the infant. D must have taken the phrase ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν ("they took him") in v. 22 as the key, and thus that "the purification" was "his" purification, and was the one thing that prevented his parents from taking him to the temple earlier. Therefore, D wrote "his" to coincide with his understanding of the import of the passage.

The following variant involves a very minor change in the normal text, but the alteration produces an interesting reading and is included here to show that D, even by minor grammatical alterations, can produce a significant reading that will maintain his editorial designs:

\(^9\) Gilmour, p. 60. Cf. Creed, p. 39, Easton, p. 26, and Mees, "Lukas 1-9," p. 97, who agree with Gilmour that both the purification and redemption rites are combined in αὐτῶν ("their"), but who also after mentioning the separation into the two personal pronouns αὐτῆς ("her") and αὐτοῦ ("his"), offer no possible solution as to why D ties αὐτοῦ with the purification.
The first thing that should be noted is the absence of the definite article before τὸν ("God") in the normal text. This takes on significance when we realize that τὸν ("God") appears 120 times in the normal text of Luke and of these 120 appearances it has the definite article 108 times. It appears only 12 times without the article. ¹⁰

Moreover, the usual English translation of the verse supplies the definite article ("the favor") which is absent in the Greek text. The significance of the omission of this article seems to have led D to alter the preposition from ἐπ' ("upon") to ἐν ("in").

Dana and Mantey are quite positive about the importance of the use of the definite article: "Scholars have

not accorded it sufficient attention, nor sought with proper diligence to apprehend the real genius underlying its various uses." 11 Our major concern here is that the absence of the article quite frequently indicates the qualitative aspect of the noun. 12

In our present verse we have an anarthrous noun modified by a second anarthrous noun in the genitive case. This is one construction identified by grammarians in which the genitive noun may express quality (δεό = deity or divine). Since Luke uses the article with δεός ("God") 90% of the time, the use of δεός ("God") without the article might very well prove to be significant.

Χάρις in 2:40 is generally translated "favor" or "grace" because it fits nicely with the sense of ἐπ'αυτό ("upon him"). Arndt and Gingrich, however, give "favor" and "grace" as a second possibility for the translation of this word. The first possibility is "graciousness, attractiveness." 13 Moulton and Milligan also give "favor" as a

---


13 Arndt and Gingrich, p. 885.
second possibility, with "grace, graciousness" as their first listing. Liddell and Scott give "outward grace or favor . . . loveliness" as the first possibility. Thayer agrees with Arndt and Gingrich by listing "grace" and "favor" as a second possibility. For the first possibility Thayer says, "Prop. that which affords joy, pleasure, delight, sweetness, charm, loveliness." 

Understanding that one of the basic meanings of χάρις is attractiveness or loveliness, and knowing that a noun without an article can express quality, D instituted a simple change in the preposition, from ἐπί ("upon") to ἐν ("in"), and changed Luke's normal tradition from, "And the grace (or favor) of God was upon him," to a reading that magnifies the personality and character of the child, "And divine loveliness (graciousness, sweetness, or charm) was in him."

The Messianic King

Two of the most fascinating variants to be found in D's text of St. Luke stand side by side in 3:22--the

---


16 Thayer, p. 665.
heavenly voice that was heard at Jesus' baptism, and in 3:23-38—the genealogy of Jesus.

The alteration made in the words of the heavenly voice has occasioned a lively discussion by almost every commentator and scholar interested in the textual problems of the New Testament, while the differences between the genealogies found in Matthew and Luke in the normal text have raised a seemingly endless debate. D's alterations add still another dimension to this discussion.

The three synoptics present an almost identical account of the words spoken by the heavenly voice at Jesus' baptism. D makes the following alteration in Luke's account:

Luke 3:22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ φωνὴ εξ οὐρανοῦ γενεσθαί σὺ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ μου ὦ ἁγαπητός εὖ σοι εὐδοκησά σα</td>
<td>καὶ φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γενεσθαί λόγῳ μου εἰ σὺ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγεννηκα σε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;And a voice came from heaven, You are my beloved son, in you I am pleased.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;And a voice came from heaven, You are my son, Today I have begotten you.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are various opinions as to the import of the words in this alteration. B. H. Streeter considered the
reading of D as the original,\textsuperscript{17} as did A. Harnack,\textsuperscript{18} who thought that the B reading in Luke was assimilated from the reading of Matthew and Mark because D's reading was open to doctrinal objections.\textsuperscript{19} Easton says that this reading may "... represent the original (pre-Markan) form of the words, transmitted by oral or non-canonical written tradition."\textsuperscript{20} Blass favors the idea that D's reading is original because it fits in logically with the genealogy that immediately follows.\textsuperscript{21} Montefiore concludes:

If this, as some think, is the true original reading, it would show that Luke, in its original form, knew nothing of the miraculous birth. To the divine Son the baptism could bring no new, special relation to God.\textsuperscript{22}

However, there are those such as Easton, who disagree with Montefiore's conclusion:

The theological difficulty caused by this reading is quite needless; Messiahship (= 'sonship,' here) was an

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17}Burnett Hillman Streeter, \textit{The Four Gospels} (London: Macmillan and Company, 1961), p. 143.
\item \textsuperscript{19}It is of interest to note that D makes this alteration in Luke's text alone, the normal readings in Matthew and Mark remain unchanged. Once again this points up the need of an investigation of D in Matthew and Mark.
\item \textsuperscript{20}Easton, pp. 43-44. \textsuperscript{21}Blass, pp. 169-70.
\item \textsuperscript{22}See Montefiore, p. 143 for discussions against the originality of this variant. Cf. Godet, p. 126; Hatch, \textit{Western Text}, pp. 24-25; and Williams, pp. 45-46.
\end{itemize}
office of Christ's humanity and was by no means necessarily involved in the Incarnation.\textsuperscript{23}

Mees thinks that D's reading grew out of the catechism instruction of the early church. Luke applies Psalms 2:7 (from which "You are my son, today I have begotten you" is taken) to the resurrection (Acts 13:33), and because the heavenly voice at the baptism suggested Psalms 2:7, the church saw ". . . the redemption as a powerful Epiphany of God upon earth, which manifested itself by the baptism for the first time and has been surpassed in the resurrection."\textsuperscript{24}

The normal reaction is to view "You are my son, today I have begotten you" as an Adoptionist reading. Streeter, for example, suggests that the Western text gave an original Adoptionist account of the baptism.\textsuperscript{25} K. Lake favored this theory of a primitive Adoptionism.\textsuperscript{26} Such a reaction to D's reading can be readily understood, for it appears in the Gospel of the Ebionites: καὶ φωνῇ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα· σὺ μου ἐλ ὁ νίδς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ ηὐδόκησα, καὶ πάλιν ἔγῳ σήμερον γεγέννηκα σε\textsuperscript{27} ("And a

\textsuperscript{23}Easton, pp. 43-44. \textsuperscript{24}Mees, pp. 106-07.

\textsuperscript{25}Streeter, p. 143.


voice from heaven saying, You are my beloved son, in you I am pleased, and again, today I have begotten you").

In discussing the significance of the D reading, Montefiore refers to the conclusion of Burkitt, that it is doubtful that the D reading is the original, much less an older form of the story; the supposed glaringly Adoptionist view of the baptism can hardly be more Adoptionistic than the way the story of the baptism is told by Mark. 28

Justin Martyr uses this reading in his Dialogue with Trypho (88:8). However, Williams says that when Justin used it he knew that he was quoting Psalms 2:7 and that he loved to combine the Old with the New Testament. Williams then concludes, following Lagrange, that Justin may have originated this reading and that Tatian borrowed it from Justin. 29

If so Justin and possibly Tatian could have popularized the variant, so that it passed on to Clement of Alexandria and to Origen: from them Methodius of Olympus, Hilary and Augustine may have derived their knowledge of it. 30

The main points of this discussion that revolves around D's variant do not, however, answer the immediate question that we are concerned with, What was the thinking behind D's use of this variant? To settle this question

28 Montefiore, p. 389.


30 Williams, pp. 46-47.
properly we must first look at the variant presented in
the next several verses.

Beginning with verse 23, Luke presents his version
of Jesus' genealogy. There has been a great deal of de-
bate over whether the genealogy belongs to Joseph or Mary.
It is possible, as we shall see, that D saw a convenient
vehicle for his editorial scheme in the genealogy.

It is not possible to present the texts of B and
D; the length of the variant prohibits this. All that
needs to be said is that D sets aside the genealogy of
the normal tradition between Joseph and David and incor-
porates Matthew's kingly line with some corrections: Mat-
thew says that Uzziah was the son of Joram; D corrects
this by adding three names, Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah,
making the list agree with Old Testament accounts. (The
first chapter of Matthew in D is lost, so we do not know
if D made these corrections there as well.) Other than
noting what D has done to Luke's genealogy, very little
is said by scholars as to possible reasons for this
change.31

The key to solving the problem of these two var-
iants can be found in the comment made by Blass, that the

31Torrey does propose, however, that D is a Greek
translation of an Aramaic version in which the genealogical
corrections were made for the benefit of Aramaic speaking
variant in the words of the heavenly voice is connected with the genealogy in the normal text of Luke.\textsuperscript{32} (Of course, Blass made this observation in an attempt to show this variant as the original reading of Luke 3:22; he was in no way trying to explain this variant in relationship with the alteration in the genealogy made by D.) However, it is probable that D made these two alterations as a single unit of thought.

D had received this variant from a Western source which had altered Luke 3:22 (the heavenly voice) so that it was a direct quote of Psalms 2:7, "You are my son, I have begotten you today." Since this Psalm was the royal Psalm of a king of Judah, it was appropriate for D to supply Jesus with the royal line (borrowed from Matthew) in the next few verses.

Concerning Psalm 2, E. W. Heaton says:

> The Psalm was composed, like Psalm 110, for the coronation of a Davidic king in Jerusalem. It probably continued to be used on the official anniversary of the king's accession throughout the period of the monarchy and subsequently it was reinterpreted as a prophecy of the coming Messiah.\textsuperscript{33}

At the anointing of the king, he was admitted to a unique relationship with God, which is described as an adoption.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{32}Blass, pp. 169-70.


\textsuperscript{34}Cf. Heaton, p. 152; Charles Augustus and Emilie
The Jewish Encyclopedia tells us that,

... the anointing of the king made him Meshiah YHWH, placed him in a special relationship to God, and established him as the one chosen by God to represent His rulership in Israel and to bear witness to His glory before the nations.35

Christians, of course, saw in this Psalm a prophecy pointing to Jesus, and used it as such in their discussion with Jews (Justin Martyr being a case in point). Although Jews themselves once saw Messianic implications in this Psalm, their views changed, probably as a reaction to the Christian use of this Psalm:

'Meshiah' (anointed one of God) in Psalms ii.7, which was formerly thought to have Messianic reference, is now taken as referring either to a Hasmonean king or to Israel. The latter interpretation is that prevailing in the Midrash.36

In speaking of the creation of Psalm 2 for the coronation of a Davidic king, Heaton said that eventually it was re-interpreted as a prophecy of the coming Messiah. He then makes the following observation: "This later development, in view of the contents of the poem, was altogether lamentable and thoroughly misleading."37


36 Ibid., p. 506. 37 Heaton, p. 151.
In summary then, the process which led to D's distinctive use of these variant readings was probably as follows: D received the variant reading in Luke 3:22 (the heavenly voice) from his Western source. Because of the royal significance of Psalm 2, and because the Church saw in this Psalm a prophecy of the Messiah, D quite naturally applied it to Jesus. Because this variant appears in connection with the baptism of Jesus, D views this baptism as the anointing of Jesus as the Messianic King.

Thus Psalms 2:7, which implies that the newly-anointed king of Judah now becomes God's son in a unique way, which he was not previous to the anointing, is applied to God's Son as he takes upon himself a phase of this sonship which he had not previously occupied, i.e. the role of the "Messiah" King. D now logically alters the adjoining genealogy to support his position and ascribes to the newly-anointed King the royal line of David. Thus once again, D has supported his editorial scheme of magnifying the role and position of Jesus.

Directly connected with this whole discussion is an interesting variant found in 9:20:

Luke 9:20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰπεν δὲ αυτοῖς οἱ μείζονες δέ τινα με λεγετε εἶναι πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἰπεν τὸν χρυσοῦν τοῦ δυ</td>
<td>εἰπεν δὲ αυτοῖς οἱ μείζονες δέ τινα με λεγετε εἶναι ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ πέτρος εἰπεν τὸν χρυσοῦν τοῦ δυ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"And he said to them, And who do you say that I am? And Peter answered and said, The Christ of God."  

"And he said to them, And who do you say that I am? And Peter answered and said, The anointed Son of God."

+ οὐ κατ' ἐμὴν των Χριστῶν, D 28 213 1675 ε ῶ

It does not appear at first that the addition in D makes a significant change in Luke's normal text. It would seem that whether one reads "the Christ [Anointed] of God" or "the anointed Son of God" the thought is the same. However, considered in light of the alteration in the heavenly voice and the genealogy, the change in Peter's confession takes on significance. The alterations in chapter three were designed to portray Jesus in a new phase of sonship as the Messiah king. D now sustains this concept of Jesus by soliciting support from Peter's confession.

At first glance, one is tempted to say that D's alteration in Luke says no more than the parallel in Matthew, where Peter's confession reads "οὐ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ζωντός ("You are the Christ, the son of the living God"—Matthew 16:16). In Matthew's construction, ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱός ("the Christ, the son"), it is possible to take Χριστὸς ("Christ") as an attributive adjective and arrive at the same reading as in D's text in Luke, "the anointed son." Arndt and Gingrich, however, say that Χριστὸς ("Christ") occurs in our literature only as a
noun. 38 Thus Peter's confession in Matthew is consistently translated, "the Christ, the son."

However, in D's text in Luke χριστόν definitely functions as an attributive adjective, thus supporting the alterations in chapter three and holding forth Jesus as occupying a phase of sonship which he previously did not occupy, "the anointed son of God," i.e. the "Messiah" king.

Jesus' Relation to the Father

Whenever possible, D avoids any reference on the part of Jesus to the Father as being "my Father." Jesus is allowed to address the first Person of the Godhead as "Father," but it seems to take on the characteristic of a title and does not show a relationship between the Father and Jesus that would necessarily indicate rank or position of authority. As Jesus talks to the people about their relationship with the first Person in the Godhead and uses such descriptive terms as "your Father," "say, our Father," and "your heavenly Father," the omission of "my Father" in the words of Jesus becomes noticeable.

In the normal text of Luke, the phrase, "my Father," is used four times by Jesus. The first usage is retained by D:

Luke 2:48,49

38Arndt and Gingrich, p. 895.
48. καὶ ἵδοντες αὐτὸν εἴχαν γναθήσαν καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μητέρα αὐτοῦ τεκνὸν τῇ εἴποντι αὐτοῦ οὕτως ἤδον ο πατήρ σου καὶ ὁ ὁδυνώμενοι ζητοῦμεν σε 49. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸι ἦτητετε με οὐκ ἠδείτε οὐκ ἐν τοῖς του πατρὸς μου δεὶ εἶναι με ἞του μεν σε 48. καὶ ἵδοντες αὐτὸν εἴχαν γναθήσαν καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μητέρα αὐτοῦ τεκνὸν τῇ εἴποντι αὐτοῦ οὕτως ἤδον ο πατήρ σου καὶ ὁ ὁδυνώμενοι καὶ λυποῦμενοι ζητοῦμεν σε 49. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸι ἦτητετε με οὐκ οἶδατε οὐκ ἐν τοῖς του προς μου δεὶ με εἶναι

"48. And when they saw him, they were astonished and his mother said to him, child, why have you done thus with us? Behold, your father and I sought you anxiously. 49. And he said to them, why did you seek me? Did you not know that I must attend to the things of my Father?"

The retention of μου ("my") in v. 49 is a safeguard against misunderstanding Mary's remark in the previous verse. Mary refers to Joseph as Jesus' father in v. 48; Jesus in v. 49 immediately disclaims any human origin. The preservation of "my Father" in this account does not touch on the issue of authority, as do the two following examples, but upon the issue of origin. Therefore, D retains "my Father" and thus preserves Luke's tradition of Jesus'
supernatural birth. In the next two passages, however, D can omit μου ("my") safely, without raising questions about his divine nature:

Luke 10:22

**Codex B**

παντα μου παρεδοθη υπο του πατρος μου και ουδεις γεινωσκει τις εστιν ο υιος ει μη ο πατηρ

"All things have been given to me by my Father and no one knows who the Son is except the Father."

**Codex D**

παντα μου παρεδοθη απο του πατρος και ουδεις γεινωσκει τις εστιν ο υιος ει μη ο πατηρ

"All things have been given to me by the Father and no one knows who the Son is except the Father."

υμο] απο, D
om. μου, D a c l vg codd sy Marcion Justin

Luke 22:29

**Codex B**

καγω διατιθημα υμιν καδως διεδετο μοι ο πατηρ μου βασιλειαν

"As my Father appointed a kingdom for me, I also appoint one for you."

**Codex D**

καγω διατιθημα υμειν καθως διεδετο μοι ο πατηρ βασιλειαν

"As the Father appointed a kingdom for me, I also appoint one for you."

om. μου, D pc e

In the last passage, D retains μου ("my") but omits του πατρος ("Father"). This omission is significant:

Luke 24:49

**Codex B**

και ιδου εγω εξαποστελλω την επαγγελιαν του πατρος μου εφ υμας

**Codex D**

και εγω αποστελλω την επαγγελιαν μου εφ υμας
"And behold I send the promise of my Father upon you."

om. ὅνομα, D
om. τοῦ πατρὸς, D e

We may find in this variant the clue as to why D omitted μου ("my") in 10:22 and 22:29. D appears to look upon Jesus as equal to the first Person in the Godhead. He may have understood the passages with "my Father" as tending to assign a position of subordination to Jesus.39

The omission of "Father" in 24:49 would seem to indicate this feeling. "The promise of my Father" of the normal text tends to indicate that Jesus is not of sufficient authority to communicate blessings to his followers and must depend upon the Father for them; therefore, "Father" is omitted and the blessings become those of Jesus, to be dispensed by him. D also wishes to emphasize the equality of Jesus with the Father; therefore, he alters Luke's normal text, as far as possible, without causing

39Mark did not use the phrase, "my Father"; Matthew uses it 15 times. Of these 15 usages, one is a lacuna in D. However, D omits μου ("my") once in Matthew (24:36), but this omission brings Matthew into harmony with Mark. Luke does not contain a parallel of this verse. Therefore, we can examine 14 out of 15 occurrences of "my Father" in Matthew; in 13 of the 14 occurrences D retains "my" with "father." There is a very good possibility that if we had the lacuna (7:21) it would be retained there too. The motivation that caused D to omit "my" before "Father" tends to eliminate any suggestion that Jesus is inferior to the Father in authority, position, etc. in D's text in Luke.
the rise of undue misunderstandings, so that Jesus will not appear in an inferior position to the Father.

The Miracles of Jesus

D also uses the miracles of Jesus as a medium to exalt him. The first miracle recorded by Luke is an exorcism, and it was performed by Jesus on the Sabbath in the synagogue at Capernaum. In Luke's tradition this miraculous healing on the Sabbath immediately follows Jesus' rejection by his fellow Nazarenes. This pericope is introduced by Luke in the following words:

Luke 4:31

Codex B

καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς καφαρ-
ναουμ πολίν τῆς γαλειλαῖας
καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς καφαρ-
ναουμ πολίν τῆς γαλειλαῖας
tαι την διδασκαλίαν την παραδιδάσκαλον εν
ορίοις ζαβουλῶν και
tαι την διδασκαλίαν αυτούς εν τοῖς σαββάσιν
αυτούς εν τοῖς σαββάσιν

"And he went down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee

and he was teaching them on the Sabbath."

Codex D

"And he went down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee situated beside the sea in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali, and he was teaching them on the Sabbath."

+ την παραδιδάσκαλον εν ορίοις ζαβουλῶν και νεφθαλείμ post γαλιλαίας, D

The variant of this verse is a harmonization with Matthew 4:13, "And leaving Nazareth he went and dwelt in Capernaum situated by the sea in the territory of Zebulun
and Naphtali." Conzelmann's interest in this variant is grounded in his position that Luke was unfamiliar with the geographical setting of Jesus' ministry:

Most remarkable of all, however, is the fact that we are not told anywhere in Luke that Capernaum is situated by the lake. Yet the fact that it is situated here is part and parcel of many of the traditions. Simon the fisherman has his home here (iv,38). It cannot be an accidental omission, as it occurs all the way through. Manuscript D is aware of the omission and supplements from Matthew.40

Again, speaking of D's variants which contain geographical alterations (mainly 4:31; 5:27), Conzelmann says:

It must be admitted that Codex D with its tendency to make corrections makes us suspicious rather than favorably inclined towards it. It is the geographical references in particular that make us suspect its special readings.41

It may not have been D's purpose to clear up Luke's geographical misconceptions in 4:31 when he borrowed from Matthew 4:13. If we reconstruct Luke's tradition we find Jesus going to Galilee in the power of the Spirit (4:14) immediately after his success over the temptations in the wilderness. Filled with power he taught in Galilee, with no specific city being mentioned; his fame spread through the surrounding countryside, and he was being glorified by all men (4:15). In v. 16, Luke has Jesus going to Nazareth, his home town. Here he teaches, and he and his message are rebuffed quite violently by the Nazarenes.

40 Conzelmann, p. 39. 41 Ibid., p. 40, n.3.
Leaving the city that has rejected him, Jesus comes to Capernaum and teaches.

Conzelmann would have us believe that the addition in D was to clear up a geographical confusion by pointing out that Capernaum was situated by the sea. It seems more accurate to say that D wished to salvage Jesus' ministry by contrasting the reception given him in Nazareth with his reception in Capernaum. By harmonizing this verse in Luke with Matthew 4:13 and by employing the term Zebulun and Naphtali, D directs the minds of his readers to a prophecy in Isaiah 9:1,2. Matthew quotes this prophecy and attaches Messianic significance to it:

And leaving Nazareth he went and dwelt in Capernaum situated by the sea, in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali, that what was spoken by Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled: 'The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, toward the sea, across the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles, the people who sat in darkness have seen a great light, and for those who sat in the region and shadow of death light has dawn (Matthew 4:13-16).

Through this variant D underscores the fact that the Nazarenes, in their rejection of Jesus, have also

42Outside the Pentateuch and the historical books of the Old Testament Zebulun and Naphtali are only mentioned five times. Of these five only Psalms 68:27 and Isaiah 9:1 mention them together. Within the Pentateuch and the historical books, only Judges 4:10; 5:18 place these two names together when the remainder of Jacob's children are not being referred to. Judges 4:10 refers to the assembling of Naphtali and Zebulun to follow Barak and Deborah to war; in Judges 5:18, Naphtali and Zebulun are mentioned in Deborah's Song of victory. D's use of these two names is an obvious reference to the prophecy of Isaiah.
rejected a message from God that would have brought light and joy. Also, he directs the minds of his readers to an Old Testament prophecy that was considered by the early church as a Messianic prophecy and applies it to Jesus' ministry, even though he does not quote the words of this prophecy in detail as does Matthew.

To insert the words of this lengthy quotation from Isaiah's prophecy at this point in Luke appears to be too much of an alteration of the normal text even for D. The implication contained in the variant is sufficient for insertion into the text. That this harmonization with Matthew contains a geographic reference to the sea is of secondary importance. The Messianic overtones that D applies to Jesus' ministry are the thought of major interest.

Returning to the account of Jesus' first miracle in Luke's tradition, we find another variant in 4:34. While teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum, Jesus was interrupted by a man who was demon possessed. The demon in control of the man recognized Jesus, even though the people were unaware of his true identity, and it "cried out with a great voice."

Luke 4:34

Codex B

εα τι ημείν και σοι ἃν
ναζωρηνεν ἡλθες απολέσαι
ημας ολδα σε τις ει ο
αγιος του θυ

Codex D

τι ημείν και σοι ἃν
ναζωρηνεν ἡλθες ημας ωθε
απολέσαι ολδα σε τις ει ο
αγιος του θυ
"Ah! What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know you who you are, the Holy One of God."

