

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

The Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37):
Its Function and Purpose within the Lukan Journey Section

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the
School of Theology and Religious Studies
Of The Catholic University of America
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree
Doctor of Sacred Theology

By

Piotr Blajer

Washington, D.C.

2012

The Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37):
Its Function and Purpose within the Lukan Journey Section

Piotr Blajer, S.T.D.

Director: Frank J. Matera, Ph.D.

This dissertation begins with a history of research. Early Christian writers and the Fathers of the Church tended to interpret the parable of the Good Samaritan allegorically. This method of interpretation remained a major way of reading the parable until the end of the nineteenth century. In the wake of Adolf Jülicher's studies on the parables, however, scholars began to explore the origin of the parable, its classification, as well as its historical background. After this history of research, the first chapter of the dissertation concludes that scholars have not given sufficient attention to the literary setting of the parable of the Good Samaritan within the Lukan journey section.

In the second chapter this dissertation discusses the text and structure of the parable as well as the meaning of "neighbor" in the time of Jesus and the origin of the animosity between the Jews and Samaritans. The chapter concludes that the parable of the Good Samaritan has two major parts, the initial dialogue between the scholar of the law and Jesus (10:25-28) and the parable proper (10:29-37).

The third chapter considers the literary setting of the parable; namely, the Lukan journey section (9:51–19:46). The study of this chapter shows that the placement of the travel notices pointing to Jesus' journey to Jerusalem is not random. They serve to highlight the passages, which remind the reader of the universal scope of salvation. The dissertation

distinguishes between the geographical end of the journey section, the entry into the temple area (19:46), and the final goal of the journey section, which is Jesus' ascension into heaven (24:50-53; Acts 1:6-12). This distinction enables the reader to see salvation as destined for all people regardless of their pedigree or socio-economic status.

The fourth chapter offers a narrative analysis of the parable of the Good Samaritan. The analysis notes that the narrator omits any information that could identify the wounded man. The Samaritan is unable to identify the wounded man, his origin, or social status; nonetheless he chooses to do whatever is necessary to assist him. Thus, the parable of an unnamed man who falls into the hands of the robbers and of a Samaritan traveler who helps him challenges the scholar of the law to accept Jesus' teaching. In this way the scholar finds the answer to his question; one cannot inherit eternal life unless one accepts all people regardless of their origin.

The final chapter shows how the parable of the Good Samaritan picks up the major themes of the journey section and develops them further (Jesus comes to fulfill the law not to abolish it, universal salvation destined for all regardless of their status, and the growing conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders of the people).

This dissertation by Piotr Blajer fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in Sacred Theology approved by Frank J. Matera, Ph.D., as Director, and by John Paul Heil, S.S.D., and Hellen Mardaga, Ph.D., S.T.D., as Readers.

Frank J. Matera, Ph.D., Director

John Paul Heil, S.S.D., Reader

Hellen Mardaga, Ph.D., S.T.D., Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	iii
List of Abbreviations	ix
Chapter One	
History of Research.....	1
1. Introduction.....	1
2. The Allegorical Interpretation.....	1
<i>2.1. Representatives of Patristic Allegorical Interpretation</i>	2
2.1.1. Irenaeus of Lyon	2
2.1.2. Origen	4
2.1.3. Augustine	5
<i>2.2. Ancient Critique of Patristic Allegorical Interpretation</i>	7
2.2.1. Ephrem the Syrian.....	7
2.2.2. John Chrysostom.....	8
<i>2.3. Representatives of Medieval Allegorical Interpretation</i>	9
2.3.1. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio	10
2.3.2. Thomas Aquinas	11
<i>2.4. The Reformers' Critique of Allegorical Interpretations</i>	12
2.4.1. Martin Luther	12
2.4.2. John Calvin	13
3. Modern Period	15
<i>3.1. Historical-Critical Studies</i>	16