"What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come here to destroy us? I know you who you are, the Holy One of God."

om. εα, D 33 56 58 61 it copsa, bo sy s Marcion
απολέσαι ημας] ημας ωδε απολεσαι, D 68

Luke indicated earlier (vv. 14,15) that Jesus, in the power of the Spirit, had been working in Galilee, although no specific city was identified at that time. 4:23 indicates that Jesus had been in Capernaum prior to his visit to Nazareth and had worked miracles in the city, but the miracles are not enumerated. The addition of ὅδε ("here") by D would seem to indicate the following: (1) although Jesus had ministered in Capernaum earlier, no exorcism had been performed prior to this in this city; (2) sometime during Jesus' ministry in Galilee (cf. vv. 14,15), prior to this encounter in the synagogue, Jesus had performed exorcisms and this demon was aware of it.

This addition supports the earlier statement of Luke that the "fame" of Jesus had spread among the people throughout Galilee, vv. 14,15. More than this, however, D indicates that Jesus' "fame" was well known among Satanic forces and that wherever the two met a conflict ensued.

In describing this conflict, D makes two additions that magnify the power of Jesus:
Luke 4:35,36

Codex B

35. καὶ επετείμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἱησοῦς λέγων 'Εστι ἤτοι καὶ ἐξέλθε ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ ῥεῖψων αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμονίον εἰς τὸ μεσόν ἐξῆλθεν ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλαψαν αὐτόν.
36. καὶ εγενέτο ἰαμβὸς επὶ πάντας.

"35. And Jesus rebuked him saying, 'Be still, and come out of him!' And when the demon had thrown him down in the midst he came out of him, doing him no harm.

"36. And there was fear upon all."

Codex D

35. καὶ επετείμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἱησοῦς λέγων 'Εστι ἤτοι καὶ ἐξέλθε ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ ῥεῖψων αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμονίον εἰς τὸ μεσόν ἀνακραυγάσαν τε εξῆλθεν ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλαψαν αὐτόν.
36. καὶ εγενέτο ἰαμβὸς μγας επὶ πάντας.

"35. And Jesus rebuked him saying, 'Be still, and come out of him!' And when the demon had thrown him down in the midst crying out, he came out of him, doing him no harm.

"36. And there was great fear upon all."

The addition of ἀνακραυγάσαν ("crying out") intensifies the drama of the confrontation, making the victory over the demon more dramatic. The addition to Luke appears to have been influenced by Mark, who also has the account, for at the point where the demon was expelled, Mark's account reads, "And when he had cried (φωνῆσαν) with a loud voice, he came out of him" (Mark 1:26). If the alteration in Luke's tradition was influenced by Mark, D was consistent at this point, for he altered Mark's "When he had cried (φωνῆσαν) with a loud voice" to "He cried out (ἀνακραύγασαν) with a loud voice." In D's alteration of both Luke's and Mark's tradition, the intensification of
the drama can be felt when ἀναυωράζω, ("cry out . . . of the cry of demoniacs . . . of the cries of frightened men")\textsuperscript{43} replaces φωνέω ("produce a sound or tone . . . call someone").\textsuperscript{44}

The addition of μέγας ("great") to Luke's tradition intensifies the reaction of the spectators to the miracle performed by Jesus. This intensified reaction can also be seen in the final variant of this pericope:

Luke 4:37

\begin{tabular}{ll}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ εἴσεπορεύετο ηχὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα τοπὸν τῆς περιχώρου</td>
<td>καὶ εἴηλθεν η ἀκοή περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα τοπὸν τῆς περιχώρου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;And a report began going out concerning him into every place of the surrounding countryside.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;And the report went out concerning him into every place of the surrounding countryside.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{tabular}

εἴσεπορεύετο ηχὸς] εἴηλθεν η ἀκοή, D α

"Εἴηλθεν η ἀκοή ("The report went out") is a harmonization with Mark's account (1:28). As we have seen so often, D uses harmonization as a tool to develop his understanding of Luke's tradition and to strengthen his biases. With the alterations already viewed in this pericope that tend to magnify Jesus and his ministry, it is only following this trend to a logical conclusion to say that the

\textsuperscript{43}Arndt and Gingrich, pp. 55-56.

\textsuperscript{44}Ibid.; Thayer, p. 878.
final alteration of the pericope endeavors to add weight to the general view already being developed by D.

The addition of the definite article changes Luke's general statement, "a word" or "a report" to "the report" or "the account," thus making Luke's account of what followed the miracle more precise, for the report that was spread throughout the neighboring region would now be an account of the healing of the demoniac.

A similar alteration by D produces a similar effect. The pericope tells of a man full of leprosy coming to Jesus and asking for healing. Jesus responds by stretching forth his hand and touching the man. The healing is immediate. Jesus now instructs the man to say nothing to anyone and to go and show himself to the priest:

Luke 5:14

Codex B

καὶ αὐτὸς παρηγγείλειν αὑτῷ μηδὲν εἰπεῖν ἀλλὰ απελθὼν δείξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσενεγκείς περὶ τοῦ καθάρισμου σου καθὼς προσεταξένεις μόνον εἰς μαρτυρίον αὐτοῖς

"And he charged him to speak to no one, but go, show yourself to the priest and present an offering for your cleansing as Moses commanded for a testimony to them."

Codex D

καὶ αὐτὸς παρηγγείλειν αὑτῷ μηδὲν εἰπεῖν ἀπελθεὶ δὲ καὶ δείξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσενεγκείς περὶ τοῦ καθάρισμου σου καθὼς προσεταξένεις μόνον ἵνα εἰς μαρτυρίον ἦν μηδὲν τουτο

"And he charged him to speak to no one, but go and show yourself to the priest and present an offering for your cleansing as Moses commanded in order that this might be a testimony to you [plural]."
All three synoptics record this miracle and all three close the instruction given to the healed man with the same words, εἰς μαρτυρίων αὐτοίς ("for a testimony to them"). Therefore, we must look elsewhere for the origin of this reading in D. There is little doubt in Williams's mind but that Marcion was the originator of it, "... to avoid the implication that Jesus enjoined a witness to the Jews." 45 Williams also tells us that Sanday and C. H. Turner, on the other hand, took this reading to be original. 46 If Marcion was the originator of this reading, and if he wished to avoid any endorsement of the official Jewish view by Jesus, why did he use ὑμῖν ("you," plural) instead of σοι ("you," singular)?

Plummer suggests four possible ways of understanding αὐτοίς ("to them"):

(1) the priests may be convinced of My Divine power;
(2) the priests may see that I do not disregard the Law;
(3) the people may be convinced that the cure is complete, and that the leper may be readmitted to society;
(4) the people may see that I do not disregard the law.47

He feels that there is a good possibility that both numbers two and four are the correct interpretations. Creed,

45Williams, p. 13. Cf. Creed, p. 77; Arndt, p. 159.
46Williams, p. 13. 47Plummer, p. 150.
however, believes that ἀυτοῖς ("to them") means people in general and not the priests. His argument is based upon the statement of Jesus that the man was to show himself τῷ ἵερετὶ ("the officiating priest," singular). Tinsley translates εἰς μαρτύριον ἀυτοῖς ("as a witness to them") in the text of his work as "... that will certify the cure." Then in his commentary he writes:

The Greek phrase translated that will certify the cure (literally in the Greek 'as a witness to them') might be intended to mean 'as a sign that a mighty power is in your midst.'

In this case it would not matter to whom the sign is given; it is the evidence of Jesus' power that is of importance.

If D adopted this "Marcionite reading" to avoid showing any indication on Jesus' part that he was willing to comply with Jewish ritualistic regulations, which may very well be the reason for this reading in D, then we might say that D had Creed's viewpoint in mind. ἀυτοῖς ("to them"; Creed) or ὑμῖν ("to you"; D) refers to the people in general. Τοῦτο ("this thing") could then refer to the cleansing as being the witness of Jesus' power (agreement with Tinsley) and not to the offering as being a witness that he was willing to comply with Jewish ritual.

48 Creed, p. 77.

And if we take the miracle as the witness to Jesus' power, and understand ὑμῖν ("to you") to refer to the people in general, instead of the much smaller group of priests, then we find this variant in harmony with D's over-all purpose of magnifying Jesus and his ministry.

The second significant variant found in this pericope is an addition to v. 14, present in D alone. It reads as follows:

ο δὲ ἐξέλθων ἢμεῖς καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον ὅστε μηκετί δυνάσθαι αὐτὸν φανερῶς εἰς πάλιν εἰσελθεῖν ἄλλα ἔξω ἢν ἐν ἑρμοίς τόποις καὶ συνήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἤλθεν πάλιν εἰς καφωρναύμ.

But when he went out he began to proclaim and spread abroad the word so that he was no longer able to enter into the city openly, but he was without in a desert place and they were coming together to him and he came again to Capernaum.

This is an obvious harmonization with Mark 1:45; the two read identically except for the last statement about Jesus' return to Capernaum. Again D's literary purpose is clear. By this harmonization, Jesus' popularity is intensified and Jesus himself is magnified beyond Luke's tradition in the normal text.

In Luke 9:11 we have a summary statement concerning a day's work among the people by Jesus, which serves as a backdrop for the miraculous feeding of the five thousand. D makes an addition to this general statement that tends to magnify Jesus as a healer and emphasizes his compassion for the multitudes:
"And when the crowds learned it they followed him, and when he had received them he spoke to them concerning the kingdom of God, and those having need of healing he healed."
to Jesus for healing and found it (Luke 8:42-48). So D glorifies Jesus as a divine healer, placing him above the normal practitioners of the healing arts.

By adding "all," D now magnifies Jesus' compassion for the physically afflicted. Not only was he capable of healing the most difficult cases, but D emphasizes that none was turned away without having his needs met.

Conclusion

Thus we have seen that through major alterations, and at times slight changes, D has altered the text for the magnification of Jesus. The variants in this chapter show that he accomplishes his editorial design by the following methods:

1. By understanding that an anarthrous noun points out quality and by changing a preposition, we discover how D is enabled to magnify the personality and character of the child Jesus.

2. By quoting Psalms 2:7 intact, D changes the words of the heavenly voice. Because this is a royal Psalm of coronation, D alters Luke's genealogy between Joseph and David by inserting the royal line of kings found in Matthew's genealogy, thus portraying Jesus as the Messianic king.

3. By removing μου ("my") as a modifier of "Father," D emphasizes the equality of Jesus with the
Father; therefore, he alters Luke's normal text, as far as possible, without causing the rise of undue misunderstanding, so that Jesus will not appear in an inferior position to the Father.

4. By harmonizing Luke's tradition with that of Matthew, D is able to use a prophecy in Isaiah, understood by the early church as a Messianic prophecy, to introduce Jesus' use of miracles.

5. By intensifying the action within the account of a miracle and intensifying the reactions of the people to the miracles, D achieves a magnification of Jesus.

6. By emphasizing that physically afflicted people who needed his healing came to him and he healed them all, D glorifies Jesus as a compassionate, divine healer.
The Kingdom of God

The question of Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom of God and its relationship to his preaching and ministry has been discussed and debated in great detail. In this chapter it is not our purpose to review this literature, but rather to discover Luke's understanding of the relationship between Jesus' ministry and the Kingdom of God, and to see how the variant readings in D alter or support Luke's concept of the kingdom.

In comparing the statements about the kingdom as they appear in the three synoptics, one can see possible reason for the conclusion of Conzelmann, that Luke's material on the kingdom tends to deal with its nature rather than with its immediate appearance.¹ This tendency in St. Luke has led some, like Conzelmann, to take the position that we can see in this synoptic gospel a changing attitude toward eschatology. The arrival of the kingdom is seen as being postponed until sometime in the future.² This position is supported by pointing to the

¹Conzelmann, p. 114. ²Ibid., p. 117.
notable omissions in Luke of the word ηγγίκεν in statements concerning the appearance of the kingdom ("the kingdom of heaven is at hand").

Before looking at these omissions it would be well to review the significance of the grammatical construction of ηγγίκεν ("is at hand," perfect, indicative of ἐγγίζω). This construction is what Dana and Mantey call the intensive perfect:

The Intensive Perfect. It is most in keeping with the basal significance of the tense to place emphasis upon the existing results, for it is distinctively the tense of the "finished product." When special attention is thus directed to the results of the action, stress upon the existing fact is intensified. This is the emphatic method in Greek of presenting a fact or condition. It is the way of saying that a thing is. There is no exact equivalent of this idiom in English, consequently there is no way to give it an exact translation. Usually its closest approximation is the English present, but it is important to bear in mind that it is not a mere duplicate of the Greek present. It presents an existing fact more forcibly than either the Greek or English present could possibly do.

However, if ηγγίκεν is taken as an intensive perfect and if Luke's delay in using this word is understood as an attempt to direct his readers' understanding of the kingdom into a position similar to his own, then Conzelmann failed to understand what Luke was attempting to do.

Dana and Mantey, p. 202. Concerning the intensive perfect, A. T. Robertson says, "In reality they are perfects where the punctiliar force is dropped and only the durative remains. . . . Giles (Man., p. 481) thinks that originally the perf. was either intensive or iterative like στηκα, and that the notion of recently completed action (extensive) is a development" (pp. 894-95). Blass and De-Brunner say, "The perfect with certain verbs has wholly the sense of a present (as in classical)" (p. 176). Herbert Preisker says, "In the older writings the distinctive feature of both ἔγγυς and ἐγγίζειν is that they express the
When we see the sentence, Ἡγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ("For the kingdom of heaven is at hand"--Matthew 3:2), we are to understand that Matthew is putting into the strongest terms possible the belief that the kingdom is breaking in upon men--now!5

Let us notice how the normal tradition in Luke temporarily avoids the use of this term. Matthew's record of John the Baptist's message, μετανοεῖτε Ἡγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ("Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"--Matthew 3:2) is changed by Luke to καὶ Ἡλθεν...

characteristic aspect of the early Christian situation, being used of the eschatological fulfillment, of the great turning point in world history, of the coming of the kingdom of God directly into the present as the miracle of God [emphasis supplied]. E.g. Mt. 3:2: Ἡγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, cf. Mk. 1:15 and par.; Mt. 10:7; Lk. 10:9,11; 21:8." Kittel, Vol. II, p. 331.

("And he came .... . proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins"--Luke 3:3).

The statement of Jesus found in Matthew and Mark, "Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"--Matthew 4:17) and "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand"--Mark 1:15), is eliminated by Luke, and Jesus is presented as talking to the people about the kingdom, rather than its imminence: "And when he had received them he spoke to them about the kingdom of God"--Luke 9:11).

Matthew's account of the preparations for sending the twelve disciples on their missionary tour, two by two, "And as you go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand"--Matthew 10:7), is simply rendered by Luke as "And he sent them forth to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal"--Luke 9:2).

One is led to ask, Why did Luke not wish to speak of the kingdom of heaven in terms used by Mark and Matthew? The answer supplied by Conzelmann and others is that Luke was one of the first to see that the kingdom was not to be established immediately and that the church had to adjust
its thinking to the long haul of future history. There is little that can be said against this argument. However, we may not have the complete picture if we let the issue rest at this point. It may very well be that Luke also avoided the Ἰησοῦς statements found in Matthew and Mark because:

1. The statement, "For the kingdom of God is at hand," may not have meant too much to "Theophilus" with his Gentile background.

2. If these statements were included and Theophilus sought to understand their import, he might have been in danger of arriving at a wrong conclusion about the kingdom.

3. Luke wanted to lead Theophilus into an understanding of the kingdom that was similar to his own. This would not be accomplished by making a statement, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," totally separated from a context that would help one to understand the nature of the kingdom. Therefore, Luke was careful that statements concerning the kingdom were placed in a context that would help Theophilus to understand the nature of the kingdom.

This brings us to two occasions where Luke did use Ἰησοῦς in connection with the kingdom (Luke 10:9,11), occasions that are exclusive to Luke. However, these two occurrences do not stand as broad generalizations, as do the earlier statements concerning the kingdom made by John the
Baptist and Jesus in the accounts of Mark and Matthew. Rather they are qualified by the context in which they are placed, the context of miraculous healing. This may provide the key to the understanding of Luke's conception of the relationship between the kingdom of God and Jesus' ministry, especially if we consider these two statements in the light of others made by Luke concerning the kingdom and their context of deeds of healing.

Before looking at these two texts, we shall investigate the statements concerning the kingdom as they are set into the context of miraculous healings by Luke. In Matthew we find two occasions where the preaching of the kingdom is mentioned together with healing:

And he went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and healing all manner of disease and illness among the people (Matthew 4:23).

And Jesus went about all the cities and villages teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and healing all manner of disease and illness (Matthew 9:35).

Both statements read almost identically and appear to be a summary report on the nature of the work and preaching of Jesus. Proclaiming the kingdom of God was one aspect of his preaching, and healing was another aspect of his ministry.

It would not seem that in either of these statements the presence of the kingdom could be equated with the
performance of miraculous healings. In fact, in parallel passages in Mark and Luke, "kingdom" is omitted by Mark and "healing" is omitted by Luke:

Mark 1:39 (Matt. 4:23)

καί ἐλθὲν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αυτῶν εἰς οἶλην τὴν γαλικελλαίαν καὶ τα δαιμονία εκβάλλων.

"And he came into all of Galilee, preaching in their synagogues and casting out demons."

Mark 6:6 (Matt. 9:35) Luke 8:1

καὶ περιηγεῖν τὰς κωμὰς κυκλῳ διδασκόνων καὶ εγένετο εὖ τῷ καθέξις καὶ αὐτὸς διώδευεν κατὰ πολιν καὶ κωμῖν κηρύσσων καὶ ευαγγελίζομενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ οἱ δώδεκα σὺν αὐτῷ

"And he went round about the villages teaching."

"And it came to pass afterwards, that he systematically passed through cities and villages preaching and presenting the good news of the kingdom of God and the twelve were with him."

In Mark's gospel there is no trace of tying miracles to the kingdom. In Matthew, however, we see a single instance of this (excluding the two summary reports just considered):

"And if I cast out demons by the Spirit of God, indeed, the kingdom of God has come upon you"--Matthew 12:28). The first class conditional sentence affirms the reality of the presence of God's kingdom. In this case the presence of the kingdom is verified by an exorcism.
Luke ties the ability of Jesus to work miraculous healings more closely to the kingdom than Matthew, so that one can say that miracles testify to the presence of the kingdom. In turn, the term "kingdom" can then be equated to the activity of God's power and His reign on earth.\(^6\)

Various scholars have concluded the same thing but have expressed it in different ways. Rudolf Bultmann equates "kingdom of God" with "reign of God," which is breaking in upon men. Jesus' power to work miracles, and especially to cast out demons, can be interpreted as the beginning of the overthrow of Satan.\(^7\)

C. H. Dodd, in developing his defense for realized eschatology says:

But Jesus says, 'If I, by the finger of God, cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you.' . . . It is not a matter of having God for your King in the sense that you obey His commandments: it is a matter of being confronted with the power of God at work in the world.\(^8\)

And also:

\(^6\)Geldenhuys, p. 330 and Arndt, pp. 282,300.


\(^8\)Dodd, p. 29. Cf. George Ladd, "The Kingdom of God--Reign or Realm?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII(1962), 237, who says: "The exorcism of demons is indeed a sign of the kingdom, but it is not a sign of an imminent approaching kingdom; rather it is a sign of a present kingdom. In the coming of Jesus God has entered into history in his kingly activity to accomplish his redemptive purpose."
We have seen that in apocalypse the final victory over 'the kingdom of the enemy' is the coming of the Kingdom of God; and that in the Synoptic Gospels the exorcisms of Jesus are treated as signs of this victory and so of the coming of the Kingdom.  

However, it must be emphasized again that it is in Luke that the motif of miracle = presence of the kingdom or reign of God is developed more fully. We first see a loose construction of this equation (miracle = presence of the kingdom) in chapter four.

Jesus arrived in Capernaum after his rejection in Nazareth. On the Sabbath day he went to the synagogue where he healed a man possessed of a demon. After the services concluded, he went to Simon's house where he healed Simon Peter's mother-in-law. At sunset, when the Sabbath was past, people flocked to Jesus, either to be healed themselves or to bring someone with them that needed healing. The next morning the crowds from Capernaum again sought out Jesus and asked him not to leave their area. Luke records Jesus' reply as follows: "... it is necessary for me to present the good news concerning the kingdom of God to other cities also, for this cause I was sent" (Luke 4:43). Luke thus ties the preaching or the presenting of the good news of the kingdom of God directly with the miracles of healing (i.e. release from the powers of evil) that were performed the day before.

---

9Dodd, pp. 57-58.
The parallel to Matthew 12:28 develops the point more clearly, "But if I cast out demons by the finger of God, indeed, the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Luke 11:20).

At this point we can return to the two passages in Luke that use ἡγγίκεν when speaking of the kingdom. The setting is the commissioning of the seventy. After they were advised on how to relate to those who accepted their presence, Jesus instructed them as to their work: καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθένεις, καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς ἡγγίκεν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ("Heal the sick in it and say to them, the kingdom of God is come upon you"--Luke 10:9). He then instructed the seventy as to how they should behave if they were repulsed: καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ύμῶν εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἀπομασσόμεθα ύμῖν πλὴν τοῦτο γινώσκετε ὅτι ἡγγίκεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ("And the dust of your city clinging to our feet we wipe off against you; but understand this, the kingdom of God is come upon you"--Luke 10:11).

The inhabitants of the city that received the ambassadors of Jesus were to be blessed by the healing power that passed from Jesus' representatives to the populace. Without a doubt, this healing power would bring relief and joy. Amid their rejoicing the people were to be told that the kingdom is come upon them. Those who spurned the
ambassadors would not know the joy of the healing power, but they too were to be told that the kingdom is come upon them; but they were not to share in it because they had rejected it by rejecting those who were empowered to bring it to them.

However, it does not seem that everyone who was healed entered into the full joy of the kingdom, although, as just seen, the kingdom was present to all men through the power of God whether they shared in the workings of that power or not. As will be seen below, some men did share in the workings of the power of God, rejoiced in release from physical suffering, yet did not enter into the fullest joy of the presence of the kingdom of God.

Luke presents the theme of the kingdom in the context that would leave no question as to the kingdom's nature. Therefore, he omits the general statements about the kingdom's arrival made by John the Baptist (Matthew 3:2) and Jesus (Matthew 4:17; Mark 1:15), statements which leave the reader free to view the nature of the kingdom according to his own personal thinking.

This context gives evidence of God's power to rule and authority over evil (= illness), so "kingdom" becomes "power to reign."\(^{10}\) It is when Luke has established his concept of the "kingdom of God" that he uses for the first

---

\(^{10}\)Cf. Ladd, pp. 236-37.
time the phraseology employed by Matthew and Mark when speaking of the kingdom, ἡγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ("For the kingdom of heaven is come"—Luke 10:9,11).

If ἡγγικεν is to be taken as intensive perfect, Conzelmann's position that the passage of Luke 10:9,11 refers to the future arrival of the kingdom cannot be accepted.11

Luke's understanding of the connection between miracles of healing and the kingdom reaches its clearest presentation in chapter 17. Beginning with verse 11 we have the account of the ten lepers who requested healing and were sent by Jesus to the priests. On their way they discovered the leprosy fading and the glow of health returning to their body tissue. One of the ten forgot where he was going and in his joy returned, praising God, to find Jesus. When the benefactor was found by the cleansed man, "He fell upon his face at his feet thanking him" (Luke 17:16). After further conversation, Jesus said to the prostrated man, "Arise, Go! Your faith has saved you" (Luke 17:19).

What is here meant by "saved"? If it is seen as release from leprosy, this man's condition was no different from the nine who did not return to express gratitude, for they too were cleansed. However, if "saved" is understood

to refer to a spiritual relationship between man and God, then this man was seen by Jesus to be in a different condition than were the nine who did not express their gratitude.12

It appears that D understood these words of Jesus as applying to a spiritual experience. To strengthen this understanding of the passage, D makes the following omission:

Luke 17:16

Codex B | Codex D
---|---
καὶ εἶπεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστῶν αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτὸς ην σαμαριτῆς | καὶ εἶπεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ην δὲ σαμαριτῆς
"And he fell upon his face at his feet thanking him, and he was a Samaritan."

om. εὐχαριστῶν αὐτῷ, D

It is possible that the omission is a homoeoteleuton. On the other hand, in view of D's free handling of the text of Luke, the omission could be intentional. If it is intentional, it fits into two editorial themes seen in D: (1) the glorification of Jesus (as we have already seen), for the omission of "thanking him" leaves the

Samaritan prostrated at Jesus' feet with no qualifying explanation. This can be taken as an act of homage, as well as thanks; thus Jesus is glorified by the worship rendered him by a foreigner. (2) The revelation of an anti-Judaic bias (which is yet to be investigated); that this stranger would return to give thanks to Jesus, or yet, to worship him, shows the nine Jewish lepers as being unresponsive to the ministry of Jesus.

However, these two points are not our immediate interest. We are interested in the omission in the light of Jesus' statement to the Samaritan, "Your faith has saved you." In the light of this statement D's omission portrays the Samaritan as rendering worship to Jesus, as an expression of submission to Jesus' authority and power that could heal a disease of the nature of leprosy. Thus it is probable that D viewed the prostrated Samaritan as expressing his belief in Jesus as a Saviour, not only from physical maladies but from sin as well.

Jesus was then asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God was to come, whereupon Jesus replied: "The kingdom of God does not come with observation, neither will they say behold here or there, for behold, the
kingdom of God is within you"—Luke 17:20,21).

Luke ties the healing of the ten lepers to Jesus' answer to the question of the Pharisees because the cleansing illustrates perfectly what Jesus meant in his answer to the Pharisees' question. Ten men were physically healed, but only one found the kingdom. When the one healed man

13"The following defend "among you": Arndt, pp. 373-74; Plummer, p. 406; Paul M. Brescher, "Luke 17:21," Concordia Theological Monthly, XV(1944), 730-36; idem, "Luke 17:20-21 in Recent Investigations," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXII(1951), 895-908; Burton Scott Easton, "Luke 17:20-21," American Journal of Theology, XVI(1912), 275-83; F. Warburton Lewis, "Luke xvii.21," Expository Times, XXXVIII(1926/27), 187-88; Alexander Rüstow, "ἐν τοῖς ὑμῖν ἔστιν, Zur Deutung von Lukas 17.20-21," Zeitschrift für die Neuestamentliche Wissenschaft, XVII(1960), 197-224. Creed defends "within you," as a spiritual kingdom, "By the time that Luke's Gospel was written the term 'the kingdom of God' had lost its earlier definition and could be used with the new context and associations which the teaching, death, and resurrection of Jesus had imparted to the term (cf. Ac. i.3, xxviii.31). The Spirit—the first installment of the inheritance—was already bestowed, and St. Paul could write to the Romans (xiv.17) οὐκ ἔστιν ἔστιν ἠ β. τ. Θ. βρότως καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χάρα ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ. Whatever actual saying of Jesus may lie behind these words, it may be that Luke believed that Jesus set the spiritual presence of the kingdom in men's hearts in antithesis to the expectation of its appearance 'here' or 'there.' But even if this is so, the eschatological conception is by no means superseded in the mind of the evangelist, or eliminated from his gospel" (p. 219). The pericope of the ten lepers would indicate that Otto Betz's statement may need qualification. Betz says, "The miracles of Jesus cannot be separated from obedience to his message and acceptance of his messianic claim. Luke makes this unmistakably clear from the very beginning": "The Kerygma of Luke," Interpretation, XXII(1968), 137. From Luke's point of view it might be more accurate to say that the miracles of Jesus may provide an entrance into a deeper experience of sharing the joys of the kingdom of God and salvation.
returned to Jesus praising God, falling on his face at Jesus' feet and thanking him, he was expressing the joy of a discovery that far exceeded the joy of finding his physical body cleansed of a dread disease. Through this healing he found a relationship with God that enabled Jesus to assure this man of something more than physical healing.\(^{14}\)

For Jesus could say to the man, "Go! Your faith has saved you," and to the Pharisees, "The kingdom does not come by observation, but it is within you." It is interesting to note that of all the parables recorded by Matthew which are prefixed with "The kingdom is like . . . ," Luke has only two, the Mustard Seed (13:18,19) and the Leaven (13:20,21). Both parables deal with inner spiritual growth.

So it would seem that Luke conceives of miracles

---

of physical healing as evidence of the presence of the power of God to reign, not only in gaining victory over the powers of evil which have control over human bodies, but also evidence of the power of God to establish his reign over the lives of men who are willing to accept this reign.

Let us summarize what has been said to this point:

1. Luke avoids applying the term ΒΧΧΧΧΕ to the kingdom as Matthew and Mark apply it in the ministry of John the Baptist and Jesus until he can develop his thesis concerning the kingdom.

2. Luke does seem to foresee a delay in the immediate establishment of God's kingdom on earth which terminates the power of the nations.

3. He sees instead the reign of God being established in men's lives through the ministry of Jesus.

4. The working of miraculous physical healings, which terminates the end of the reign of evil over physical bodies, is evidence of God's power to establish his reign over men's spiritual lives. The alteration by D makes this viewpoint more explicit.

Luke has not altogether forsaken an eschatological end to secular history. In chapter 21, he still foresees "the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory" (Luke 21:27). Those who are able to read the signs of the times will see in secular events omens of the
approaching end: "So also you, when you see these things happen, you know that the kingdom of God is near" (Luke 21:31). That Luke foresees an eschatological end in the future which involves the judgment of those who have rejected the rule of God is borne out in such parables as the Great Banquet (14:15-24), the Ten Pounds (19:11-27), and the Vineyard and the Tenants (20:9-19).

So Luke sees an immediate kingdom or reign of God that is established within the hearts of men, and he sees also the future end of secular history when God will establish his undisputed rule, permanently, upon the earth.

Turning now to D, we will examine what his understanding was of Luke's theology of the kingdom. First, it should be noted that D supports Luke's attempt to equate miracles with the presence of the kingdom. We have already referred to Jesus' statement concerning the kingdom in Luke 4:43 ("It is necessary for me to present the good news concerning the kingdom . . . to other cities also . . . "), but to understand D's alteration here it may be necessary to summarize again the background of this statement.

Jesus had performed two miracles on the Sabbath: a man possessed with a demon was healed in the synagogue, and Peter's mother-in-law was relieved of a burning fever. After sunset, a multitude of people sought him out for healing, or the healing of someone else they had brought with
them. The next morning the crowds again sought him and requested that he not leave their city, whereupon Jesus said that he had to go to other cities also in order to complete his mission:

**Luke 4:43**

**Codex B**

ο δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς
στὶ καὶ ταῖς
εὕρολς πολείςν εὐαγγέλις-
σασάδι δεὶ με τὴν
βασιλείαν του θύ
στὶ επὶ τουτο
ἀπεσταλν

"And he said to them, 'it is necessary for me to present the good news concerning the kingdom of God to other cities also, for this cause I was sent.'"

**Codex D**

ο δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς
στὶ δεὶ με καὶ εἰς τὰς
αλλὰς πολείς εὐαγγέλι-
σασάδι αὐτὴν
βασιλείαν του θύ
εἰς τουτο γαρ
ἀπεσταλν.

"And he said to them, 'it is necessary for me to present the good news concerning this kingdom of God to other cities also, for this cause I was sent.'"

---

The variant that we are interested in is αὐτὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ δεοῦ ("this kingdom of God"). There are grammatical constructions where it is permissible for αὐτὴν ("her") to function as ταῦτην ("this"). Robertson identifies this construction as a semi-demonstrative use of αὐτός. "Αὐτός is beginning to have a semi-demonstrative sense (common in modern Greek) in the New Testament, as in Lu. 13:1, ἐν
Also:

In Luke αὐτὸς ὁ is sometimes almost a pure demonstrative as it comes to be in later Greek. The sense of "very" or "self" is strengthened to "that very." Thus αὐτῷ τῇ ὥρᾳ (Lk. 2:28), ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ (13:1), ἐν αὐτῷ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (23:12). The modern Greek freely employs this demonstrative sense. . . Moulton (Prol., p. 91) finds this demonstrative use of αὐτὸς ὁ in the papyri.16

If the variant reading, αὐτήν, were to be taken as a demonstrative pronoun, D then would be strengthening Luke's apparent equation of miracles = presence of the kingdom, for "this" would then connect "kingdom of God" directly to the miraculous power for healing that Jesus possessed. The request of the citizens of Capernaum that Jesus not leave their city stems from the healings Jesus performed on the previous Sabbath and the mass healings he performed that evening after sunset.

If D understood Luke as saying that the kingdom of God (i.e. God's reign) is present, evidenced by Jesus' power to heal, then the next two variants might be explained in this context. The first is an omission in Luke's version of the beatitudes, and the second is an addition in Luke's version of the Lord's prayer:

Luke 6:21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μακαριοι οι πεισωντες νυν στι χορτασθησεσθε μακαριοι</td>
<td>μακαριοι οι πεισωντες νυν στι χορτασθησεσθε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οι κλαλοντες νυν στι γελασετε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15Robertson, p. 290. 16Ibid., p. 686.
"Blessed are those who hunger now, for they shall be filled; blessed are those who weep now, for they shall laugh."

Practically no comments by scholars can be found on the missing beatitude in D. Homoeoteleuton seems unlikely. It appears that D omitted this beatitude deliberately. If this omission is considered in the context of Luke's view of the kingdom of God, we might find a possible explanation for its omission. Weeping has no place among those who have experienced the presence of God's kingdom. The statement, "Blessed are those who weep now, for they shall laugh," is for those who live before the establishment of God's rule. Now, however, God's power to rule, his kingdom, is present and evidenced by Jesus' authority over the powers of evil. The time to comfort those who weep is past and the time to laugh is here. Now we shall notice the addition:

Luke 11:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἶπεν ὃς εὐθεῖς στὰν προσευχήσομεν λέγετε πατέρ</td>
<td>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν στὰν προσευχήσομεν μὴ βαπτολογεῖτε ὡς οἱ λοιποὶ δοκοῦσιν γὰρ τίνες στὶ εὐ τῇ πολυλογείᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουσθοῦσιν ἀλλὰ προσευχομένου λέγετε πατέρ ἡμῶν ο ἐν τοῖς οὐράνοις αγιασθῆτω ὄνομα σου ὑμῶν ἐξήθετω σου ἡ βασιλεῖα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"And he said to them,
when you pray, say,
Father,
hallowed be your name, your kingdom come."

Variants 2, 3, and 5 are obvious harmonizations with the text of Matthew; they are interesting but are of no significance for the present study. Our main concern is with the addition of ἐπὶ γῆς ("upon us") before "let your kingdom come." It is believed that this variant originated from an interesting reading for which there is evidence from Tertullian (Adv. Marc. iv.26), Gregory of Nyssa, and 604 (a cursive edited by Hoskier in 1890). The reading is Ἐλθέτω τὸ πνεῦμά σου (τὸ ἅγιον) ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ καθαρισάτω

---

17 Plummer, p. 295. Cf. Metzger, pp. 154-55. R. Leaney, "The Lucan Text of the Lord's Prayer," Novum Testamentum, I(1956), 103-11, sees Gregory's text at Luke 11:2 as being authentic and thus is consistent with the view that this form may be derived from Jesus himself.
Nhôç,¹⁸ ("Let your [Holy] Spirit come upon us and cleanse us").

Plummer suggests that this variant could be read with either "Thy kingdom come" or "Hallowed be Thy name."¹⁹ Creed informs us that Harnack proposed to substitute it for the first two petitions, but Creed concludes there is no positive evidence for such a position.²⁰ However, he points out that "the words" of this variant "or their equivalent were a substitute for the first, not for the second petition" in Marcion, i.e. for "Hallowed be Thy name."²¹

Metzger indicates that no one can be certain that "upon you" in D should be taken as evidence of an earlier petition for the Holy Spirit: "To pray that God's name may be hallowed upon us is entirely congruent with Old Testament references to causing the divine name to dwell there. . . ." Therefore, Metzger believes that the variant reading is a liturgical adaptation of the original form of the Lord's Prayer. This adaptation was possibly used during the rite of baptism or the laying on of hands.²²

Any reason advanced for the presence of this variant

in D's text of Luke can only be suggestive. It would appear that D was acquainted with the variant reading that petitions the presence of the Holy Spirit; but D does not appear to be sufficiently under the influence of Tertullian and Gregory of Nyssa as to change the normal text of Luke to include this petition. However, it seems that D does see in the words, "upon us," something that may be used in his editorial scheme.

Because of its position in the Greek text, this addition can be read with what precedes it, "Hallowed be Thy name," or with what follows, "Thy kingdom come." There does not seem to be sufficient evidence in D's editorial scheme to warrant the variant reading to be taken with what precedes it, thus producing what Metzger sees as "a liturgical adaptation of the original form of the Lord's Prayer." However, it is apparent that D has an editorial interest in Luke's theology of the kingdom. To petition the coming of God's kingdom upon the believer is in harmony with D's understanding of God's kingdom in Luke's normal text.

Thus in essence, the prayer is no longer asking God in a general way to send his kingdom, but rather asking God to make the petitioner ready to receive it; this petition in the context of Luke's view of the kingdom, i.e. that Jesus' miracles indicate its presence, now becomes an expression of eager realization that the kingdom can be
experienced now. This concept of the kingdom is supported by the following variant in D.

Earlier we discussed the significance in the normal tradition of the healing of the ten lepers and its bearing on Jesus' answer to the question posed by the Pharisees, "When is the kingdom of God coming?" D perhaps senses the original significance of what Luke was saying about the kingdom and alters Jesus' reply in the following manner:

Luke 17:20,21

**Codex B**

20. επερωτηθείς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν φαρισαίων ποτε ερχέται η βασιλεία του σὺ απεκρίθη αυτοῖς καὶ εἰπεν συν ερχέται η βασιλεία του σὺ μετα παρατηρήσεως

21. οὐδὲ εροσιν ἰδου ὅτε η εἰκὲν ἢ ἰδου γαρ η βασιλεία τοῦ σὺ εντὸς υμῶν εστιν.

"20. And having been asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God would come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God comes not with observation

21. Nor will they say, behold here or there; for behold the kingdom of God is within you."

**Codex D**

20. επερωτηθείς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν φαρισαίων ποτε ερχεται η βασιλεία του σὺ απεκρίθη αυτοῖς καὶ εἰπεν συν ερχεται η βασιλεία του σὺ μετα παρατηρήσεως

21. οὐδὲ εροσιν ἰδου ὅτε η ἰδου εκεὶ μὴ πιστευσῃς ἰδου γαρ η βασιλεία τοῦ σὺ εντὸς υμῶν εστὶν.

"20. And having been asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God would come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God comes not with observation

21. Nor will they say, behold here or behold there; Believe it not, for behold the kingdom of God is within you."

---

v. 21 + ἱδοὺ, D lat syς Tatian
+ μὴ πιστευσῆτε post ἐκεί, D
+ ἱδοὺ ante ἐκεί, D
There is little question but what μὴ πιστεύσητε ("believe it not") is a harmonization with Matthew 24:23 and Mark 13:21, where Jesus warns against false christs. Although Luke lifts v. 21a out of the eschatological context of Matthew 24 and Mark 13 and places it into a non-eschatological setting here, D's harmonization of Luke's normal text does not necessarily imply that eschaton is to be equated with the kingdom "within," for D does not alter Luke's eschatological chapter (21) in a manner that would do away with the future eschaton. As used by D in this context the addition of μὴ πιστεύσητε leaves little question that the present kingdom is established internally; it is a spiritual kingdom. One cannot point out its geographic location by saying "Lo here or there."

Coming immediately after the cleansing of the ten lepers, this addition serves as a commentary on how D understood the significance of the story in the normal text; i.e. ten men were cleansed, but only one found the true joy of what the cleansing power was a representative. To him Jesus said, "Your faith has saved you."

Although D endeavors to present more explicitly Luke's concept of an internal, spiritual kingdom, he does not stress this aspect of the kingdom to the elimination of the eschaton in the normal text.\(^{23}\) Thus we can say

\(^{23}\text{Cf. Creed, pp. 218-19.}\)
that D recognized two kingdoms in the theology of St. Luke: the spiritual kingdom we have already spoken of and the second kingdom, which is to be established at the parousia of the Lord. We see this understanding on the part of D in two additional alterations.

The first alteration is found in connection with Jesus' statement that there would be some who would not taste death until they saw the coming of the kingdom. Because the alteration of D is tied closely to an observation made by Conzelmann about Luke's normal text as it contrasts with the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark, we shall look at the statement as it appears in the three synoptics before we investigate D's alteration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αμην λεγω υμιν οτι εις τινες των ωδε εστωνν οιτινες ου μη γευσονται θανατου εως αν ιδωσιν τον υιον του ανθρωπου ερχουμενον εν τη βασιλεια αυτου</td>
<td>και ελεγεν αυτοις αμην λεγον υμιν οτι εις τινες οιτινες ου μη γευσονται θανατου εως αν ιδωσιν την βασιλειαν του δυ</td>
<td>λεγω δε υμιν αληθως εις τινες των αυτου εστηκοτων οι ου μη γευσονται θανατου εως αν ιδωσιν την βασιλειαν του δυ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Truly I say to you that there are certain ones who are standing here who will not taste death until they see the son of man coming in his kingdom."

"And he said to them, truly I say to you, there are certain ones who are standing here who will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God come in power."

"And I say to you, truly there are certain ones who are standing here who will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God."
Now we will see how D alters Luke's statement of this event:

**Luke 9:27**

**Codex B**

"And I say to you, truly there are certain ones who are standing here who will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God."

**Codex D**

"And I say to you, truly there are certain ones who are standing here who will not taste death until they see the son of man coming in his glory."

Jesus' statement that there were some present with him who would not taste death until they had seen the kingdom has caused a great deal of discussion. Plummer sums up the various interpretations; the kingdom here could be understood as referring to one of the following:

1. The transfiguration
2. The resurrection and ascension
3. Pentecost
4. The spread of Christianity
5. The internal development of the gospel
6. The destruction of Jerusalem
7. The second advent

We need not go into the reasoning connected with each

---

24 Plummer, p. 249.
position represented here. We are primarily concerned with D's alteration and how it bears witness to his understanding of the kingdom.

Conzelmann points to the absence of any reference to the "coming" of the kingdom in Luke's presentation of this scene as evidence that the church was accepting a further delay in the parousia. Therefore, "the idea of the coming of the Kingdom is replaced by a timeless conception of it."25 D, evidently, was also sensitive to the omission of ἐληλυθοίτον ("come"--Mark 9:1) and ἐν δυνάμει ("in power"--Mark 9:1) by Luke, terms which Conzelmann speaks of "... as a realistic description of the Parousia."26 But D must have felt also that the omission of these terms was inconsistent with Luke's theology of the kingdom.

It would appear that D borrows τὸν ὦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ... αὐτοῦ ("the Son of Man coming ... his") from Matthew, and the idea of Mark's ἐν δυνάμει ("in power") is expressed by ἐν δόξῃ ("in glory"). However, it is much more likely that D carries on the motif of v. 26 substituting "the Son of Man coming in his glory" for "the kingdom of God" in v. 27; thus the "idea of the coming of the Kingdom" is brought back into time by D.27

---

25 Conzelmann, p. 104. 26 Ibid.
27 Cf. Mees, pp. 104-05.
We must now ask, if D understood the kingdom of God to be a spiritual kingdom, and if he strengthens this idea by adding "believe it not" in Luke 17:21, then how did he conceive of "the Son of Man coming in his glory," and why did he put it into the time period of those who were with Jesus? There is only one possible answer: D sees Jesus as the Son of Man; the "coming in his glory," which is referred to in this variant, is the glorification of Jesus at his transfiguration, which immediately follows the passage we are presently considering.

We must note at this point that D understands references to the future establishment of the kingdom as referring to the second advent. Therefore, he can substitute "the Son of Man coming in his glory" for Luke's "the kingdom of God." The transfiguration, which occurred about a week after Jesus' statement that some standing there would see "the kingdom of God" (or "his coming in glory"), would be considered by D as a miniature enactment of the glorious event that was to occur at the climax of world history.

That D could equate "the kingdom" and the second advent as a yet future event is borne out again in our next variant:

Luke 23:42
"And he said, Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingly power."

"And turning to the Lord, he said to him, Remember me in the day of your coming."

---

D presents the statement of the thief as another indication that Luke is presenting two kingdoms in his tradition. One is "within you," concerning which men cannot say "Lo here or lo there." The second is to be seen in the words of the thief, "when you come in your kingly power." D understands this statement to refer to the parousia; therefore, without changing the essential meaning of the words that are before him, as far as he was concerned, he expresses his understanding of this passage by substituting "in the day of your coming" for "kingly power." The "kingly power" in Luke's normal tradition is evidenced by Jesus' power to heal which is already present. D's alteration makes it explicit that the thief was referring not to Jesus' present power but to his future appearance.
The Son of Man

We have just noted above that D seems to consider Jesus as the Son of Man. By his variant in 9:27, D puts the promise that some would "see the Son of Man coming in his glory" into the present lifespan of his listeners by tying it to the transfiguration. We shall now consider two more passages in which D was able to express his belief that Jesus was the Son of Man:

Luke 17:22

Codex B

εἰπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητας ελευσονται ημεραι οτε επιθυμησίης μιαν των ημερων του υλου του ανθρωπου ιδειν και οικ ωςεσθε

"And he said to the disciples, the days shall come when you will desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man and you will not see it."

Codex D

εἰπεν ουν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητας ελευσονται ημεραι του επιθυμησαι υμας μιαν των ημερων τοις τουτων του υλου του ανθρωπου και οικ ωςεσθαι

"And he said to the disciples, the days shall come when you will desire one of these days of the Son of Man and you will not see it."

If the reader is not inclined to see Jesus as the Son of Man, the literature on the problem that is presented by the use of the term "Son of Man" in the gospels abounds. For an up-to-date listing of the most important works in this area see the footnotes in Wm. O. Walker, Jr., "The Origin of the Son of Man Concept as Applied to Jesus," Journal of Biblical Literature, XCI(1972), 482-90.
present Son of Man, the normal text of Luke allows him to view the days of the Son of Man as being yet future, thus eliminating Jesus as the Son of Man. However, this is not possible with the text of D. By omitting ἰδεῖν ("to see") and adding τοῦτον ("these") after ἡμέρων ("days"), the "desire" of the disciples will be for something that they have already experienced, i.e. the days that they have spent associated with Jesus. Thus D presents clearly his understanding that when Jesus referred to the "Son of Man," he was referring to himself.

The second Son of Man passage is in connection with the sign of Jonah:

Luke 11:30

Codex B

καθὼς γὰρ εγένετο ο
λόγας τοῖς νεανίσταις
σημείον οὕτως ἐσται
καὶ ο οὐς τοῦ ανθρώπου
τῇ γενέᾳ ταυτῇ

Codex D

καθὼς γὰρ εγένετο
λόγας σημείον τοῖς
νεανίσταις οὕτως ἐσται
καὶ ο οὐς τοῦ ανθρώπου
τῇ γενέᾳ ταυτῇ καὶ
καθὼς ἤλως εἰ τῇ κοιλίᾳ
tou κηποὺς εγένετο τρίς
ημέρας καὶ τρεῖς νυκτας
οὕτως καὶ ο οὐς τοῦ
ανθρώπου εἰν τῇ γη

"For just as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites so the Son of Man also shall be to this generation."

"For just as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites so the Son of Man also shall be to this generation and as Jonah was in the belly of the whale three days and three nights so the Son of Man also shall be in the earth."

The normal text of Luke says that the Son of Man will be a sign to "this generation." Luke does not specifically identify what it is about the Son of Man that will be the sign, nor does he give any indication as to who the Son of Man is. By harmonizing Luke's tradition with Matthew 12:40, D supplies the two elements that are lacking in the normal tradition. First, he identifies the sign of Jonah with the burial and resurrection of Jesus (this will be discussed in detail later); secondly, he identifies the Son of Man as Jesus, who was to be in the earth three days and three nights.

**Conclusion**

We conclude with a summary of the various points we have investigated in this chapter. First, the main points concerning Luke's understanding of the kingdom:

1. Luke saw the presence of the kingdom as evidenced by Jesus' power to work miracles of healing (Luke
2. Matthew only once equates kingdom with miracles and that was an exorcism (Matthew 12:28); Mark sees no relationship at all.

3. Through miracles Luke sees "kingdom" as God's power to reign.

4. Connecting the Pharisees' question, as to when the kingdom was to come, to the statement of salvation addressed to the grateful leper, Luke understands the nature of God's "present" kingdom to be spiritual (Luke 17:20-21).


Now let us look at D's understanding of Luke's position as seen through D's variants:

1. D strengthens Luke's position that Jesus' power to heal is evidence of the presence of the kingdom, by adding αὕτην ("this") before βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ("kingdom of God"--Luke 4:43), when the citizens of Capernaum asked him to stay with them so they might benefit from Jesus' healings.

2. In answering the Pharisees' question as to when the kingdom would come, D adds μὴ πιστεύετε ("believe it not") to the comment by Jesus, "they say behold here or
behold there." In so doing D emphasizes the spiritual nature of the kingdom.

3. D envisions the coming of the Son of Man in glory; it is therefore possible to say that he recognized in St. Luke the presence of two kingdoms, the spiritual kingdom that rules in submissive hearts and the kingdom of glory at the eschaton.

4. Concerning the Son of Man, D sees Jesus as being the present Son of Man and makes alterations in Luke 17:22; 11:30; 9:27 to make his understanding clear.
CHAPTER V

IN DEFENSE OF THE GENTILES

Luke's interest in the whole of mankind as well as in insignificant individuals stands as a generally acknowledged contrast to the relative exclusiveness of Matthew and Mark.¹ This universalism of Luke is supported and expanded by D.

Earlier, in dealing with the ministry of John the Baptist (chapter two), it was pointed out that three groups came to receive his baptism, the crowds (3:10), publicans (v. 12), and soldiers (v. 14). In the normal text of Luke the three groups requested ethical advice, "What shall we do?" By the addition of "in order that we might be saved," D changes their question on ethical behavior into a far more important question concerning salvation.

Beginning with the inquiry, "What shall we do in order that we might be saved," D reveals a desire to place the soldiers in a more favorable light, especially in

¹Cf. Reicke, pp. 63-74; Geldenhuys, pp. 43-45; Arndt, pp. 30-31; Plummer, pp. xxxiii-xxxvi; Gilmour, p. 7.
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connection with the crucifixion. It is generally conceded that it is difficult to determine whether the soldiers requesting baptism were Jewish or Roman. However, on the basis of καὶ ἡμεῖς ("we also") in v. 14, it is concluded by some that these soldiers were Jewish support-units for the tax-collectors. Their inquiry of John is based upon a desire to know if the baptism of repentance extended to the tax-collectors was extended to them also.

However, there seems to be a tendency in D to regard all the military in Luke as Roman; the foundation upon which commentators regard the soldiers in v. 14 as Jewish is removed by D:

**Luke 3:14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>επηρωτών δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ στρατευομένων λεγοντες τί ποιησόμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς</td>
<td>επηρωτησάν δὲ καὶ στρατευομένων λεγοντες τί ποιησόμεν ἵνα σωθῶμεν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| "And the soldiers also asked him saying, what must we also do?"          | "And the soldiers also asked saying, what must we do in order that we might be saved?"

---

2 Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 85-93. Epp concludes that D in Acts treats the Roman officials with reserve and on the basis of their ignorance frees them from blame in their treatment of the apostles, pp. 147-54.

3 Cf. Plummer, p. 92; Creed, p. 53; Godet, p. 114; Geldenhuys, p. 139; Farrar, p. 88.
There is no way to arrive at a definite conclusion as to the nationality of these troops in the present context of D's text. However, this is not to say that a conclusion cannot be reached by investigating other variants in connection with soldiers. If it can be shown that D regards all military as Roman, the requests of the soldiers for baptism becomes significant, the refusal of John's baptism by the religious leaders becomes more striking, and D's universalism is extended a step beyond that of Luke.

The following variant helps to clarify D's thinking with regard to the soldiers, but what D says here is implicit and not explicit:

**Luke 22:4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀπελθὼν συνελάλησεν τοῖς ἀρχιερεύσιν καὶ στρατηγοῖς. . . .</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπελθὼν συνελάλησεν τοῖς ἀρχιερεύσιν. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;And when he had departed he spoke with the chief priests and captains. . . .&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;And when he had departed he spoke with the chief priests. . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

om. καὶ στρατηγοῖς, D 31 it sy
c

That the στρατηγοὶ ("captains") in v. 4 are the captains of the temple guards is deduced from 22:52, εἶπεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους ἐπ'αὐτὸν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ
στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους . . . ("And Jesus said to the chief priests, captains of the temple and elders who were approaching him . . ."). Most commentators conclude that the captains in v. 52 are those that are mentioned in v. 4, and thus would be Jewish. ⁴

Creed suggests that the omission in v. 4 resulted from harmonization with Matthew and Mark. ⁵ This is entirely possible, for we have already seen that harmonization is one of D's favorite editorial tools. Easton's suggestion that the omission was made because the copyist did not know who the "captains" were is not too convincing since they are eventually identified in v. 52. ⁶ Plummer makes an interesting observation concerning the allied witnesses of this omission: although D it sy² omit καὶ στρατηγοὺς ("and captains"), a b c e ff² i l q sy² substitute καὶ γραμματεύσιν ("and scribes"). D d alone have a complete omission with no substituting group. ⁷

Because στρατηγοῦ ("captains") is used with no qualifying phrase in v. 4, D may have omitted it, thinking it would be confused with the Roman military command. In v. 52, where the word "captains" is qualified by the phrase

---

⁴Cf. Arndt, p. 430; van Oosterzee, p. 331; Gilmour, p. 372; Geldenhuys, p. 548; Godet, p. 459; Creed, p. 260; Plummer, p. 491; Farrar, p. 323; Montefiore, p. 584; Easton, p. 316.

⁵Creed, p. 260. ⁶Easton, p. 316. ⁷Plummer, p. 491
"of the temple," D allows the word to stand, for there is no danger of confusing them with the Roman military. Thus D removes any possibility of connecting the Romans with the betrayal of Jesus, which is the subject of Luke 22.

But more than this, D implies that "soldiers" in Luke are Roman military, unless they are explicitly identified otherwise. Therefore, the omission of "we also" in 3:14 would seem to indicate that D interpreted the soldiers who came to John the Baptist to be Roman.

There is very little said by commentators on the next omission, yet it is significant:

Luke 24:7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. . . λεγὼν τον υἱὸν του ανθρώπου οτι δεί παραδοθηναι εις χειρας ανθρωπων αμαρτώλων και σταυρωθηναι και τη τρίτη ημέρα αναστηναι</td>
<td>. . . οτι δεί τον υἱὸν του ανθρώπου παραδοθηναι εις χειρας ανθρωπων και σταυρωθηναι και τη τρίτη ημέρα αναστηναι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;... saying concerning the Son of Man that he must be betrayed into the hands of sinful men and be crucified and raised the third day.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;... that it was necessary for the Son of Man to be betrayed into the hands of men and be crucified and raised the third day.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8Conzelmann observes that in Luke's sources the soldiers that are involved with the crucifixion are Roman, whereas in Luke soldiers are still present, but their nationality is not certain (p. 88). Montefiore observes that the mocking of Jesus at his trial before Herod (23:6-16) is transferred by Luke from the Roman soldiers (Matthew 27:27-31; Mark 15:16-20) to a Jewish chief and his guards (pp. 619, 622).
om. λεγων, D c
om. αμαρτωλων, D it

Conzelmann takes ἀμαρτωλῶν ("sinners, sinful") as a term applied to the Jews in Luke's normal text. He bases his position upon the use of νόμος ("law") and ἁνομος ("lawless") in the speeches of Stephen and Peter in Acts. He sees νόμος ("law") as referring to the moral law in Stephen's speech (Acts 7:53) and ἁνομος ("lawless," or those devoid of the principles of the moral law) as applicable to the Jews at the crucifixion of Jesus in Peter's speech (Acts 2:23) and not applicable to the Romans, which is the Jewish use of the term. In Luke 24:7, Conzelmann sees ἀμαρτωλῶν ("sinful") as an interpretation of ἁνομία ("lawlessness"), which Luke applied here to the Jews and not to the Romans.9

D apparently sees the case differently. If he saw ἀμαρτωλῶν ("sinful") as applying to the Jews, as Conzelmann suggests, he might have allowed the word to stand, for this is a strong anti-Judaic reading. The position of Conzelmann places the emphasis in verse 7 upon the betrayal, for it was into the hands of the Jews that Jesus was delivered, with the resulting crucifixion stemming from their pressure tactics (23:18-23) in the face of Pilate's declaration of innocence (23:13-15). Therefore, Conzelmann sees Luke

9Conzelmann, p. 92.
holding the Jewish people responsible for Jesus' death.10

On the other hand, D seems to read v. 7 with the emphasis on σταυρωθηναι ("to be crucified"). The actual mechanics of the crucifixion were carried out by the Roman soldiers, although the presence of the military is not noted by Luke until 23:36; after the crucifixion had already taken place.11 D regards the men in v. 7 as Roman soldiers. Jesus was handed over to them to be crucified. The omission of "sinful" thus indicates that D does not hold the Roman soldiers directly responsible for the crucifixion.

It would seem that the omission of the prayer for forgiveness in Luke 23:34 is closely tied to the omission in 24:7. In the normal text of Luke this prayer is as follows, ὅτε Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν πάτερ, ἀφες αὐτοῖς οὐ γὰρ ὁμοσσιν τί πολούσιν ("And Jesus said, Father forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing"--Luke 23:34).

10 Ibid., pp. 90-93.

11 The involvement of the Roman soldiers in the crucifixion is very clear in the other two synoptics, cf. Matthew 27:27-31 and Mark 15:16-20. The earlier observation noted in Conzelmann stands here: Luke removes all identification of where the military comes from; thus in Luke's normal text these soldiers are not identified. D, however, sees all the military as Roman; therefore, these soldiers are Roman. Upon this premise D alters their mockery of Jesus; we will deal with this alteration in the next chapter.
D, however, omits the prayer. 12

Opinion is divided over for whom the prayer was offered. Some commentators believe it was for the Roman soldiers who were simply carrying out the order of their superiors. 13 Others feel the prayer was spoken for the Jews. 14 A third group believes it was for both the soldiers and the Jews. 15 Opinion is also divided as to whether this reading was part of the original text. 16 The majority of those who feel that the prayer was offered on behalf of the Jews believe that it was omitted by copyists because they thought it incredible that God should forgive them. 17

12 The following are witnesses for the reading: X * C Q pl lat sy P Marcion Origen. The following witnesses omit the reading: P 75 B D* W Θ pc sy P copsa.

13 Arndt, pp. 468-69; Creed, p. 286; Blass, Philology, pp. 93-94.


15 Farrar, p. 348; Gilmour, p. 408; van Oosterzee, p. 372; Williams, Alterations, pp. 8-9.

16 Those who feel the reading was original include: Caird, p. 251; Godet, p. 482; Plummer, p. 545; Arndt, pp. 468-69. Those who feel the saying is genuine, but was inserted into the original text include: Gilmour, p. 408; Metzger, p. 180; Creed, p. 286.

17 Caird, p. 251; Tinsley, p. 201; Creed, p. 286; Arndt, pp. 468-69.
However, we are primarily concerned with D's rationale for the omission of this prayer. Geldenhuyse's suggestion relating to the normal text of Luke provides a reasonable rationale for D's omission, especially in the light of D's omission of ἁμαρτωλόν ("sinful") in 24:7:

That Jesus did not pray for the Roman soldiers but for the guilty Jewish people follows from the fact that such a prayer for the soldiers was unnecessary, for they only carried out orders and had no share in His condemnation.18

In the thinking of D, if these men who were performing the mechanics of the crucifixion were not considered "sinful" by Jesus, the prayer uttered by our Lord for their forgiveness would be meaningless; thus it was omitted.

From the next series of variants we infer that D is reluctant to permit Gentiles to appear with Jews in the eschatological judgment. We have already dealt with the following verse in developing D's understanding of the Son of Man; now, however, we must return to it in order to investigate the sign of Jonah:

Luke 11:30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καθὼς γὰρ ἐγενέτο ο</td>
<td>καθὼς γὰρ ἐγενέτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅνας τοῖς νινευταις</td>
<td>ὅνας σημιον τοῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σημειον οὕτως εσταί</td>
<td>νινευταις οὕτως εσταί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ο ὦς του ανθρωπον</td>
<td>καὶ ο ὦς του ανθρωπον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῇ γενεα ταυτη</td>
<td>τῇ γενεα ταυτη καὶ καθως</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Geldenhuyse, p. 614.
"For just as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites so the Son of Man also shall be to this generation."
context of this whole passage). Thus this harmonization with Matthew becomes another variant that can be added to a list of variants in which D avoids a direct reference to Gentile involvement in the future eschatological judgment.

If D understood the judgment message of Jonah to be analogous to the warnings of Jesus concerning a coming eschatological judgment, his harmonization with Matthew would be an attempt to change Luke's tradition by identifying the sign as Jonah's experience in the belly of the whale instead of Jonah's judgment message. This alteration would then fit the pattern of four other alterations which follow:

Luke 11:31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασιλισσα νοτου εγερθη-σεται ευ τη κρισει μετα των ανδρων της γενεας ταυτης και κατακρινει αυτους. . . .</td>
<td>βασιλισσα νοτου εγερθη-σεται μετα των ανδρων της γενεας ταυτης και κατακρινει αυτους. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation and will condemn them. . . .&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The queen of the south shall rise up with the men of this generation and will condemn them. . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

om. εν τη κρισει, P45 D ff2

Luke 11:32, in the normal text, contains a similar statement about the men of Nineveh: "The men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn God's people, became a source of condemnation to the Jews because of their unbelief.
it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here." However, the entire verse is omitted by D; it is possibly due to homoeoteleuton for both v. 31 and v. 32 end with ὃδε ("here"). Because D alters the thought of judgment in connection with the city of Nineveh in v. 30 to Jonah's experience of being in the belly of the fish, it is a piece of consistent editorial work to omit this statement in v. 32, where Nineveh is pictured as standing in judgment, especially when only one verse separates the two statements.

The third and fourth omissions of judgment are as follows:

Luke 10:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι σοδομοὶς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ  ἐκείνῃ ανεκτοτερὸν ἐσται καὶ τῇ πολεῖ ἐκείνῃ</td>
<td>λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι σοδομοὶς ανεκτοτερὸν ἐσται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θανατοῦ τῇ πολεῖ ἐκείνῃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I say to you that it shall be more tolerable for Sodom in that day than for that city.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;But I say to you that it shall be more tolerable for Sodom in the kingdom of God than for that city.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luke 10:14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πλὴν τυρφ καὶ σείδωνι ανεκτοτέρον ἐσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει ἡ ὑμῖν</td>
<td>πλὴν τυρφ καὶ σείδωνι ανεκτοτερὸν ἐσται καὶ τῇ κρίσει ἡ ὑμῖν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Moreover, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the judgment than for you."

The third of this series of variants may very well provide the key for understanding the thinking behind these alterations. Luke 10:12f. is an appendage to Jesus' instructions given to the seventy disciples who were sent out two by two. As a part of the instructions, Jesus told them to proclaim that the kingdom of God was at hand (v. 10). If a city refused to receive their message, they were to shake off the dust of that city as a testimony against its citizens (v. 11). At this point Jesus concludes his instructions and begins a denunciation of the cities that had rejected his ministry (vv. 13ff.).

D's alteration in v. 12 from the words "in that day" to "in the kingdom of God" seems to depend on and reflect the announcement at the end of v. 11 that the disciples were to make to the cities that rejected their ministry: "Therefore, know this, that the kingdom of God is at hand." By altering "in that day" of v. 12 immediately following the concluding remark about the kingdom in v. 11, D changes the thought from future judgment to God's kingdom, which every Jew expected to enter. However, D's alteration now indicates that it will be more tolerable for Gentiles in this kingdom
than for the Jewish cities that reject the summons of the Gospel.

Likewise, the omission of "in the judgment" in v. 14 would be based on the same reasoning, for v. 14 is still in the context of Jesus' denunciation of the Jewish cities that did not respond to his ministry. The words, "in the judgment" in v. 14, were omitted by D because the words "in the kingdom of God" were naturally still understood from v. 12.

The repeated omission of the judgment seems to indicate that there may have been a reservation on the part of D to have the Jewish people and the Gentiles stand together in judgment. For Jesus did say that if the mighty works that had been done in Chorazin and Bethsaida had been done in Tyre and Sidon, these Gentile cities would have repented in sackcloth and ashes (v. 13). But the mighty works of Jesus were not performed in these Gentile cities. They did not have the opportunities to repent that were offered to the Jewish cities. Therefore, D may not have been able to envision these two groups standing side by side under divine judgment when the opportunities were unequal.

The apparent refusal of D to accept the concept of Jews and Gentiles standing together under divine judgment appears to lie at the foundation of his alteration of the sign of Jonah, for it seems that D understood the sign of
Jonah in v. 30 to be the judgment message he delivered to the Ninevites. The next two verses again deal with the Jews and Gentiles standing in judgment together. D harmonizes Luke's tradition with that of Matthew, making Jonah's experience in the belly of the whale the "sign," and thus a type of Jesus' burial and resurrection. This results in a diversion of the minds of his readers away from the element of judgment. He then eliminated the words, "in the judgment," in v. 31 and omitted completely the next verse which deals with the Ninevites standing in judgment with the men of Jesus' generation.

By this series of variants, D removes the Gentiles from being involved in a divine judgment that places them side by side with the Jewish nation, which has had superior spiritual advantages.

From the preceding variants we are able to conclude the following:

1. D indicates implicitly that he views all references to soldiers as being to Roman soldiers.

2. D goes beyond the normal Lucan tradition in freeing the Roman soldiers from the guilt of the crucifixion.

3. D is reluctant to allow Jews and Gentiles to stand together under divine judgment. Therefore, he eliminates this thought, wherever possible, from Luke's normal text.
CHAPTER VI

ANTI-JUDAIC SENTIMENTS OF D

To this point we have noted two instances where D has revealed an anti-Judaic bias. These instances might be summarized by way of introduction to the present chapter:

1. The refusal of John's baptism by the religious leaders has already been noted. D views John's call to repentance as a call to the salvation to be offered by the coming Messiah, and he puts this thought into the mouths of the crowd, the publicans, and the soldiers by adding "that we might be saved" (3:10,12,14) to their question, "what shall we do?" In the light of D's rendering, the leaders' rejection of John's ministry now becomes more serious, for their rejection of John indicates a rejection of the salvation that will be extended through the one whom John is preparing the people to receive.

2. D displays an apparent reluctance to allow the Gentiles to stand in the judgment with the Jews. By omissions he removes the Gentiles from the context of any forthcoming judgment while allowing the Jews to be rebuked for their lack of response to Jesus' teachings and deeds, and
to stand under the threat of impending judgment.

Further evidence of D's anti-Judaic bias abounds. It will not be necessary to look at every alteration, for an investigation of the major changes should be sufficient to view D's thinking.

The Role of Jerusalem

The city of Jerusalem plays an important role in the tradition of the Gospel of Luke. A glance at a concordance indicates that references to Jerusalem in Luke outnumber those in Matthew more than two to one and those in Mark nearly three to one. Conzelmann sees Jerusalem as forming a connecting-link between the story of Jesus and the life of the Church. As far as Luke's gospel is concerned, Jerusalem is a "... necessary place of enmity--necessary, that is, from the point of view of redemptive history."\(^1\) However, "the fact that it is necessary from the point of view of saving history for the Passion to take place precisely in Jerusalem does not exonerate the Jews."\(^2\) D intensifies the motif of Jerusalem as "a place of enmity":

Luke 5:17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ εγένετο ἐν μίᾳ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ ἄυτος ἦν διδασκόντων καὶ ἦσαν καθή-μένοι οἱ φαρισαῖοι καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ εγένετο ἐν μίᾳ τῶν ἡμερῶν αὐτοῦ διδασκόντος συνελθὲν τοὺς φαρισαίους καὶ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Conzelmann, p. 133.  \(^2\)Ibid.
"And it came to pass during one of those days that he was teaching and the Pharisees and teachers of the law were sitting who had come out of all the villages of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem and the power of the Lord was present for him to heal with."

There are a number of things that must be noted in this verse. According to the normal tradition it is the Pharisees and the teachers of the law who have come out of every village of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem. As a result of D's alterations, the presence of these men is noted in passing, but it is the sick that have come to Jesus. Metzger notes that the difficulty of the text caused some copyist to omit ό ("who") altogether (X 33) "and others to replace it with δέ (D itd,e syr).\n\n\nοι νομοδιδασκαλοί οί ησαν εληλυθότες εκ πασῆς τῆς κωμῆς τῆς γαλιλαίας καὶ ιουδαίας καὶ τερούσαλημ καὶ δύναμις κύ την εἰς το ἱασθαί αὐτὸν

νομοδιδασκαλοὺς ησαν δὲ συνεληλυθότες εκ πασῆς κωμῆς τῆς γαλιλαίας καὶ ιουδαίας τοῦ ἱασθαί αὐτοὺς
sick who have come from all parts to be healed."³

Metzger also notes that a failure to see that ἀυτὸν ("he") is the subject, not the object of τὸ λατρεύω ("to heal") "... led copyists to replace it with a plural form, as ἀυτοιος (A C D al) ... ."⁴ In D, it is necessary to understand the ἀυτὸν of the normal text as subject of the infinitive of purpose for clarity. D's negative appraisal of the religious leaders (see Chapter Six) led D to see ἦσαν ("they were") as referring to the afflicted in Galilee and Judea who were coming to be healed.

It is necessary to stress two points that result from D's alterations: (1) It is those other than the Pharisees and teachers of the law that have come to Jesus, mainly for purposes of healing; and (2) they have come from everywhere but Jerusalem. The absence of people from this city when all of Galilee and Judea are represented by those seeking help indicates an attitude of rejection on the part of the inhabitants of Jerusalem; as Conzelmann has pointed out earlier, Jerusalem is a "necessary place of enmity." Furthermore, in the two instances where Luke lists the areas responding to Jesus and where Jerusalem is included (5:17; 6:17), D omits that city. The fact is, D in no way sees the capital city responding to Jesus' ministry.

³Metzger, p. 138. ⁴Ibid.
This is illustrated again by the next variant:

Luke 6:17,18

17. καὶ καταβας μετ' 
αυτων εστη επι τοπου 
πεδεινου και ωχλος 
πολυς μαθητων αυτου 
και πληθος πολυ του 
λαου απο πασης της 
Ιουδαιας και Ιερουσαλημ
και της παραλιου τυρου 
και σειδωνος
18. οι ηλθον ακουσαι 
αυτου και λαδηναι απο 
tων νοσων αυτων. . . .

"17. And when he had 
gone down with them he 
stood upon a level place 
and a large crowd of his 
disciples and a great 
multitude of people 
from all of Judea and 
Jerusalem and the 
region around Tyre 
and Sidon
18. Who came to hear 
him and to be healed 
from their diseases 
. . . ."

---

v. 17 om. πολυς, D it 
ιερουσαλημ και της παραλιου τυρου και σειδωνος] 
αλλων πολεων, D (e c)
v. 18 οι ηλθον] εληλυθοτων, D

The areas from which these people came are expanded in the parallel passages of Matthew and Mark. Matthew includes Galilee, Decapolis, and the other side of the Jordan (4:25), along with Jerusalem and Judea. Mark also includes Galilee and the other side of the Jordan, but adds Idumaea
and Tyre and Sidon along with Jerusalem and Judea (3:7,8).

Creed observes that "all of Judaea" in Luke probably means Galilee, Judea, Idumaea and the country across the Jordan. In the normal text of Luke this is a possibility. In D, however, it appears that the phrase "and other cities" covers everything outside the province of Judea. That D did not consider Judea as an all-inclusive term is evidenced by the following variant:

Luke 23:5

Codex B

οἱ δὲ εὐισχυον λέγοντες οτι ανασειει τον λαον διδασκων καθ ὅλης της Ιουδαίας καὶ αρξαμενος απο της γαλιλαίας εως ωδε

"And they pressed the issue saying, he stirs up the people teaching throughout all Judea, even beginning from Galilee till here."

Codex D

οἱ δὲ εὐισχυον λέγοντες ανασειει τον λαον διδασκων καθ ὅλης της γῆς αρξαμενος απο της γαλιλαίας εως ωδε

"And they pressed the issue saying, he stirs up the people teaching throughout the whole land, beginning from Galilee till here."

om. οτι, D lat syC [Ιουδαίας] γῆς, D
om. ματ, p75Q D Θ pl vg Cl

By substituting "land" for "Judea," D indicates that Judea did not include Galilee as far as he was concerned. The thing that is significant for our interests, however, is that D omits Jerusalem in the two previous

5Creed, p. 89.
texts (5:17, 6:17), and thus portrays this city as unresponsive to Jesus' ministry. D's portrayal of this city fits Jesus' lament, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often have I wished to gather your children, as a hen gathers its brood under its wings, and you were not willing" (Luke 13:34).

D's Use of πονηρός ("evil")

D's use of πονηρός ("evil") as an anti-Judaic device in Luke/Acts has already been noted by Epp. 6 One problem he raises in respect to Luke is that of harmonization with Matthew and Mark, a problem that is not faced in the text of Acts. We will look at the variants presented by Luke:

Luke 5:21,22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. καὶ πρεσβέτο διαλογίζεσθαι οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἑρείσαοι</td>
<td>21. καὶ πρεσβέτο διαλογίζεσθαι οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἑρείσαοι εἰς ταῖς καρδιάς αυτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγοντες τις εστὶν οὕτως οὐς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας τις δυναται αμαρτίας αφεῖναι</td>
<td>λέγοντες τις οὕτως λαλεῖ βλασφημίας τις δυναται αμαρτίας αφεῖναι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰ μὴ μονός ο ἔς</td>
<td>εἰ μὴ εἰς ἔς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ἐπιλγονοὺς δὲ ο ὑς τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αυτῶν αποκρίθεις εἰπὲν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τι διαλογιζεῖθεν</td>
<td>22. ἐπιλγονοὺς δὲ ο ὑς τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αυτῶν λέγει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς ταῖς καρδιάς ὦμων</td>
<td>αὐτοὶς τι διαλογιζεῖθαι εἰς ταῖς καρδιάς ὦμων πονηρα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6Epp, pp. 42-45, 49.
"21. And the Scribes and Pharisees began to reason saying, who is this who speaks blasphemies? Who is able to forgive sin except God alone? "22. And Jesus knowing their reasoning, answered and said to them, Why do you reason in your hearts?"

All of the variants in v. 21 and the first variant in v. 22 are harmonizations with Mark 2:6,7. The last variant, which is the one we are interested in, is a harmonization with Matthew 9:4.

We will now look at D's use of πονηρία ("malice"), which again is a harmonization:

Luke 20:23

Codex B

κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς "And when he perceived their craftiness, he said to them"

Codex D

ἐπιλύνους δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πονηρίαν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τι με πειράζετε "And when he knew thoroughly their malice, he said to them, why do you tempt me?"
The first variant, ἐπιγνωκός ("when he knew thoroughly"), possibly may have resulted from the influence of Luke 5:22, where D inserted πονηρός ("evil") into Luke's text. The word is used in both places to indicate that Jesus knew exactly the working of his opponents' minds. 7

The second variant in the present passage is a harmonization with Mark, against Matthew who has ὑποκρίται ("hypocrites") as the concluding word. If D were harmonizing his text with Matthew it would seem logical that he would have retained this word because of its anti-Judaic force.

Concerning the problem with harmonization of the Gospels, Epp says:

Whether these additional occurrences of πονηρός in D are sufficient to indicate a preoccupation with this term by the D-text is not clear because of the evidence of harmonization. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the term was found or remembered in the parallels and used consciously according to a predilection for it. 8

Let us now consider the evidence. Of the five variants in 5:21,22, four are harmonizations with Mark. The only harmonization with Matthew is πονηρός ("evil"), which D prefers to Mark's ταῦτα ("these things"--Mark 2:8). Of the three variants in 20:23, one is the possible result of the influence of an earlier pericope (5:22)

7 Cf. Arndt and Gingrich, ἐπιγινώσκω . . . 1. with the preposition making its influence felt . . . " (pp. 290-91).

8 Epp, p. 45.
where D inserted πονηρός ("evil") into the normal text, thus bringing the two passages into harmony concerning Jesus' knowledge of his opponents' thinking. Πονηρία ("malice") is a definite harmonization with Matthew, and again a preference for Matthew's term over Mark's ὑποκρίσιν ("hypocrisy"—Mark 12:15). The third harmonization is again with Mark, "Why do you tempt me?", instead of Matthew's account, "Why do you tempt me, hypocrites?"

Of the eight variants in these two passages five are harmonizations with Mark, two are with Matthew, where D chooses Matthew's terms πονηρός ("evil") and πονηρία ("malice") over Mark's terms, and one variant is possibly taken from Luke's own earlier use of the term in 5:22.

To emphasize further that D seems to have a "preoccupation" with πονηρός ("evil"), Epp points out that Peter's question to Ananias in Acts 5:4D is patterned after Luke 5:22D, "τι θα δοθον έν τῃ καρδία σου ποιήσαι πονηρόν τοῦτο; (B om. ποιήσαι and reads το πράγμα for πονηρόν). . ."9

The final use of πονηρός ("evil") is found in 23:41 where the penitent thief declares Jesus' innocence:

Luke 23:41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ημείς μὲν δικαίως</td>
<td>καὶ ημείς μὲν δικαίως</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9Ibid., p. 44.
Van Oosterzee says that Luke's use of the term 
ἀτοπον ("amiss") is a mild expression denoting the inno-
cence of Jesus.\textsuperscript{10} The alteration made by D sets Jesus'
innocence in stronger contrast with the Jews, whom D re-
peatedly labels as evil.\textsuperscript{11} The anti-Judaic sentiment of
D is perhaps stronger here, in these series of variants,
than in any other place.

Other Anti-Judaic Statements

Although the anti-Judaic sentiment of D is not as
strong in the next variant, its presence is equally as
clear as in the preceding variants:

\textbf{Luke 5:37-39}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Codex B & Codex D \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{10}Van Oosterzee, p. 376.

\textsuperscript{11}Cf. Epp's study of Luke 23:41 in the light of
Acts 3:17, where D accuses the rulers of doing evil by
crucifying Jesus: "As far as the D-text is concerned, the
Jews had done an evil thing to Jesus, who himself, in fact
had done nothing evil" (p. 44).
37. And no one places new wine into old wineskins lest the new wine will burst the skins and will be poured out and the wineskins destroyed.

"37. And no one places new wine into old wineskins lest the new wine will burst the old skins and will be poured out and the wineskins destroyed.

"38. But new wine must be placed into new wineskins.

"39. No one drinking old wine wishes new, for he says, the old is good."

The motif of the wine is found in both Matthew and Mark, as well as in Luke, and all three gospels have practically the same wording. It is generally agreed that the old wine is a symbol of Judaism and the new is a symbol of Christianity.\(^\text{12}\) However, neither Matthew nor Mark has

\(^\text{12}\)Cf. Gilmour, p. 110; Arndt, p. 172; van Oosterzee, pp. 89-90; Plummer, pp. 163-64; Creed, p. 83; Geldenhuys, pp. 196-97. Cf. Alistair Kee, "The Old Coat and the New
Luke's preference for the old wine (v. 39). Marcion's influence is recognized by some as a possible reason for the omission of this verse, for he would not wish to say that the old Jewish economy is better than the Christian Church.\(^\text{13}\)

Whether D made the omission under the influence of Marcion's text or not, the fact remains that D's omission is in keeping with his overall anti-Judaic sentiment, for this verse virtually admits the contentment of the Jewish people with their form of worship and Christianity's lack of appeal for them. It is for this very reason that some commentators believe that v. 39 is "... an interpolated apology for the relative failure of Christian missions among Jews."\(^\text{14}\) However, if it is an interpolation it is early, because of the number of early witnesses that have this reading.

In chapter 11, Luke presents his parallel to Jesus' scathing denunciation of the religious leaders that Matthew presents in chapter 23. Several changes are made in this discourse as presented by D. It is not necessary to

\(^{13}\text{Cf. Arndt, p. 172; Creed, p. 83; Metzger, pp. 138-39.}\)

\(^{14}\text{Gilmour, p. 110. Cf. Plummer, pp. 164-65 and Farrar, p. 125.}\)
investigate them all; we will look briefly at only a few.
The context of Luke's account is a morning meal at the home of a Pharisee. Upon entering, Jesus sat at the meal without washing:

Luke 11:38,39

Codex B

38. ο δε φαρισαῖος ἵδων εὐθυμασεν
οτί οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀριστοῦ
39. εἶπεν δὲ ὁ καὶ πρὸς ἀυτὸν ὑπὲρ ὑμείς οἱ
φαρισαῖοι.

"38. And the Pharisee, when he saw it, marveled because he did not wash first before taking of the meal.

"39. And Jesus said to him, Now you Pharisees,

Codex D

38. ο δε φαρισαῖος ηρξατο διάκρινομενος εν εαυτῷ
λέγειν δια τι οὐ πρῶτον εβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀριστοῦ
39. εἰπεν δὲ ὁ καὶ πρὸς ἀυτὸν ὑπὲρ ὑμείς οἱ
φαρισαῖοι υποκρίται.

"38. And the Pharisee, taking issue within himself began to say, why does he not wash first before taking of the meal?

"39. And Jesus said to him, Now you Pharisees, hypocrites.

In v. 38 ἵδων εὐθυμασεν οτί] ηρξατο διάκρινομενος εν εαυτῷ λέγειν δια τι, D 251 lat Tatian
v. 39 + υποκρίται post φαρισαῖοι, D b

In v. 38, D uses a more expressive word, διακρίνομαι ("taking issue, dispute"), than θαυμάζω ("to marvel") of the normal text, thus intensifying the Pharisee's reaction to Jesus' behavior. On the other hand, D intensifies Jesus' castigation of the Pharisee by calling him a hypocrite, which is a harmonization with Matthew 23.

By the following variant in v. 42, D wishes to free Jesus, in his teaching and deeds, from Old Testament
teachings that might be regarded as Jewish customs or restrictions; this motive for introducing variants will again be seen in connection with the Sabbath:

Luke 11:42

Codex B

[Text in Greek]

Codex D

[Text in Greek]

"But woe to you Pharisees, because you tithe mint and rue and every herb, and you pass by judgment and love, but these things one must do and the others must not be neglected."

+ του δυο, [rell; B]
om. ταυτα δε εδει ποιησαι κακεινα μη παρειναι, D Marcion

The addition of του δυο ("of God") is witnessed by an overwhelming majority of manuscripts, and appears to be omitted by B alone; hence, it is not significant in our study. The omission of the last clause in D, however, is of significance. Montefiore believes D is justified in the omission of this clause. The principle of these words ("These things one must do, and the others must not be neglected") is opposed to Jesus' behavior as a guest at the Pharisee's morning meal, i.e. his refusal to wash
before eating is a minor matter and washing his hands would have accommodated the conscience of the Pharisee in v. 40.\textsuperscript{15} Metzger feels these words were unacceptable to Marcion, who omitted them from his text, and this influenced the omission in D.\textsuperscript{16}

However, it must be noted that D includes many things that Marcion omitted. It is possible that D used a text that was free from Marcion's influence as the basis of his manuscript. This would not disallow the further possibility, however, that D had in his possession or was acquainted with Marcion's text, or, perhaps, a text that reflected Marcionite readings, and chose from it readings that appealed to his biases. Certainly the omission of this clause is anti-Judaic in nature, for it eliminates from Jesus' teaching instruction that would tend to support what would be thought of as Jewish custom and tradition.

We will now look at one more variant from this discourse:

Luke 11:44

Codex B

\[
\text{ουαὶ υμῖν} \quad \text{οἳ ἐστε ως}
\]

\[
\text{τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἀδήλα καὶ}
\]

\[
\text{οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ περὶ-
\]

\[
\text{πατούντες ἐπάνω οὐκ}
\]

\[
\text{οἴδαςιν}
\]

Codex D

\[
\text{ουαὶ υμείν γραμματεῖς καὶ}
\]

\[
\text{φαρισαῖοι οἳ ἐστε}
\]

\[
\text{μνημεῖα ἀδήλα καὶ}
\]

\[
\text{οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐπάνω περὶ-
\]

\[
\text{πατούντες οὐκ}
\]

\[
\text{οἴδασιν}
\]

\textsuperscript{15}\textit{Montefiore, p. 482.} \textsuperscript{16}\textit{Metzger, p. 159.}
"Woe to you because you are as hidden graves; the men who walk on them do not know it."

"Woe to you Scribes and Pharisees because you are hidden graves; the men walking on them do not know it."

In the text of B, Luke draws an analogy between the Pharisee and a hidden grave, with which personal contact would bring defilement. D removes the analogy and makes the Pharisee the hidden grave in actuality.

There is a close affinity between Luke's parable of the pounds and Matthew's parable of the talents. Luke's parable presents the man of noble birth absenting himself from his servants in order to receive a kingdom. Citizens of the kingdom he was about to receive send a delegation protesting his proposed rulership. Upon his return, the new king takes account of the service of his servants and then punishes those citizens who did not wish his rule.

The parable, as it appears in Luke, differs from Matthew in each of the above particulars except for the settlement of accounts with the servants. In Matthew's account the useless servant is punished in two ways: (1) what he has is taken from him and given to another, and (2) he is consigned to outer darkness. In Luke's account, the unfaithful servant loses what he has, but receives no further punishment. It is the citizens who did not want
the king's rule who are consigned to destruction.

D is not content to leave matters there. It may be possible that he saw in the faithful and the unfaithful servants representation of the two dispensations. Those who diligently increased what was entrusted to them by their master are possibly representative of the Christian Church. The man who hid what was entrusted to him by his master is possibly seen as representing Jewish exclusiveness. Let us now notice the alterations made by D:

Luke 19:24,25,27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. καὶ τοὺς παρεστώσιν εἶπεν ἀρατε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν μναν καὶ δοτε τῷ τὰς δέκα μνας ἐχοντι</td>
<td>24. εἶπεν δὲ τοὺς παρεστώσιν ἀρατε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπενεκτατε τῷ τὰς δέκα μνας ἐχοντι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ ἔχει δέκα μνας</td>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. πλην τοὺς εκδρούς μου τούτους τους μὴ δελεαστας με βασιλεύσαι επ' αὐτοὺς ἀγαγετε ὡδὲ καὶ κατασ-φαξατε αὐτοὺς ἐμπροσθεν μου</td>
<td>27. πλην εκείνως τους εκδρους μου τους μη δελοντας με βασιλευειν επ αυτους αγαγετε ωδε καὶ κατασ-φαξατε ευπροσθεν μου καὶ του αχρειου δουλου εκβαλετε εις το σκοτος το εξωτερον εκει εσται ο κλαυθμος και ο βρυγμος των οδουν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"24. And he said to those standing by, Take the pound from him and give it to the one who has the ten pounds.

"25. And they said to him, He has ten pounds.

"27. However, these enemies of mine who did not wish me to rule over them,
bring them here and
slaughter them before me."

And cast the useless ser-
vant into outer darkness,
there shall be weeping and
gnashing of teeth."

v. 24 om. τὴν μνα, D it
dοτε] ἀπενεκατε, D
v. 25 om., D W 047 69 565 1230 1253 1675 it sySC
v. 27 toutouc] εκελνους, D lat syC
+ καὶ τὸν αχρείον δούλον εκβάλετε εἰς τὸ σκοτος τὸ
εξωτερικὸν εκεῖ εσται ο ἐκλογημὸς καὶ o βρυγμὸς τῶν
οδοντων post μου, D

If D sees the faithful servant with ten pounds as
representative of the church and the useless servant as
the Jewish economy, the alterations made by D would be
understandable. In D, when the useless servant is stripped
of what he possesses and it is given to the productive ser-
vant, the protest raised by those standing by is elimi-
nated. Thus D possibly may see the transferral of the
things which are profitable (covenant promises, etc.) from
Judaism to Christianity, i.e. those things which Chris-
tianity retained of Judaism and incorporated into its
system.

The addition in v. 27 is a harmonization with Mat-
thew 25:30. As we have noted, in Luke's normal text the
useless servant loses what was committed to him but is not
punished further. In D's alteration, the useless servant
is consigned to outer darkness, thus not only losing what
has been committed to him but receiving a punishment more
The Sabbath Controversies

It is in connection with the Sabbath that D finds one of the most fruitful subjects for the expression of his anti-Judaic sentiments; therefore, we shall be more concerned with details here than in the earlier sections of this chapter.

Of the three synoptics, Luke has the most detailed report of the activities of Jesus and his followers on the Sabbath. For the convenience of this study we shall deal with the block of Sabbath material in two sections: (1) the Sabbath controversies, and (2) miscellaneous material on the Sabbath.

The first block of Sabbath material has to do with the portrayal in the gospels of the behavior of Jesus and his disciples during the hours of the Sabbath, behavior which is of such a nature that it brings them the scorn and severe castigation of the religious leaders. The basic issue of these controversies is this: Is it lawful to relieve human suffering on the Sabbath, when to do so

17Cf. Montefiore who thinks that Luke 19:27 and Matthew 25:30 stand outside of and have been added to the parable, and that the additions have reference to the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 566); and Easton, who believes that the scene lies in the context of the eschatological future and does not refer to the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 282).
would carry a person beyond the limits of proper Sabbath observance prescribed by the tradition of the elders?

Luke records four miracles performed on the Sabbath (4:31-37; 6:6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6). The first miracle that is recorded is without a confrontation between Jesus and the religious leaders; Luke holds it in common with Mark. The next three lead to a confrontation. Of these three Matthew and Mark record only one, the healing of the man with the withered hand.

All three synoptics give an account of the disciples eating grain while passing through the grain field on the Sabbath, which leads to the first of four confrontations in Luke (6:1-5; 6:6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6). A list of these incidents in their chronological order as the synoptics present them follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclean Spirit</td>
<td>4:31-37</td>
<td>1:21-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withered Hand</td>
<td>6:6-11</td>
<td>3:1-6</td>
<td>12:9-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled Woman</td>
<td>13:10-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man with Dropsy</td>
<td>14:1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Luke and Matthew follow the Markan order in presenting the material they have in common with Mark. However, there are some differences as to when each evangelist works this material into the framework of his gospel.

The pericope of the unclean spirit (Luke 4:31-37;
Mark 1:21-28) is placed in a different context by Luke than by Mark. According to Mark, Jesus appears in Galilee preaching the gospel after John the Baptist's imprisonment. Passing along by the Sea of Galilee, Jesus calls his first disciples, Peter, Andrew, James, and John. Arriving in Capernaum, Jesus and his newly-called disciples enter the synagogue. Here, as Jesus begins to teach, he is interrupted εὐθύς ("immediately") by a man possessed by an unclean spirit. Jesus orders the spirit to come out of the man. The command is obeyed after a display of demonic fury.

In Luke's tradition we note the following:

1. Jesus goes directly to Galilee after the temptations in the wilderness, while in Mark it appears that Jesus, after the temptations, may have stayed in Judea until John's imprisonment.

2. The first detailed account of Jesus' ministry is his rejection in Nazareth, while in Mark it is the call of his disciples. (Matthew follows Mark's order.)

3. Jesus is alone; the call is not extended to his disciples until sometime later (Luke 5:1-11).

4. After his rejection at Nazareth, Jesus goes to Capernaum, where he encounters the man with the unclean spirit in the synagogue on the Sabbath.

From the pericope itself and the context into which
it is placed we can derive the following concerning the
traditions of Luke and Mark:

1. In Mark the amazement of the people in the
synagogue appears to be equally as great over the fact
that Jesus performed this deed on the Sabbath as over the
exorcism itself:

**Mark 1:27**

. . . ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ
διδαχὴ καὶ νη κατ
ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς
πνευμασί τοῖς ἀκα-
δαρτοῖς ἐπιτάσσει

"... what is this?
New teaching with
authority! He even
commands the unclean
spirits and they
obey him."

**Luke 4:36**

. . . ΤΙΣ Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΟΤΙ
ἐν ἔξευσι καὶ δύναμιν ἐπι-
τάσσει τοῖς ἀκαδαρτοῖς
πνευμασίν καὶ ἔξερχονται

"... what word is this?
For with authority and
power he commands the
unclean spirits and they
come out."

In Mark, it is possible that διδαχὴ καὶ νη κατ ἐξουσίαν
("new teaching with authority") has reference to the work
of healing performed on the Sabbath, which would be a "new
teaching" on what is lawful in Sabbath observance, and
this would in turn be contrary to the popular teaching of
rabbis at that time. What amazed the synagogue congrega-
tion was the fact that Jesus' behavior (healing on the
Sabbath in opposition to the popular teaching of his day)
was supported by the approval of God, evidenced by the
vanquishing of a demon. Thus, in this sense this exorcism
on the Sabbath may be considered as "new teaching with
power."
That healing on the Sabbath was considered unlawful can be seen from the reaction of the ruler of the synagogue to the healing of the woman who was crippled in Luke 13:14:

And the ruler of the synagogue, answering with indignation because Jesus healed on the Sabbath, said to the crowd, "There are six days in which one ought to work; in them therefore come for healing and not on the Sabbath day."

2. In both the tradition of Mark and Luke Jesus performed the exorcism unchallenged. This may be accounted for if this was the first miracle performed on the Sabbath. The work of healing itself and the fact that the unclean spirit was subject to the authority of one who brashly brushed aside tradition evidently left the leaders of the synagogue without words. However, this was not to be the case again.

3. Luke in no way hints at the doctrinal or traditional overtones of this miracle, as Mark does.

4. In Mark's tradition, the newly-called disciples were witnesses to this miracle, whereas in Luke's tradition Jesus was alone. This is, perhaps, the most significant point for our purposes. For in Mark's tradition, the disciples now have Jesus' precedent, the "new teaching," for their future behavior on the Sabbath, whereas in Luke's tradition they presumably do not.
We might say that the above pericope of the unclean spirit, i.e. the precedent set by Jesus, forms a foundation for the first encounter in Mark's tradition between Jesus and his disciples on the one hand and the religious authorities on the other. For the first Sabbath encounter over what is lawful and what is not lawful on the Sabbath is occasioned by the disciples' behavior in the grain field. In Luke's tradition this foundation is missing, but regardless of this fact, D makes some interesting harmonistic changes, as we shall see below.

The pericope of the grain field is found in all three synoptics; however, we will be concerned only with a comparison between Mark and Luke as we trace the development of Luke's tradition. Matthew will enter the discussion only as he adds something of significance or holds something in common with Luke against Mark.

After recording the fact that Jesus and the disciples were passing through a grain field on the Sabbath, we read:

**Mark 2:23,24**

23. ... καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔρχαντο ὁδοποιεῖν τιλλόντες τοὺς σταχνὰς

24. καὶ οἱ φαρεσαῖοι εἶλον αὐτῷ ὅδε τὸ πολύσιν τοῖς σαββασίν οὐκ ἔξεστιν

"23. ... and his disciples began, along the way, to

**Luke 6:1,2**

1. ... καὶ εστίλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡσθιον τοὺς σταχνὰς ψωχοντες ταῖς χερσίν

2. τινες δὲ τῶν φαρεσαίων εἶπον τῷ πολεμίῳ ὁ σωκ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σαββασίν

"1. ... and his disciples picked and ate the kernels,
pick the kernels.

"24. And the Pharisees said to him, behold, why do they do on the Sabbath what is not lawful?"

Two things are to be noted. First, Luke adds the detailed information that the disciples threshed the kernels of grain by rubbing them in their hands. This harvesting and threshing constituted unlawful work according to the Pharisees. 18

Second, we must notice that when lodging their accusations of Sabbathbreaking the Pharisees addressed themselves to Jesus in Mark's tradition, but in Luke's tradition the Pharisees speak to the disciples directly. Plummer suggests that Matthew and Mark follow a pattern in recording the charges leveled by the religious leaders. "In Mk. ii.24 and Mt. xii.2 the charge against the disciples is addressed to Christ, while in Mk. ii.16 and Mt. ix.11 the charge against Christ is addressed to the disciples." 19 This suggestion makes it appear that the religious leaders wished to discredit the one in the eyes of the other. In the text presently under consideration, there is a precise reason why the Pharisees addressed whom

---


19 Ibid.
they did in each of the two respective traditions. The reason can be found in the context of the pericope of the unclean spirit. In Mark, by condemning the disciples' unlawful behavior in the grain field, the Pharisees appear to place the blame for their action on Jesus: ". . . [they] said to him, behold, why do they do on the Sabbath what is not lawful?" Their argument was with Jesus' διδαχὴ νέα ("new teaching"), and the example that he was setting in disregarding the traditions of the elders by healing on the Sabbath.

In Luke's tradition, the disciples were not present when the man with the unclean spirit was healed on the Sabbath, nor had they been exposed as yet to the "new teaching" in regard to the Sabbath. Therefore, the Pharisees confront the disciples directly: "Why do you do what is not lawful?" In both Mark's and Luke's tradition it was the disciples who plucked the grain and ate, not Jesus. It would not be correct, therefore, to include Jesus in the "you" of the Pharisees' question. Jesus' reply in Luke's tradition (vv. 3-5), therefore, becomes a defense of his disciples, while in Mark (vv. 25-28) Jesus' reply is a defense of his own action, which led the disciples to harvest and thresh on the Sabbath, and a defense of his "new teaching."

20Cf. Easton, p. 76.
Jesus' defense is based on the actions of David and his men in eating the bread of the presence when they were hungry, which was not lawful for anyone but the priests only (Luke 6:3,4; Mark 2:25,26).

This pericope concludes with the following:

Mark 2:27,28

27. καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς τὸ σαββατόν διὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εὐγενετὸς, καὶ οὐχ ο ἀνθρώπος διὰ τὸ σαββατὸν
28. ὡς τε κυρίος εστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββατοῦ.

Luke 6:5

27. καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Κυρίος εστιν τοῦ σαββατοῦ, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

"27. And he said to them, the Sabbath exists for the benefit of man, and not man for the Sabbath;
28. Wherefore, the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath."

Jesus' comments on the purpose of the Sabbath in Mark's tradition, added to the Old Testament authority of David's action, present strong defense for his "new" understanding of what is lawful and what is not lawful in proper Sabbath observance. Luke, in defending only the disciples' behavior in his tradition, evidently feels that the precedent of David's actions and the authority of this Old Testament illustration are sufficient to carry the weight of the argument. Although Matthew also leaves out Jesus' statement of the purpose of the Sabbath that is found in Mark, he adds the illustration of the priests
working on the Sabbath and being blameless, thus strengthening Jesus' position in his gospel.

It is not our intention to take up here the discussion as to who the Son of Man is in Luke's normal text (we have already seen that D considers Jesus to be the Son of Man). We can simply leave this matter by saying that in both traditions Jesus indicates that he and his disciples have the sanction of the Son of Man in their Sabbath behavior despite the traditions of the elders.\textsuperscript{21}

D harmonizes the following question posed by the Pharisees in Luke with Matthew and Mark:

Luke 6:2

\begin{tabular}{l|l}
Codex B & Codex D \\
\hline
\textit{τίνες δὲ τῶν φαρισαίων εἶπον τι πολεῖτε ὁ οὐκ ἔξεστιν τοὺς σαββασίν;} & \textit{τίνες δὲ τῶν φαρισαίων εἶλεγον αὐτῷ εἰδέ τι πολούσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου τοὺς σαββασίν ὁ οὐκ ἔξεστιν;} \\
\end{tabular}

"And certain ones of the Pharisees said, why do you do that which is not lawful on the Sabbath?"

By making two harmonistic changes D alters Luke's

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{εἰπον} ὁ εἶλεγον αὐτῷ, D Tatian \\
\textit{τι πολεῖτε} τι πολούσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου, D \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{And certain ones of the Pharisees said to him, behold, why do your disciples do that which is not lawful on the Sabbath?"
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{21}Cf. Plummer, p. 168; Arland J. Hultgren, "The Formation of the Sabbath Pericope in Mark 2:23-28," \textit{Journal of Biblical Literature}, XCI(1972), 38-43; and Montefiore, pp. 62-64 for a discussion as to whom the Son of Man is and his authority over the Sabbath.
tradition, i.e. from εἰπόν ("said") to ἐλέγον αὐτῷ ("said to him," follows Mark) and from ποιεῖτε ("do you do") to ποιοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου ("do your disciples do," following Matthew, only in the inverted interrogative form). By having the Pharisees address their complaint to Jesus, D now makes Jesus the object of their scorn. The defense that follows is no longer a defense of the disciples' actions on the part of Jesus, but is now a defense of his teachings and position in regard to the Sabbath.

D fails to complete his harmonization of this pericope in Luke by leaving out Mark's account of the purpose of the Sabbath. By placing the statement about the Son of Man (6:5) after v. 10, Jesus' defense ends with his appeal to Old Testament authority and the precedent of David. However, D now adds to the end of 6:4 a unique pericope of a man found working on the Sabbath: τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενος τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σάββατῳ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἀνθρωπε εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς μακάριος εἰ εἶ δὲ μὴ οἶδας ἐπικαταρατός καὶ παραβάτης εἰ τοῦ νόμου ("On the same day, seeing a certain man working on the Sabbath, he said to him, 'Man, if you know what you are doing you are blessed; if you do not know, you are cursed and are a transgressor of the law.'")

Because D is the only manuscript with this reading, many conjectures have been offered as to its origin. Williams suggests it may have been a "floating piece of
oral tradition," but Käser believes D found it in written form. Torrey sees it as,

... an "apocryphal" anecdote in which Jesus tells a man seen working on the sabbath that he is doing a very dangerous thing in his apparent transgression of the law. The revision here for the benefit of Jewish readers is very evident.

In 1895, Blass revived the seventeenth century hypothesis of Jean Leclerc that Luke had himself produced two editions of Acts. Blass's theory was that Luke originally wrote his gospel in Palestine, and that when he was in Rome with Paul the Christians there asked him for a copy of his work. Luke wrote out his gospel again with such alterations as he thought necessary. Blass theorized similarly with regard to Acts; one copy was made for Theophilus, to whom it was addressed, and another for the Church at large. D represents the later edition of the gospel and the earlier of Acts, while the Neutral text represents the earlier edition of the gospel and the later of Acts.

---


24 Torrey, pp. 131-32.
Blass believed that the addition to Luke 6:4 would have given "great offence even to Christian Jews," because its spirit is Pauline. Therefore, Luke preferred to leave the saying out of the gospel that was destined for Oriental congregations, a large part of which consisted of Jews, while there was no reason for leaving it out of the gospel prepared for the Romans, which D supposedly represented. Blass's theory was received with favor by some scholars; however, investigation revealed some serious difficulties and the two editions of Luke/Acts theory is not accepted today.

Hatch feels that Westcott and Hort's suggestion that "this utterance and the Pericope de Adultera may possibly have come from the same source" is entirely conjectural. He feels rather, that it must have come from some extraneous source which is now lost. Godet also believes that this pericope is an interpolation similar to the woman taken in adultery,

... but with this difference, that the latter is probably the record of real fact, while the former can only be an invention or a perversion. Nobody could

---


27 Hatch, p. 18.
have labored publicly in Israel on the Sabbath day without being instantly punished. 28

Montefiore condemns the addition as ungentine on the assumption that Jesus would scarcely "have gone so far in open approval of a direct violation of one of the fundamental injunctions of the Law and of one of the Ten Commandments." 29

Käser believes that D sensed Luke's preference for the number three and found this spot in Luke's tradition to be an ideal location for the insertion of this pericope. The μακάριος/ἐπικατάρατος ("blessed/cursed") of 6:5D corresponds to the three occurrences of μακάριοι/οὐαί ("blessed/woe") of the immediate vicinity (6:20ff, 24ff). The insertion of this pericope after the experience in the corn field and the healing of the withered hand (6:6-11) makes a sequence of three Sabbath pericopes. The pericope originated as a defense against the increasing danger which arose within the church coming from its own rank of liberals, Käser believes. The curse of this logion is against unbounded lawlessness. 30

With the small amount of information we possess on this addition in the D text of Luke, it would be utterly

---

28 Godet, p. 185.
29 Montefiore, p. 409.
30 Käser, pp. 417, 424-25.
futile to try to identify its origin. The only thing we can do with certainty, therefore, is address ourselves to the significance of its presence.

As is already apparent in the pericope of the grain field and as will be further emphasized in the succeeding Sabbath encounters, Luke uses the Sabbath controversies to develop his tradition concerning the Sabbath. The issue in Luke is over what is lawful and what is not lawful in Sabbath observance. However, the full significance of this addition cannot be seen until the rest of the Sabbath controversies are examined. We will, therefore, return to this addition shortly.

The second Sabbath controversy immediately follows the pericope of the corn field, and Luke holds it in common with Matthew and Mark. We will again be concerned only with a comparison between Luke and Mark in order to isolate Luke's tradition, since the account in Matthew holds nothing in common with Luke where it diverges from Mark and hence makes no significant contribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark 3:1-3</th>
<th>Luke 6:6-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς συναγωγήν καὶ ἦν εἰκεῖ ἀνθρώπος ἐξηραμμένην εχών τὴν χείρα | 6. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἐτερῷ σαββατῳ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν καὶ ἦν ἀνθρώπος ἦκεὶ καὶ ἦν χεῖρ αὐτοῦ ἣ δεξία ἦν ἡχαρ

31Metzger (p. 140) notes its presence in the text of D but makes no attempt to identify its origin or to comment on its meaning.
2. And he entered again into the synagogue. And there was there a man which had a withered hand.

3. And he said to the man with the withered hand, stand in the midst.

Let us notice the details added by Luke: (1) Jesus entered the synagogue on another Sabbath and taught; (2) those who were watching him closely were Scribes and Pharisees; (3) Jesus knew their intent.

The whole issue of the confrontation is again Jesus' understanding of Sabbath observance as opposed to the traditions of the elders:

Mark 3:4

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἔξεστιν τοῖς σαββάσιν αγαθοποιησάι τῇ κακοποιήσαι ψυχὴν σώσαι η ἀποκτείναι οἱ δὲ εσιωπῶν

Luke 6:9

ἔπειν δὲ ἵνα πρὸς αὐτοὺς επερωτήσωμεν εἰ ἔξεστι τῷ σαββάτῳ αγαθοποιῆσαι τῇ κακοποιήσαι ψυχὴν σώσαι η ἀπολέσαι
"And he said to them, Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath or to do evil, to save life or to destroy? And they were silent."

But now we note that in Luke's tradition both Jesus' attitude toward the religious leaders and their reaction to his behavior are softened:

Mark 3:5,6

5. καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοῦ μετ' ὀργῆς συνλυπούμενος επὶ τῇ παρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ ανδρῷ ἐκτείνον τὴν χειρὰ καὶ ἐξετείνην καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεῖρ αὐτοῦ

6. καὶ ἔξελθοντες οἱ φαρισαῖοι εὐθὺς μετὰ τῶν ἤρωδιανον συμβούλιον εδίδον καὶ αὐτῷ ὡς αὐτὸν ἀπολείσωσίν

"5. And when he had looked around upon them with anger, being grieved because of the hardness of their hearts, he said to the man, Stretch out your hand, and he stretched it out and his hand was restored.

"6. And the Pharisees went out and took counsel immediately with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him."

Luke 6:10,11

10. καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς εἰπεν αὐτῷ ἐκτείνον τὴν χεῖρα σου ὅ δε εποίησαν καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεῖρ αὐτοῦ

11. αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπλησθῆσαν αὐνοίας καὶ διελαλοῦν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τι αν ποιήσαντι τῇ ἰου

"10. And when he had looked around upon them all he said to him, Stretch out your hand. And he did so and his hand was restored.

"11. And they were filled with anger, and discussed with one another what they might do with Jesus."

In Luke's tradition: (1) Jesus did not get angry with the leaders because of the hardness of their hearts, nor (2)

---

32 D in Mark makes an interesting substitution here; he replaces πωρόσει ("hardness" or "callousness") with νέκρωσει ("deadness"), which would certainly contain an anti-Judaic flavor.
did the Pharisees take counsel with the Herodians (as in Mark only) as to how they might destroy Jesus (in both Matthew and Mark).

Let us now note how D changes Luke's tradition by a series of harmonizations:

**Luke 6:6**

**Codex B**

εγένετο δὲ εἰς ετέρῳ σαββάτῳ εἰσελθείν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν καὶ ἡν ἀνδρῶπος εκεί καὶ η χειρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὰ ην ἔπεσα.

"And it came to pass on another Sabbath that he entered into the synagogue and taught. And there was a man there and his right hand was withered."

**Codex D**

καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν σαββάτῳ εν ἡ ἡν ἀνθρώπος ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν χειρα.

"And he entered again into the synagogue on the Sabbath where there was a man having a withered hand."

D completely rewrites this verse; and is the only witness to this alteration; however, the noteworthy thing here is that B has Jesus entering the synagogue in order to teach and D omits this:

**Luke 6:9-11**

**Codex B**

9. εἰπεν δὲ ἐς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπερωτῶν ὡμᾶς εἰ εξεστὶ τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιήσατε ἡ κακοποιήσατε ψυχὴν σώσαι ἡ απολέσαι
10. καὶ περιβλεψάμενος παντας αὐτοὺς εἰπεν αὐτῷ ἐκτείνον τὴν χειρα σου ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χειρ αὐτοῦ

**Codex D**

9. εἰπεν δὲ ὁ ἢς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπερωτησεν ὡμᾶς εἰ εξεστὶ τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιήσατε η κακοποιήσατε ψυχὴν σώσαι η ἀπολέσαι οἱ δὲ εσιώπων
10. καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς παντας εν ὁργῇ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκτείνον τὴν χειρα σου καὶ ἐξετείνεν καὶ ἀπεκατεσταθη ἡ χειρ αὐτοῦ ως καὶ η ἀλλη
"9. And Jesus said to them, I will ask you if it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath or to do evil, to save life or destroy?

"10. And when he had looked around upon them all he said to him, Stretch out your hand, and he did so, and his hand was restored.

"11. And they were filled with anger, and discussed with one another what they might do with Jesus."

By adding οἱ δὲ ἔσωστον ("and they were silent") and ἐν ὀργῇ ("in wrath"), D harmonizes Luke with Mark and intensifies the confrontation between Jesus and the religious leaders. D now climaxes this intensified confrontation by a third harmonization, i.e. the leaders took counsel as to how they might destroy Jesus. By this series of
harmonizations D increases the tension between Jesus and the leaders where Luke had softened the confrontation in his tradition.

By inserting v. 5 between vv. 10 and 11, which had been displaced by the addition of the man working on the Sabbath, it appears that D is seeking additional strength for the Sabbath tradition of Luke, for now the approval of the Son of Man follows a display of divine power in healing instead of following the action of the disciples in the grain field, where there is no display of divine power.

The final two confrontations between Jesus and the religious leaders over proper Sabbath observance are peculiar to Luke (13:10-17; 14:1-6). They both involve the question of healing on the Sabbath (the crippled woman and the man with dropsy). In both pericopes Jesus reminds the religious leaders that they do not consider it a violation of the Sabbath to care for their livestock or to aid an animal in distress; therefore, why should it be a violation of the Sabbath to bring physical healing to a human being, and to a child of Abraham at that? These two pericopes add to the weight of evidence concerning Jesus' understanding of proper Sabbath observance. D offers no significant variants here.

We will now summarize what we have discovered from
these Sabbath controversies about Luke's tradition and the changes made by D.

1. Whereas in Mark's tradition we have the call of the first disciples before the exorcism of the unclean spirit on the Sabbath, in Luke's tradition this miracle was performed before any disciples joined Jesus. It is probable that Jesus' attitude toward what was lawful on the Sabbath was a part of the "new teaching" that amazed the people in Mark.

An interesting observation is made by Montefiore about Jesus' understanding of proper Sabbathkeeping:

So far as we can gather, Jesus's attitude towards the Sabbath was something like the attitude of Liberal Judaism today. It must be observed rather in the spirit than in the letter. The regulations for its observance must not be allowed to destroy its intention. Directly the Sabbath becomes a burden, the object of the Sabbath is frustrated. The aim is the important point: how precisely we carry out the aim is less important. Nevertheless, one must not push the antithesis between Jesus and Rabbinic teaching too far.

His teaching is an excellent counterbalance to that casuistic minuteness which is the danger of legalism. It is emancipating; it enables one to breath freely. In modern times, at any rate, and with modern ideas, the Sabbath can hardly be observed except on the lines suggested by Jesus.33

2. The first encounter between Jesus and the religious leaders over Sabbath observance is caused by the disciples. In Mark's tradition they are following Jesus' precedent, the "new teaching." But in Luke it is just a natural

action on the part of hungry men.

In Mark's tradition the indignation of the Pharisees is leveled at Jesus because they see the disciples breaking the Sabbath as a result of Jesus' teaching and influence. Therefore, Jesus' reply is a defense of his "new teaching," a part of which is the removal of the man-made restrictions around the Sabbath.

In Luke the indignation of the Pharisees is leveled at the disciples for yielding to physical desires which led them to set aside the traditions of the elders. Jesus' reply is a defense of his disciples' actions. D, however, imposes Mark's tradition on Luke by harmonization, thus changing Luke's tradition and making Jesus the object of direct castigation for the disciples' actions.

3. The addition at the end of Luke 6:4 (the man found working on the Sabbath) does not appear to be an attempt by D to do away with the Sabbath, but rather an attempt to strengthen the Sabbath motif being developed by Luke. 34 This motif of Jesus' special understanding of

34 The position taken here is, as we have already seen, in agreement with that taken by Montefiore (Vol. I, p. 409), also, Leon E. Wright, Alterations of the Words of Jesus (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 137-38: "We should venture the suggestion, however, that the purport of the saying is not in defense of Sabbath-breaking"; Easton (p. 75): "... it does not represent Christ's attitude (against P, Ls), for Christ did not teach the repeal of the Sabbath law"; Godet (p. 185): "... Jesus, who never permitted Himself the slightest infraction
the Sabbath is strengthened by each Sabbath encounter between Jesus and the religious leaders, i.e. it is lawful to do deeds of kindness and love for fellow human beings and to supply immediate personal, physical needs.\textsuperscript{35} In the Sabbath addition of D, we are not informed as to the nature of the work performed by the man seen by Jesus. From Jesus' remarks we may be safe in concluding the following:

a) The deed being performed would have been forbidden by the traditions of the elders.

b) Appearing as it does in connection with the disciples' experience of passing through the grain field and Jesus' use of the Old Testament illustration of David and the bread of the presence, the unknown deed should fit into Jesus' understanding of proper Sabbath observance, i.e. a deed of kindness and love or the supplying of some immediate personal need.\textsuperscript{36} It is logical to assume that of a true commandment of Moses (whatever interpreters may say about it), certainly would not have authorized this premature emancipation in anyone else"; and Jeremias (p. 63): "So far from advocating the abrogation of the Sabbath the intention of the logion is the exact opposite—to protect the Sabbath from frivolous neglect."

\textsuperscript{35}Cf. Harvie Branscomb, "Jesus and the Pharisees," Union Seminary Magazine, XLIV(1932-33), 37.

\textsuperscript{36}Cf. Jeremias (p. 64, cf. p. 63): "No, from all we know of Jesus' attitude to the Sabbath, it must be the nature of the work he is doing which causes Jesus to praise him. Jesus reckons with the possibility that he is engaged in a labour of love"; and Käser, p. 420.
it does, since Jesus is made to give his approval.

c) The negative aspect of Jesus' remarks to the man indicates that if the man has performed this deed, whatever its nature, not being aware of the humanitarian and spiritual nature of the Sabbath law in general, he is in danger of being accused of becoming a breaker of the whole law because he has failed to see the humanitarian and spiritual nature of God's law as a whole.

It may very well be that D views Luke as too slow in freeing the Sabbath from Jewish tradition. Luke omits the "new teaching" motif and the statement regarding the purpose of the Sabbath; therefore, D strengthens in chapter six what it takes Luke to chapter 14 to develop.

4. In the second Sabbath confrontation (the man with the withered hand), Luke softens Mark's tradition. D, however, with a series of harmonizations intensifies the encounter. Then, with one final harmonization, D changes Luke's tradition regarding the nature of the counsel being taken by the religious leaders; this alters from what should be done with him to how they might kill him. Thus D advances in point of time the plottings of the religious leaders to kill Jesus from 19:47 to 6:11 in Luke's tradition.

We are now ready to examine the second division in the block of Sabbath material, i.e. the miscellaneous statements on the Sabbath. Here we need look at only two changes
First of all, let us observe what is said in connection with the Sabbath on Jesus' visit to his home town of Nazareth. We shall again compare Luke against Mark:

Mark 6:1,2

1. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπολογοθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
2. καὶ γενομένου σαββατου ἑξάκι διδάσκειν εν τῇ συναγώγῃ. . . .

Luke 4:16

"1. And he departed from there, and came into his own country and his disciples followed him. 
2. And when the Sabbath was come, he began to teach in the synagogue. . . ."

"And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and entered the synagogue on the Sabbath according to his custom, and stood up to read."

The significant thing here is that Luke informs us that it was Jesus' custom to go to the synagogue on the Sabbath day and when the opportunity was presented to take part in the worship service he did so. Mark gives us none of this information. One would almost conclude from Mark that Jesus went to the synagogue to find a crowd of people so that he could preach and teach.

The fact that Luke tells us it was Jesus' custom to go to the synagogue on the Sabbath does not detract in the least from Luke's attempt to separate the Sabbath from Jewish tradition (as will be shown presently). The issue in Luke's tradition is not whether a person should go to
religious services on the Sabbath or not, but what constitutes work on the Sabbath.

We are now ready to compare D's rendering of:

Luke 4:16

Codex B

καὶ ἠλθεν εἰς ναζαρα οὐ ἦν
tedrammenos kai esethden
kata to eIwodos avto ev th
humera tov saevbatov eis th
sunaeygyn kai aesth anay-
wnai

"And he came to
Nazareth, where he had
been brought up, and en-
tered the synagogue on the
Sabbath according to his
custom,

and stood up to read."

Codex D

ελθων δε εἰς ναζαρεῖο ὑπὸ ἦν
kata to eIwodos en th
humera tov saevbatov eis th
sunaeygyn kai aesth anay-
wnai

"And when he had come to
Nazareth, where,

according to the
custom, he was in the syna-
gogue on the Sabbath, he
also stood up to read."

καὶ ἠλθεν εἰς ναζαρα οὐ ἦν τεθραμμένος εἰς τὴν
ναζαρεῖον ὑπὸ τὴν καὶ εἰσήλθεν
κατὰ τὸ εἰῶδος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ
ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν
συναγωγήν καὶ ανεστή αναγ-
ώναι

By omitting αὐτῷ ("his"), D implies that it was the
custom of the townspeople of Nazareth to attend synagogue
services on the Sabbath, and it was not necessarily Jesus'
custom,37 but he attended the services primarily or solely
for the opportunity to address the people.

37The omission of the phrase that connects Jesus
with Nazareth has been dealt with in Chapter Two. It was
concluded there that D has no reservations about Jesus hav-
ing been brought up in Nazareth. If this text is a "Mar-
cionite" reading, D used it, not for the omission of Jesus'
connection with Nazareth, but because of its position on
the Sabbath, cf. J. R. Harris, "New Point of View in Text-
ual Criticism," Expositor, VIII, 7(1914), 318-20.
The intention of D seems obvious. By omitting αὐτῷ ("his") D is changing Luke's textual tradition because D does not want to say that Jesus was personally bound by Jewish custom or tradition. If Jesus enters a synagogue on the Sabbath for purposes of worship, which is the custom of the Jews, he does so on his own volition. It appears that D is lessening the significance of the Sabbath in the life of Jesus against Luke's normal text in order to have Jesus free from the traditions of the elders.

It also appears that D intends his readers to see Jesus' followers as being free from Jewish tradition concerning the Sabbath. In connection with the placing of Jesus' body in the tomb we have this statement that is peculiar to Luke:

Luke 23:56

Codex B

υποστρέψασαι δὲ ἡτοιμασάν αρωμάτα καὶ μῦρα καὶ τὸ μὲν σαββάτον ἡσυχασάν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν

"And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment."

Codex D

υποστρέψασαι δὲ ἡτοιμασάν αρωμάτα καὶ μῦρα καὶ τὸ μὲν σαββάτον ἡσυχασάν

"And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day."

om. κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν, D

38 As we have already seen by D's alteration in connection with tithe paying.
By omitting the phrase "according to the commandment," D is again changing Luke's textual tradition. Luke endeavors to maintain the Sabbath institution by saying that it is Jesus' personal custom not only to attend worship services on the Sabbath but also to participate in them when the opportunity is presented, and by having the women rest according to the commandment contained in the Decalogue. D, on the other hand, is not as concerned about the Sabbath as a religious institution. His main objective is to hold forth Jesus and his followers as free from Jewish traditional restrictions regardless of what alteration this position makes in the Sabbath of the Decalogue as a religious institution.

**Conclusion**

From what we have seen in this chapter, we may conclude that the anti-Judaic bias in D can be seen in the following:

1. D strengthens the idea that Jerusalem is a place of hostility and enmity by omitting any indication that its people were responsive to Jesus' ministry.

2. D pictures the leaders as being "evil" in their designs toward Jesus, while the penitent thief declares that Jesus has done no "evil."

3. Understanding the old wine as representing Judaism, D eliminates the statement that a man who drinks
the old wine will not desire new because the old is better.

4. D minimizes the idea that Jesus supported Jewish tradition in his teaching, so he omits the instruction that tithe should be paid.

5. The analogy to hidden graves, with which personal contact would bring spiritual defilement, is removed and D makes Jesus call the Pharisees the hidden graves in actuality.

6. In the parable of the pounds, D presents the unprofitable servant as representative of the Jewish people. In his alterations he makes the unprofitable servant suffer more intensely than the rebellious people who did not want the king's rule.

7. Throughout the Sabbath controversies D heightens the encounters between Jesus and the Pharisees. When opportunity is presented, D manifests his anti-Judaic bias, as was seen by harmonizing Luke's softened account of one controversy with the harsher accounts of Matthew and Mark and making the religious leaders plot the death of Jesus much earlier.

8. D does not intend to lessen the significance of the Sabbath by the addition of the man found working on the Sabbath, but rather attempts to strengthen Luke's presentation of Jesus' understanding of proper Sabbathkeeping in opposition to the teachings of the religious leaders.
of Jesus' day.

9. D attempts to free Jesus and his followers from Jewish custom and tradition in the matter of Sabbath-keeping.
CHAPTER VII

THE PASSION, RESURRECTION, AND ASCENSION IN D

Perhaps few of the variants in the D text of Luke have received as much attention as the "Western non-interpolations" found in the last three chapters, beginning with the institution of the Lord's Supper. However, these famous variants actually tell only a part of the story of D's view of the passion and resurrection. It is the purpose of this chapter to piece together a picture of D's editorial work in regard to the final events of Jesus' earthly life, and to see if the variants in these last chapters give evidence of theological overtones or biases as do variants in previous chapters.

The Lord's Supper

Luke begins his account of the Lord's Supper with

---

1For a recent survey of the "Western non-interpolations," cf. Klyne Snodgrass, "'Western non-Interpolations',' Journal of Biblical Literature, XCI(1972), 369-79. Snodgrass states briefly the position of Westcott and Hort, then examines their position in the light of recent studies, especially that of Jeremias and Aland. Following a quick examination of the "Western non-interpolations" found in all four Gospels, Snodgrass concludes, "The papyri have forced a reconsideration of this question, and it now appears doubtful that any of the readings supported only by D and its non-Greek allies are the genuine text" (p. 379). Cf. Kenyon, The Western Text, p. 313.
material that is peculiar to himself. This material will be presented here as a single unit, to be followed by a comparison between B and D of the verses that contain the omission.

καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τὸτε τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν διὰ οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἔως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ δεξάμενος ποθήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν· λάβετε τὸτε καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἐως ὅτε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.

"And he said to them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer, for I say to you, I will not eat of it again until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves, for I say to you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come" (Luke 22:15-18).

Luke 22:19,20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. καὶ λαβὼν ἀρτὸν εὐχαριστήσας εκλασέν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς λεγὼν τούτῳ εστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν δίδομεν τούτῳ ποιεῖτε τὴν ἐμὴν ανάμνησιν 20. καὶ τὸ ποθήριον ὁσαυτῶς μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λεγὼν τούτῳ τὸ ποθήριον η̄ καίνη διαθήκη εὖ τῷ αἰματὶ μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν εἰκονομενον</td>
<td>19. καὶ λαβὼν ἀρτὸν εὐχαριστήσας εκλασέν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς λεγὼν τούτῳ εστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"19. And taking bread, when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them saying, This is my body which is given for you. This do in remembrance of me."

"19. And taking bread, when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them saying, This is my body."
"20. And the cup likewise after supper, saying, This is the cup of the new covenant in my blood, which is poured out for you."

The debate among scholars centers in the authenticity of the shorter form as opposed to the authenticity of the longer form. Those who take the shorter form

---


4Williams identifies Kenyon and Legg, along with himself, as supporters of the longer reading (p. 51). To these three can be added Pierre Benoit, "Le Récit de le Cène dans Lc. XXII,15-20: Étude de critique textuelle et littéraire," Revue Biblique, XLVIII(1939), 357-93; Clark, "Theological Relevance," p. 10; Alexander R. Eagar, "St. Luke's Account of the Last Supper," Expositor, VII, 5(1908), 252-
as the original believe that vv. 19b,20 are an interpo-
lation from I Cor. 11:23-26. Several scholars note the un-
structured form of the rite in the early church, as does
Creed:

Luke writes in an age when Christian rites and
institutions are still in a fluid state. No fixed
interpretation has yet become normative. That this
was so at the close of the first century is sup-
ported by other evidence: the Didache can give forms
of blessing for the cup and the bread (in the Lucan
order) and thanksgiving after the Eucharist without
an allusion to the Last Supper or to the death of
Christ; St. John can record the Last Supper without
any mention of the bread and wine and attach his
eucharistic teaching to the feeding of the multitude.
However, as the Pauline conception of the Eucharist
tended to become normative, the Lucan account of the
Last Supper must have been felt to be defective and
anomalous. It was in consequence already by the
middle of the second century, as it seems (Justin,
Apol. i.66) supplemented by an interpolation from
I Cor. 5

Some scholars who prefer the longer text believe
that the Lord's Supper was incorporated into the paschal
meal. This is based upon Luke mentioning two cups. The
location of the incorporation varies from the second to

62; Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 142-55;
majority of scholars that worked on the United Bible
Society's text, Metzger, p. 176; George Gardner Monks,
"The Lucan Account of the Last Supper," Journal of Bibili-
cal Literature, XLIV(1925), 228-60; Harold McA. Robinson,
"The Text of Luke xxii.17-25," Princeton Theological Re-
view, VIII(1910), 613-56; H. Schürmann, "Lk. 22:19b-20 als
Ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung," Biblica, XXXII(1951),
364-92; Snodgrass, "Western non-Interpolations'," pp. 372,
374; Burton H. Throckmorton Jr., "The Longer Reading of
55-56.

5Creed, p. 262.
the fourth cup of the paschal meal.\textsuperscript{6} Benoit believes that
the two cups in Luke are one and the same. At the point
where the "first cup" is mentioned (v. 17) the disciples
did not drink of it; it was only divided among them. The
content of this cup was drunk at the point where Luke
speaks of the "second cup" (v. 20). Thus, in reality
there is only one cup in Luke's account.\textsuperscript{7}

If one accepts the shorter text, the addition of
vv. 19b,20 can be explained simply as an interpolation
from I Cor. 11, for the purpose of bringing Luke into
agreement with the other accounts of the institution. If
one accepts the longer text, a possible explanation of the
omission of vv. 19b,20 is the confusion that results from
the two cups.\textsuperscript{8} However, Jeremias takes the position that,

the popular view that the Short Text arose because of
the exception taken to the two cups (Luke 22:17f,20)
and that the second cup was deleted because of the
supposed repetition is not satisfactory.\textsuperscript{9}

Again, one might say that the omission was caused
by a desire of some copyist to remove indications of the

\textsuperscript{6} Arndt, p. 438; Farrar, p. 325; Jeremias, pp. 84-88; van Oosterzee, p. 336; Plummer, p. 495; William F. Skene, "St. Luke's Account of the Institution of the

\textsuperscript{7} Benoit, pp. 291-92.

\textsuperscript{8} This is the usual explanation of those who sup-
port the longer text; cf. the majority of scholars listed
in footnote 3.

\textsuperscript{9} Jeremias, p. 157.
bodily suffering of the Lord. Because D includes both the scene of the angel strengthening Jesus in Gethsemane (22:43) and the account of the bloody sweat (22:44), however, without omitting any of the other scenes of bodily suffering, this point does not seem likely.

Jeremias believes that vv. 19b,20 were omitted because of the danger of misinterpretation (blood drinking). In his view, a copyist around the middle of the second century abbreviated the account when he was asked for a copy of Luke's gospel by a pagan. Because there are numerous examples of sacred formulas being abbreviated among pagans at this time to protect the sacred meaning from uninitiates, Jeremias reasons that any Christian who read the first words of the Eucharistic formula would be able to supply the remainder.\(^{10}\)

However, Benoit disagrees; he says that Christians have never hesitated to describe their more sacred mysteries, and when they did so they were properly understood.\(^{11}\) Benoit suggests that the phrase "for you" that is attached to the bread and the cup in vv. 19b,20 was not part of the liturgical text that was then in use. Therefore, vv. 19b,20 were omitted because vv. 17-19a contained a liturgical sound that was more familiar.\(^{12}\)

\(^{10}\)Jeremias, pp. 158-59. \(^{11}\)Benoit, p. 369.

\(^{12}\)Ibid., p. 365.
Because Luke begins this passage with Jesus expressing the anticipation with which he had awaited this Passover meal, it appears that the longer text is the original, with the Lord's Supper being inserted into the paschal meal. The reading in D has the following results: (1) the cup precedes the bread, 13 (2) there is no symbolism attached to the wine, and only the bread has symbolic value—"this is my body"; the remainder of the verse is harmonized with Matthew 26:26 and Mark 14:22 by the omission of "which is given for you," (3) the redemptive significance is lessened in the symbolism of the bread and completely eliminated in the wine. This leads Blass and Creed to the conclusion that this event is just an ordinary meal and that it was not Luke's intention to record the institution of what we call the Lord's Supper. 14

In evaluating this variant in D on its own merit and in the light of D's theological biases and trends as

13 As noted above, the Didache presents the service in this order; thus Creed (p. 262) feels there must have been some churches in the first century that were following the reversed order. Benoit believes that the account in the Didache is not to be trusted nor relied upon: "As for supporting the short text of Luke by the Didache, is that not to call a bonesetter to the bedside of an amputee?" (p. 366). Jeremias says, "No more can the Short Text finally be explained by saying that it presupposes a Lord's Supper in the order wine-bread (Luke 22:17-19a); such a Lord's Supper has never happened" (p. 157).

14 Blass, p. 180; Creed, p. 262.
they have been seen up to this point, the solution suggested by Jeremias (blood drinking) for the omission of 22:19b,20 seems to be the most logical. We have already noted the care with which D deals with Gentiles as they appear in Luke's account. This would certainly impress a Gentile reader. D probably found vv. 19b,20 omitted in the manuscript he was copying. Rather than correct the omission, he was content to let it stand for fear the symbolism of the wine would cause misunderstanding among his Gentile readers.

**Trial and Crucifixion**

D presents the trial and crucifixion of Jesus with some interesting variations. For the first time in Luke, the people of Jerusalem are presented as openly hostile to Jesus. We have seen previously that they were passively unresponsive to Jesus' ministry in D. However, D keeps the people out of the preliminary trial before the Sanhedrin. The initial verdict of death is the responsibility of the rulers, but the people play a far more active role in showing contempt toward Jesus in D than in the normal text. Perhaps the best way to investigate these variants is to follow them through their chronological sequence. We will begin with the arrest in Gethsemane:

**Luke 22:47**

Codex B  Codex D
While he was yet speaking, behold a crowd and the one called Judas, one of the twelve, was going before them.

And while he was yet speaking, behold a great crowd and the one called Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, was leading the way before them.

In the text of D the size of the crowd actively participating in the arrest is increased beyond the normal text by means of a harmonization with Matthew 26:47. Because the chief priests, captains of the temple, and elders are included in "the crowd" of the normal text, it would be logical to assume that the increase in number, expressed in D as a "great crowd," would be mainly composed of the people from Jerusalem.

Upon being arrested, Jesus was led to the home of the high priest (v. 54). Here he was interrogated. Although there were those who observed this interrogation, they serve only as a backdrop for Peter's denial; the ὀχλὸς πολύς ("great crowd") that participated in the arrest is not present. D indicates this in the next variant:

Luke 23:1

Codex B

Codex D
The active support and interest of the populace of Jerusalem in the arrest and the trial of Jesus before Pilate is presented by D as greater than what we find in the normal text. Thus we have a "great crowd" (v. 47) involved in the arrest instead of a "crowd" in the normal text; Pilate calls together "all the people" for his verdict (v. 13) instead of the "people" in the normal text (see below). Therefore, the omission of "the whole multitude of them" in the variant above now becomes significant, for it seems that D wishes to indicate that only the religious leaders interrogated Jesus, and when this interrogation was completed it was the rulers who led him to Pilate.

The omission of "the whole multitude of them" would seem to indicate that the "great crowd" of 22:47 had dispersed after the arrest, perhaps because they could not witness the proceedings in the home of the high priest. However, once Pilate had examined Jesus and had arrived at a tentative verdict, D then brings the populace back into the drama:

And when Pilate himself had called together the chief priests and the rulers and all the people.

As D makes the inhabitants of Jerusalem active participants in the arrest of Jesus, so he makes them active participants in the uncompromising demand for Jesus' crucifixion (22:18-25). D further incriminates the people of Jerusalem at the site of the crucifixion. In the account of Matthew and Mark, Jesus is ridiculed by both the people and the rulers, the people saying in essence, "You who can destroy the temple and in three days raise it up again, save yourself and come down from the cross" (Matthew 27:40; Mark 15:29,30) and the priests saying, "He saved others, he cannot save himself; if he is king of Israel, let him come down from the cross and we will believe him" (Matthew 27:42; Mark 15:31,32).

Luke pictures the people as silently watching the one who was crucified while the rulers alone scoffed at him. However, D takes the words spoken by the rulers and
puts them into the mouths of the crowd:

**Luke 23:35**

Codex B

καὶ εἰστηκεῖ ὁ λαὸς
deωρὼν εξεμπτηριζόν
dὲ καὶ οἱ αρχόντες
λέγοντες αλλοὺς
esωσεν σώσατω εαυτὸν
eἰ νῦν ἐστὶν ὁ ἡς
tου τοῦ θεοῦ εἰ ἐκλεκτός

"And the people stood by watching, but the rulers scoffed, saying, Others he saved; let him save himself if he is the Christ, the elect Son of God."

Codex D

καὶ εἰστηκεῖ ὁ λαὸς
ορῶν εμπτηριζόν
dὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ
eλεγὰν αὐτῷ αλλοὺς
esωσας σεαυτον σώσον
eἰ νῦν εἰ του θεοῦ εἰ
χρί εἰ ὁ εκλεκτός

"And the people stood by watching, and they scoffed at him and said, Others you saved; save yourself if you are the Son of God, if you are the Christ, if you are the Elect one."

Although the scoffing of the priests in the normal text is directed at Jesus, it is not a bold challenge hurled into his face. Through D's alterations, the people continue their active role in Jesus' humiliation, and their scoffing is a direct challenge of bold defiance.

D underscores this bold defiance of the people with further alterations: (1) by altering the remarks of the soldiers and the unrepentant thief, and (2) by altering the conversation between the penitent thief and Jesus (cf. the change in the thief's appraisal of Jesus, from
"he has done nothing amiss" to "he has done no evil," in the previous chapter).  

Luke 23:36,37,39

Codex B

36. ενεπαιξαν δε αυτῷ και οἱ στρατιώται προσ-ερχομένοι οξὸς προσ-φεροντες αυτῷ
37. καὶ λεγόντες εἰ σῡ εἰ οἱ βασίλεις τῶν οῡδαίων σω̄σον σεαυτὸν
39. εἰς δὲ τῶν κρεμασ-θέντων κακούργων εβλασφημεί αυτον οῡχι σῡ εἰ ο ΧΣ σω̄σον σεαυτὸν καὶ ημις

"36. And the soldiers also mocked him, coming and offering vinegar to him,
"37. And saying, if you are the king of the Jews save yourself.
"39. And one of the criminals who was hanging blasphemed him, Are you not the Christ? Save yourself and us."

Codex D

36. ενεπεξον δε αυτῷ και οἱ στρατιώται προσ-ερχομένοι οξὸς τε προσ-φερον
37. λεγόντες χαίρε ο βασίλεις τῶν οῡδαίων περιτεθέντες αυτῷ καὶ ακανθίνων στεφάνων
39. εἰς δὲ τῶν κακούργων εβλασφημεί αυτον

"36. And the soldiers also mocked him, coming and offering vinegar,
"37. Saying, Hail king of the Jews, placing on him a thorny crown.
"39. And one of those who was hanging blasphemed him."

v. 36 om. αυτῷ, D
v. 37 om. καὶ, D lat

15G. D. Kilpatrick, "A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story and Luke xxiii.47," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIII(1942), 34-36, adds an interesting thought that would further support D's emphasis on the defiance of the people. He takes the word δίκαιος, spoken by the centurion regarding Jesus, to be "innocent" and not "righteous." Thus the centurion supports Herod, Pilate, the soldiers, and the thief in their appraisal of Jesus against the people.
The mockery of the people (v. 35) had stemmed from Jesus' claim to be the Messiah. Their challenge, "Save yourself," indicated their disbelief and rejection of Jesus' claim to be able to save. They were responsible for his crucifixion and this crucifixion in turn testified to the accuracy of their appraisal of him. They challenged him to disprove their appraisal and their reasons for rejecting him.

The soldiers' mockery stemmed from a different point of view. They mocked him because he claimed to be a king, not because he claimed to be the Messiah, the Son of God. By changing their words, D indicates that he does not see the soldiers' treatment of Jesus as the same in nature as that of the people. The soldiers were not rejecting Jesus' claim to be the Saviour. They only mocked his claim to be a ruler in Caesar's stead.

The apparent reason for D's omission of the blasphemy of the thief is to make the rejection by the people complete. In the normal text, the blasphemy of the thief centers in Jesus' claims of being the Saviour—"Are you the Christ? Save yourself and us" (v. 39); therefore, the words of the blasphemy are omitted by D, and he simply
states that the thief blasphemed. Of all those who blaspheme and mock Jesus in D's text, the people alone touch the very heart of Jesus' proclaimed mission as Saviour; they alone are pictured as rejecting this mission.

As a general rule, one would look at the attitudes of the rulers in order to appraise the attitudes of a city or nation. D uses the people of Jerusalem to portray the attitude of rejection in the passion story. In the previous chapter we noticed that D emphasizes Luke's idea that Jerusalem is the place of enmity by portraying this city as unresponsive to Jesus' ministry. The part played by the people of this city in the passion story of D verifies the observation made concerning Jerusalem in the previous chapter.

During the trial before Pilate, one of the charges pressed against Jesus by the rulers was that of insurrection: "We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding us to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king" (23:2); "But they were urgent, saying, 'He stirs up (ἀνασείω) the people!'" (23:5). In the normal text of Luke this same charge is brought against Barabbas, but it is dropped by D:

Luke 23:25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>απελυσεν δε τον δια σταιν και φονον βεβλημενον εις</td>
<td>απελυσεν δε τον ενεκα φονον βεβλημενον εις</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"He released the man who had been cast into prison because of insurrection and murder, whom they asked for; but Jesus he delivered up to their will."

D allows the charge of insurrection logged against Jesus to stand (23:5), but separates him from the company of Barabbas by dropping the same charge against the criminal. Barabbas is now guilty of murder and Jesus, despite the charge of insurrection, is not. Thus D makes a distinction between the charges brought against the two men and indicates that Jesus' execution is not justified.

The Empty Tomb

The alterations in D that deal with the empty tomb seem to revolve around the attitude of the apostles toward the report brought to them by the women. Why did not the apostles believe? Because the women in D's text could not give the apostles any positive assurance that the resurrection had taken place. All they could offer was circumstantial evidence and an admonition to remember a prediction made by Jesus while he was yet in Galilee.
The first variant in D that relates to the empty tomb is circumstantial evidence of the resurrection:

Luke 23:53; 24:1,2

The first variant in D that relates to the empty tomb is circumstantial evidence of the resurrection:

**Codex B**

53. καὶ καθελὼν ενετυλίξεν αὐτὸ σύνδονι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνηματὶ λαξεύτω οὐκ ην οὐδὲς οὑπώ κείμενος

1. τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββατῶν ὀρθῶν βαθῶς ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα ἡλίαν φεροὺσα αἱ πτοιμασαν αρωματα

2. εὐρὸν δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκύλισμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου

"53. And he took it down and wrapped it in a linen shroud, and laid him in a rock-hewn tomb, where no one had ever yet been laid.

"1. And on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came to the tomb, taking the spices they had prepared.

"2. And they found the stone rolled away from the tomb."

**Codex D**

53. καὶ καθελὼν ενετυλίξεν τὸ σώμα του ιὴν ἐν σύνδονι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ λειτατομημένῳ οὐκ ην οὐπω οὐδὲς κείμενος καὶ δεντος αὐτοῦ επεθηκεν τῷ μνημείῳ λείθον ον μογίς εἰκοσι εκμυλον

1. μια δε των σαββατων ορθου βαθως ηροντο επει το μνημα φαιρουσαι αἱ πτοιμασαν και τινες συν αυταις ελογιζοντο δε εν εαυταις τις αρα αποκυλισει τον λιθον

2. ελθουσα δε ευρον τον λιθον αποκεκυλισμενον απο του μνημειου

"53. And he took down the body of Jesus and wrapped it in a linen shroud, and laid him in a rock-hewn tomb, where no one had ever yet been laid and when he was interred a stone was placed upon the tomb which twenty men could hardly roll.

"1. And on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came to the tomb, taking what they had prepared, and certain others came with them. And they began to reason among themselves, Who will roll the stone away?

"2. And they found the stone rolled away from the tomb."
There are those who immediately see a correlation between this stone described by D and the one that appears in Homer's *Odyssey* (ix.241). Whether or not D borrowed the general dimensions of the stone from Homer is not our concern here. What we are interested in is the fact that the women, conscious of the size of the stone and knowing that a sufficient number of men from their party had not gone to the tomb to move the stone, must have been impressed that something unusual had taken place.

By an omission in the next few verses, D continues to build the case of circumstantial evidence:

Luke 24:5, 6, 7

---

16Cf. Creed, p. 292; Plummer, p. 542; Blass, pp. 185-87.

17T. H. Wier, "The Stone Rolled Away," *Expository Times*, XXIV(1912/13), 284, suggests that Paul may have misunderstood the oral tradition of the women arriving at the tomb, and instead of finding the stone rolled away, they found Peter hastening away (for stone and Peter are identical in Aramaic), thus Paul concluded that Peter was the first to see the resurrected Lord.
Codex B

5. εὐφόβων δὲ γενομένων αὐτῶν καὶ κλεινονουσῶν τα προσώπα εἰς τὴν γην εἰπαν πρὸς αὐτὰς τι ζητείτε τὸν ζωντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν
6. οὐκ εὔτιν ὦδε ἀλλὰ ηγερθῇ μυθήτε ὡς ελαλήσεν υμῖν εἰς ὑν ἐν τῇ γαλειλαίᾳ
7. λεγὼν τὸν ὕλον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐτὶ θείον παραδοθήναι εἰς χείρας ἀνθρώπων αμαρτωλῶν καὶ σταυρώθηναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήναι

"5. And as they were afraid and bowed their faces to the ground they said to them,
Why do you seek the living among the dead?
"6. He is not here, but has risen. Remember how he told you,
yet being in Galilee,
"7. Saying, It is necessary for the Son of Man to be betrayed into the hands of sinful men and to be crucified and raised the third day."

Codex D

5. εὐφόβοι δὲ γενομέναι εκλειναν τα προσώπα εἰς τὴν γην οἱ δὲ εἰπαν πρὸς αὐτὰς τι ζητείτε τὸν ζωντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν
6. μυθότε δε οὐσα ελαλήσεν υμεῖν εἰς ὑν ἐν τῇ γαλειλαίᾳ
7. οτι θείον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήναι εἰς χείρας ανθρώπων καὶ σταυρώθηναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήναι

"5. And being afraid, they bowed their faces to the ground and the men said to them,
Why do you seek the living among the dead?
"6. Remember as much as he told you, yet being in Galilee,
"7. That it is necessary for the Son of Man to be betrayed into the hands of men and to be crucified and raised the third day."

---

v. 5 εὐφόβων δὲ γενομένων αὐτῶν καὶ κλεινονουσῶν] εὐφόβοι
dε γενομέναι εκλειναν, D a c r sy sscp Tatian
+ οἱ δὲ ante εἰπαν, D a c r sy
v. 6 om. οὐκ εὔτιν ὦδε, ἀλλὰ ηγερθῇ, D it
ω] οοσα, D c sy sscp Marcion Tatian
v. 7 om. λεγὼν, D c
om. αμαρτωλῶν, D it

By his omission in v. 6, D removes any direct

---

18 Arndt feels that "... in the MS that was at the basis of D ... the copyist must have striven for the utmost brevity" (p. 483). Metzger (pp. 183-84) says that the
mention of the resurrection. Thus when the women return
to report to the apostles what they have experienced, they
could present the following:

1. The enormous stone had been moved from the
mouth of the tomb (v. 2).
2. The tomb was empty (v. 4).
3. They talked with two men in dazzling apparel
at the tomb (v. 4).
4. These men said, "Why do you seek the living
among the dead?" and "Remember what he said while yet in
Galilee."

The only thing of a relatively positive nature
that the women could report that would support a resurrec-
tion was the words of the two men, "Why do you seek the
living among the dead?" and the appeal to remember the
prediction Jesus made while in Galilee. As a result the
apostles did not believe (v. 11).

Two more variants in the text of D might be traced
to the apostles' unbelief. First is the omission of v. 12:
δο θε νέτρος άνάστας εδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας
βλέπει τὰ ὅθοναι μονὰ καὶ ἀπήλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ
γέγονος ("And Peter arose and ran to the tomb; stooping and
looking in, he saw the linen cloths alone; and he went home
majority of the men working on the United Bible Society's
text preferred to keep the reading.
wondering at what had happened"—Luke 24:12). 19 By the omission of this verse, D maintains a consistency with v. 11 that is lost when the verse is included, i.e. none of the "apostles" (v. 10) believed the report of the women, so no one bothered to go to the tomb to verify it.

But the problem is not solved this easily. For we have v. 24 to deal with, which contains a statement made by the two disciples while walking to Emmaus with the "stranger":

Luke 24:24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀπηλθὸν τίνες τῶν συν ἡμῖν εἰπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ εὐρον οὐτῶς καὶ ἡμᾶς αἱ γυναῖκες εἰπον αὐτὸν δὲ οὐχ εἶδον</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπηλθὸν τίνες εἷς τῶν συν ἡμῖν εἰπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ εὐρον οὐτῶς ὡς εἰπὸν αὐτὸν γυναῖκες αὐτὸν δὲ οὐχ εἶδομεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;And certain ones from among us went to the tomb and found it exactly as the women had said, but they did not see him.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;And certain ones from among us went to the tomb and found it as the women had said, but we did not see him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem in the normal text has long been recognized; v. 12 says that Peter alone went to the tomb while v. 24 indicates more than one person went. This is an additional reason for the position that v. 12 was not part of the original text. We have already indicated that by this omission D sustains the unbelief among the apostles spoken of in v. 11.

However, because in D John precedes Luke in accordance with the Western order of the gospels, D was aware of John's account of both Peter and John going to the tomb (John 20:3-10). Therefore, the omission of Luke 24:12 serves a second purpose, it removes the inconsistency between Luke and John regarding Peter going to the tomb alone.

The normal text of Luke 24:24 would agree with John 20:3-10 (but disagrees with v. 12); therefore, because D eliminates Peter's trip to the tomb, he makes the visit apply to others, i.e. to at least one of the Emmaus disciples and at least one other person. At the same time D remains consistent with the context of Luke's normal text, for the women reported their experience to the "apostles" (v. 10), who did not believe and did not try to verify the report. Those who went to the tomb in D's account were
apparently outside of the circle of the twelve "apostles."
Yet, as we will see presently, those who saw the empty
tomb did not believe either.

Another omission that might very well stem from
the disciples' unbelief is found earlier in v. 3:

Luke 24:3

Codex B
εἰσελθοῦσαί δὲ οὐκ εὐρον
to σῶμα τοῦ Κύριος

"And when they entered
they found not the body
of the Lord Jesus."

Codex D
εἰσελθοῦσαί δὲ οὐκ εὐρον
to σῶμα

"And when they entered
they found not the body."

om. τοῦ Κύριος, D it

Farrar points out that this is the only place where
this term, "the Lord Jesus," can be found in the gospels.20
However, it is found fifteen times in Acts21 and appears
frequently in the epistles. Surveying the passages in
Acts, one infers that the phrase "the Lord Jesus" is a

20 Farrar, p. 358 (except for a single use in the
long ending of Mark 16:19). Those favoring it as being
original: Arndt, p. 483; Creed, p. 293; Farrar, p. 358;
the majority working on the United Bible Society's text,
Metzger, p. 183; Ignace de la Potterie, "Le titre KYRIOS
appliqué à Jésus dans l'évangile de Luc," Mélanges bibli-
ques en hommage an R. P. Béda Rigaux, A. Descamps and
A. de Halleux (eds.) (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), pp. 121-
24; Snodgrass, p. 375. Those who feel it is an interpo-
lation: Geldenhuys, p. 625; Plummer, p. 547; van Oosterzee,
p. 385.

honorific title given to the resurrected Christ. The omission in Luke 24:3 may simply stem from the fact that at that point the resurrection of Jesus was not an object of faith as far as his followers were concerned. He was not yet "the Lord Jesus," as he thus becomes in the later preaching of the apostles in Acts.

Post-Resurrections Appearances

Luke records only two post-resurrection appearances, both of them in Judea and both on the resurrection Sunday, and both have variants in D. The first appearance is to the two disciples as they make their way to Emmaus. On reaching their destination they persuade the "stranger," who had been traveling with them, to remain in their company for the evening:

Luke 24:30,31

Codex B

30. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλίθηναι αὐτοῦ μετὰ αὐτῶν λαβὼν τὸν ἁρτὸν εὐλογησεν καὶ κλάσας επεδίδον αὐτοῖς

31. αὐτῶν δὲ διήνοιχθοσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ επεγνώσαν αὐτόν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀφαντὸς εγένετο απ' αὐτῶν

"30. And it came to pass that while he was sitting at supper with them, taking the bread he blessed

Codex D

30. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλίθηναι αὐτοῦ λαβὼν ἁρτὸν ηὐλογησεν καὶ προσεδίδον αὐτοῖς

31. λαβοντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν ἁρτὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ηὐγνῆσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν καὶ επεγνώσαν αὐτὸν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀφαντὸς εγένετο απ' αὐτῶν

"30. And it came to pass that while he was sitting at supper, taking bread he blessed
and broke it and gave it to them.

"31.

And their eyes were opened and they knew him and he disappeared from them."

There is nothing in the variants themselves that detracts from the record of an appearance by Jesus. Rather, the variants revolve around the disciples' identification of the "stranger." The normal text would lead us to infer that the disciples successfully identified the "stranger" by his mannerisms in the blessing, breaking, and distributing of the bread. In the text of D the general thought is the same, but some of the details are different.

It would seem that by two omissions in v. 30 D was trying to prevent the misunderstanding that this meal with the two Emmaus disciples was the celebration of the Lord's Supper with two followers who were not present when the rite was instituted.²² The presence of the definite

²²Cf. Brown (pp. 75-77), who sees this pericope of the Emmaus disciples as a successful attempt by Jesus to reclaim two disciples that have abandoned their faith in him and left Jerusalem, the place that was symbolic of
article τόν before ἄρτον ("bread"—v. 30) in the normal text gives to this bread the ring of special quality. The sequence of blessing, breaking, and giving recalls the only other scene where these details are given so specifically—the Lord's Supper.

By the omission of the article and the second step of the sequence, "breaking," the danger of misunderstanding is reduced. At the same time D retains Luke's original thought, that Jesus is identified by his mannerism in hosting a meal, even though in this case he is a guest.²³

The reaction of the two disciples to the sudden realization of the identity of their traveling companion and to his sudden disappearance is also changed by D:

Luke 24:32,33,34

Messianic hope and glory between the resurrection and ascension.

²³ Cf. Creed, p. 262.
"32. And they said to each other, Was not our heart burning as he talked to us on the road, as he opened to us the scriptures?
"33. And arising the same hour they returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven gathered together and those who were with them, "34. saying, The Lord has risen indeed, and has appeared to Simon."

v. 32 και εἶπαν πρὸς ἀλληλοὺς ὅτι δὲ εἶπον πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, D καλομένην οὐκ εἰπομένην, D
v. 33 ἀνάστασιν, D c e copSa
v. 34 λέγοντας, D Origen

The implications of the variants in these verses are significant. The alteration in v. 34 is the key to understanding their import. In the normal text, "the eleven and those who were with them" inform the returning Emmaus disciples that the report of the women can be accepted, for now Simon can verify it, having seen the risen Lord himself. D changes the participle from λέγοντας ("saying," accusative plural agreeing with τοὺς ἐνόεσα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, "the eleven and those with them") to λέγοντες ("saying," nominative plural agreeing with the two returning disciples who are the subject of the compound verbs in this verse). Thus it is the two returning disciples who announce to the assembled group in Jerusalem the surety of the Lord's resurrection on the basis of their
experience on the way to Emmaus.

But this change implies that the Lord had appeared to Simon before the two had left for Emmaus. They, as well as the group in Jerusalem, would have been aware of Simon's experience; but in the case of the women's report, apparently no one believed. Therefore, on their return the two are made to blurt out, "The Lord has indeed risen; you can believe Simon and the women, for we too have seen him." By implication, D has materially increased the unbelief of Jesus' followers immediately after the resurrection.

With this in mind the alterations in vv. 32,33 can be understood. After Jesus makes himself known and disappears, the two muse over the veil that has darkened their understanding. The implication of v. 32 is that instead of their hearts burning while Jesus expounded the Scriptures to them along the way, they failed completely to see the correlation between the events of the previous three days and the passages the "stranger" was endeavoring to explain. The veil stemmed from their refusal to believe the report of the women (v. 11) and of Peter (v. 34). When he failed to penetrate the veil by the exposition of Scripture, the "stranger" revealed his true identity.

Upon this revelation the two return to Jerusalem
sorrowing (v. 33D), not because of the appearance of the risen Lord, but in spite of it; for now they castigate themselves for their lack of faith in failing to see the fulfillment of Old Testament Scripture in the events of the previous three days, and in failing to accept the reports of the women and Peter.

The group in Jerusalem has the same veil of unbelief over their hearts that the two Emmaus disciples experienced. But once the two recount their experience D tries to minimize the persistent unbelief, for this is the second reported appearance collaborating the women's report of the empty tomb.

While the two disciples were in the very process of recounting their experience, Jesus appeared to the whole assembled group:

Luke 24:36,37

Codex B

36. ταύτα δὲ αὐτῶν
λαλοῦντων αὐτὸς ἐστὶν
ἐν μεσῷ αὐτῶν καὶ
λέγει αὐτοῖς εἰρήνη

37. ὥρασαντες δὲ
καὶ εἰφόροι γενομένοι
ἐδοκοῦν πνεῦμα δηώρειν

"36. And while they were saying these things, he stood in the midst of them and said, Peace to you.
"37. And they were frightened and being

Codex D

36. ταύτα δὲ αὐτῶν
λαλοῦντων αὐτὸς ἐστάθη
ἐν μεσῷ αὐτῶν

37. αὐτοὶ δὲ πτωθέντες
καὶ εἰφόροι γενομένοι
ἐδοκοῦν φαντάσμα δηώρειν

"36. And while they were saying these things, he stood in the midst of them.
"37. And they were terrified and being
terrified they thought they saw a spirit."
frightened they thought they saw a ghost."

The fear that is recorded in v. 37 of the normal text is somewhat hard to understand in the face of the evidence that has been given to this point.24 However, if we follow D's account, the fear of the assembled group (except for the two Emmaus disciples and Peter) raises no problem, for their hearts are still veiled by unbelief and they truly suppose that they are seeing a spirit or ghost.

D's omission of "and he said, 'Peace to you'" in v. 36 is now calculated to minimize this unbelief.25 For the disciples to react the way they do in v. 37, after the reports of the women, Peter, and the Emmaus disciples, and while having Jesus speak to them at his appearance to quiet their fears, only magnifies the condition of unbelief. Therefore, D minimizes this unbelief by omitting the words spoken by Jesus, words that would otherwise have failed in

24Cf. Benj. W. Bacon, "The Ascension in Luke and Acts," Expositor, VII,7(1909), 255, who observes that this appearance must have been a "first" appearance: "It cannot possibly have been framed to stand after ver. 33-34, in which the two from Emmaus find 'the eleven gathered together and them that were with them, saying, 'The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.'"

25Snodgrass, p. 375.
their intended purpose of quieting the disciples' fears and establishing their faith.

Throughout this and the previous section we have discovered in D a well-developed motif of unbelief up to the point where the two Emmaus disciples tell the Jerusalem group their experience. From this point on D endeavors to minimize the lingering doubt concerning the resurrection.

The Ascension

The last four verses of Luke contain the account of the ascension, which is parallel to the longer account found in Acts 1:6-11. We will observe briefly two omissions in the gospel account:

Luke 24:51,52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>Codex D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. καὶ εὐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτούς διεστὶ απ' αὐτῶν καὶ ανεφερέτο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν</td>
<td>51. καὶ εὐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτοῦς απεστὶ απ' αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνησάντες αὐτὸν ὑπεστρέφαν εἰς Ἰερούσαλημ. . . .</td>
<td>52. καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπεστρέφαν εἰς Ἰερούσαλημ. . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"51. And it came to pass, while he was blessing them, he was parted from them and borne up into heaven. "52. And when they had worshipped him they returned to Jerusalem . . . ."

"51. And it came to pass, while he was blessing them, he was parted from them. "52. And they returned to Jerusalem . . . ."
The omission of Luke's ascension account in D has caused a great deal of discussion. The omission in v. 52 ("when they had worshipped him") seems to be directly tied to the omission in v. 51. The whole problem centers in the apparent discrepancy between Luke and Acts over the time element of the ascension. In Luke it appears that Jesus ascended on the day of the resurrection, while Acts indicates that there was a forty day period between the resurrection and the ascension (Acts 1:3).

Numerous theories have been suggested for the origin of this apparent discrepancy in Luke's normal text:

1. After writing the account in the gospel and presenting the ascension and resurrection as happening on the same day, Luke later discovered another tradition (or evolved it himself) that places the ascension forty days later. The later discovery was worked into Acts 1.26

2. Luke was aware of the forty days separating the resurrection and the ascension but did not mention it in the gospel because it would have disrupted the smoothness of the narrative; therefore, he preferred silence "to

---

a pedantic completeness."  

3. We have in Luke and Acts a twofold interpretation of the same event, one not excluding the other. The gospel presenting a "doxological interpretation" and Acts the "historical and 'pneumatic'" interpretation.  

4. The ascension occurred at the beginning of the forty days of appearances to the disciples. Luke "... interjects in Acts 1:3 a general summary of the appearances to the disciples as having covered a period of 'forty days,'" and "in no way brings out the fortieth day as signalized by any particular occurrence."  

Even though the reading of the longer text presents the difficulty of the apparent contradiction between Luke and Acts, interpreters are presently more inclined to take its reading as original, the shorter text being an


attempt to remove the contradiction. If the shorter text is taken as original, this would mean that Acts is the only book that deals with the ascension (unless the longest ending of Mark is accepted as original). However, the internal evidence of Luke 22:50-53 seems to call for the longer text.

D's omission of προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν ("worshiping him") in v. 52 may be explained easily by saying that it is an attempt to harmonize the account in Luke with the more detailed ascension account in Acts, where there is no mention of the disciples worshiping Jesus at his ascension. The omission in v. 51, καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν ("and he was taken up into heaven"), is not as easily explained.

To say that D omitted the specific statement that Jesus ascended into heaven in an attempt to harmonize Luke with the other synoptic accounts, which have no mention of the ascension, is to ignore the presence of διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν

---

30 Blass, pp. 138-40; Jeremias, p. 151; Snodgrass, p. 375; Streeter, p. 143; van Stempvoort, p. 36; Williams, pp. 51-53; majority of scholars working on the United Bible Society's text; Metzger, pp. 189-90. Those who favor the short reading are: Arndt, p. 501; Creed, p. 301; Geldenhuys, p. 647. Plummer (p. 565) suggests that the variants in vv. 51,52 were not present in the original document, "but it is conceivable that Lk. himself (or Theophilus) may have added them in a second edition of the Gospel, in order to make it quite clear what διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν meant."

31 Cf. Metzger, pp. 189-90 and Blass, pp. 138-40 for a presentation of the arguments in favor of the longer text.
("he was separated from them") in the immediate context. A normal separation between Jesus and his disciples that had no intimation of glory, or a separation that was shrouded in mystery, or that left the disciples bewildered as to what happened to their risen Lord, would not have caused the great joy of v. 52, nor would it have been the reason for their "blessing God" in the temple (v. 53).

It was not D's intent to omit the ascension from Luke. The "He was separated from them" of v. 51 together with the expressions of joy in vv. 52,53 are sufficient for the ascension account in Luke (especially in view of the detailed account of the ascension in Acts). It would appear that D made his omission in v. 51 in the interests of the Christian believers in his own time and in succeeding generations.

The long-awaited parousia of the Lord had not materialized. To guard the Christian community against an attitude of utter abandonment by its Lord, D omitted the phrase that had the disheartening ring of finality, "he was separated from them and was taken up into heaven." It was D's purpose to prevent the rise of a misunderstanding that the Lord had been separated from his church, and this separation was final. It was to prevent the rise of a sense of abandonment that the words "from them" could have produced when followed by "into heaven."
That D had the interest of the community at heart would appear to be verified by an omission in the ascension account of Acts that is almost identical to his variant in Luke: ὁτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναληφθέεις ἀφ’ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ("This Jesus who has been taken up from you into heaven"—Acts 1:11) where εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ("into heaven") is omitted by D 242 gig. D again omits the phrase that specifies the extent of the separation immediately after the statement of the separation (ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ["from them"] in Luke 24:51 and ἀφ’ ὑμῶν ["from you"] in Acts 1:11) thus endeavoring to minimize any danger that this separation might be construed by the church to have a ring of finality.

Conclusion

The following observations can be made as a result of the study of the variants in this chapter:

1. The omission of 22:19b,20 (the symbolism of the wine) would seem to result from D's sensitivity to Gentile reaction. D has shown repeatedly that he was editing Luke with an anti-Judaic bias and a Gentile interest. The omission would certainly minimize an occasion for misunderstanding among Gentile readers.

2. D strengthens the previous observation that Jerusalem is the place of enmity. He does this by showing a more hostile attitude on the part of the people of
Jerusalem toward Jesus during his passion, and by minimizing any indication of hostility toward Jesus as Saviour on the part of the soldiers and the unrepentant thief.

3. Around the empty tomb D develops a motif of unbelief on the part of the disciples. The women report circumstantial evidence of the resurrection and it is not believed by the apostles. Peter's encounter with the resurrected Lord is made to occur before Jesus appears to the Emmaus disciples, and his report is not believed. The Emmaus disciples castigate themselves for their unbelief after Jesus' appearance to them and are the ones who report the certainty of the resurrection to the Jerusalem group. From this point on D begins to minimize the unbelief of the disciples.

4. D omits the direct statement in Luke (and Acts) that Jesus was separated from his followers by going into heaven in an attempt to minimize any misunderstanding that the degree of this separation made it final.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The variant readings investigated in this study suggest that the text of D represents the work of more than a mere copyist. It is too simplistic to say with Kenyon:

Such are some of the more remarkable variants presented by this type of text in this single book of the Acts of the Apostles. In the Gospel of St. Luke they are for the most part less striking, often consisting merely of the omission or insertion of pronouns, the substitution of pronouns for proper names, or vice versa, or the interchange of καὶ and ὥς.¹

Remembering that D is the chief Greek witness of the Western text, it would be inadequate also to say with Hatch:

The reasons which led to the making of the "Western" additions mentioned above are not difficult to discern. First, the reviser or revisers desired to preserve whatever fragments of evangelic tradition could be found in sources other than those Gospels which were generally recognized in all parts of the Church, in order that no saying of Jesus or credible story connected with his life should perish. All such material was precious, and it was believed that a place should be found for it in the revised text of the New Testament. Secondly, the maker or makers of the "Western" text liked a full and smooth text, and they sought to obtain it by means of various editorial

¹Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism, pp. 346-47.
devices. In some cases, however, the desire for smoothness led to omissions.²

Although the observations of Kenyon and Hatch are correct, they fall short of explaining adequately the true nature of D's complex text in Luke. Omissions, additions, and substitutions of various nouns, verbs, and pronouns may be easily noted, but their impact upon the text remains unappreciated until the entire book is examined and it is determined whether an editorial design emerges. Until the methods used in this study were applied to D's text in Luke, its unique readings, as a whole, remained isolated elements that stimulated curiosity, but were not seen as supporting units that would help explain the existence of one another.

The text of D in Luke presents the picture of a copyist working from a manuscript containing the Western text, yet having access to other sources (Tatian and Marcion in particular, and at times showing a knowledge of the Alexandrian text). One would conclude two things about the copyist of D in Luke: (1) he was more than a copier; he was an editor; and (2) the editor of D in Luke worked with the aim of altering or strengthening Luke's tradition in compliance with his theological biases.

From the present study, one may also conclude that

theological biases account for the major portion of D's unique readings in Luke. A frequent tool used by D to develop these biases is harmonization with the other gospels. On other occasions D uses apparent "Tatianisms" and "Marcionite readings" to further his editorial design.

Two major themes emerge from D's variants: (1) the exaltation of Jesus, and (2) an anti-Judaic bias.

Three secondary themes are woven around these two major themes: (1) the two dominant characters in the first three chapters (the mother of Jesus and John the Baptist) are elevated beyond their significance in Luke's normal text; (2) Peter is made to stand out as "first" among the apostles, while the remaining apostles are protected from behavior that is not compatible with their position; and (3) Gentiles are favorably treated.

Finally it must be said that Epp's study of the text of D in Acts and the present study show a relatively consistent pattern of thought running through the variants of D in Luke/Acts.³

Because of the consistent editorial pattern seen in D in Luke/Acts, the remaining gospels in D are now

³Epp (pp. 165-71) found in Acts that the Jewish leaders are presented as more hostile toward Jesus, an anti-Judaic bias is present, there is an attempt to minimize the importance of Jewish institutions, the role of the apostles is magnified, and that there is a favorable attitude toward the Romans.
brought into question. One assumes that a manuscript which shows such marked evidence of editorial work by a copyist in two of its books would also show similar evidence in the remaining books. Should such an investigation show that Luke/Acts received editorial attention exclusive of or different from the remaining books in the manuscript, we would then face a new problem in the history of D's troublesome text.

Further questions arise concerning what the result would be if a major witness of another texttype was examined in a similar way. Would the variants of 1, 13, or Θ, which put these manuscripts in a separate group, show evidence of a particular bias or biases? Could the unusual changes from one texttype to another within the gospels of W have resulted from theological biases? One might also ask, To what degree do variant readings within manuscripts from various centuries reflect the developing theology of the growing church? These questions, of course, remain to be answered.

Although the main approach to textual criticism will continue to be that of counting variants and aligning manuscripts according to the resulting figures, it is hoped that the present study will contribute to a fuller understanding of the nature of D as, perhaps, the most unusual manuscript that stands among the large number of New Testament witnesses.
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