3.1.1. Adolf Jülicher (1886).....	16
3.1.2. Joachim Jeremias (1947).....	18
3.1.3. John Dominic Crossan (1973)	20
3.1.4. Jarmo Kiilunen (1989)	22
3.1.5. Luise Schottroff (2006).....	23
3.2. <i>Literary Studies</i>	24
3.2.1. Studies Regarding Context	25
3.2.1.1. Llewellyn Welile Mazamisa (1987).....	25
3.2.1.2. John R. Donahue (1988)	27
3.2.1.3. Greg W. Forbes (2000)	28
3.2.1.4. Ulrich Busse (2005)	30
3.2.2. Studies Regarding Structure	31
3.2.2.1. Dan Otto Via (1967)	31
3.2.2.2. Craig L. Blomberg (1990).....	33
3.2.2.3. Kenneth E. Bailey (2008)	34
3.3. <i>Comprehensive Studies</i>	36
3.3.1. Klyne R. Snodgrass (2008).....	37
4. Conclusion	39
Chapter Two	
Text and Historical Background of the Parable of the Good Samaritan.....	43
1. Introduction.....	43
2. The Limits of the Text	44
3. The Greek Text	46

4. English Translation	47
5. Textual Variants.....	48
5.1. <i>Luke 10:27</i>	48
5.2. <i>Luke 10:29</i>	51
5.3. <i>Luke 10:30</i>	52
5.4. <i>Luke 10:32</i>	53
5.5. <i>Luke 10:36</i>	56
6. The Structure of the Passage.....	57
7. The Historical Background.....	63
7.1. <i>The Commandment to Love God and Neighbor</i>	64
7.1.1. The Old Testament Evidence.....	64
7.1.2. The New Testament Evidence	66
7.2. <i>“Neighbor” at the Time of Jesus</i>	69
7.2.1. The Limits of the Term “Neighbor”	70
7.2.2. The Extension of the Term “Neighbor”	72
7.3. <i>The Samaritans at the Time of Jesus</i>	74
7.3.1. The Samaritans and the Jews in the Biblical Tradition.....	74
7.3.2. The Samaritans and the Jews in Extra-Biblical Sources.....	79
7.3.3. The New Testament Evidence	80
7.3.4. The Consequences of the Relationship between Jews and the Samaritans for the Time of Jesus	82
8. Conclusion	83

Chapter Three

The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Lukan Journey Section	85
1. Introduction.....	85
2. The Remote Context of the Parable of the Good Samaritan.....	85
2.1. <i>The Beginning of the Journey Section</i>	86
2.2. <i>The End of the Journey Section</i>	89
2.3. <i>The Structure of the Journey Section</i>	102
2.3.1. An Evaluation of Some Proposed Structures.....	103
2.3.2. A Narrative Approach.....	109
2.3.2.1. Travel Notices	109
2.3.2.1.1. <i>The Travel Notices at the Beginning and the End of the Journey Section..</i>	110
2.3.2.1.2. <i>The Travel Notices in the Middle of the Journey Section</i>	112
2.3.2.2. An Outline of the Journey Section.....	116
3. The Proximate Context of the Parable of the Good Samaritan.....	122
4. The Immediate Context of the Parable of the Good Samaritan	125
4.1. <i>Return of the Seventy-Two (Luke 10:17-24)</i>	125
4.2. <i>Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38-42)</i>	127
5. Conclusion	129

Chapter Four

A Narrative Analysis of the Parable of the Good Samaritan	133
1. Introduction.....	133
2. A Narrative Analysis.....	134

2.1. <i>The First Part: “Teacher, What Must I Do to Inherit Eternal Life” (10:25-28)</i>	135
2.1.1. The Scholar’s Question (10:25)	135
2.1.2. Jesus’ Counter-Question (10:26)	142
2.1.3. The Scholar’s Reply (10:27)	145
2.1.4. Jesus’ Answer (10:28)	151
2.2. <i>The Second Part: “And Who Is My Neighbor?” (10:29-37)</i>	155
2.2.1. The Scholar’s Question (10:29)	155
2.2.2. The Proper Parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35)	158
2.2.2.1. A Certain Man Fell into the Hands of Robbers (10:30)	159
2.2.2.2. The Priest (10:31)	166
2.2.2.3. The Levite (10:32)	173
2.2.2.4. The Samaritan (10:33)	175
2.2.2.5. Dressing the Man’s Wounds (10:34a)	179
2.2.2.6. Taking the Man into the Inn (10:34b)	182
2.2.2.7. Final Matters (10:35)	183
2.2.3. Jesus’ Counter-Question (10:36)	187
2.2.4. The Scholar’s Reply (10:37a)	191
2.2.5. Jesus’ Answer (10:37b)	196
3. Conclusion	199
Chapter Five	
General Conclusion	204
1. History of Research	204
2. Text and Historical Background of the Parable of the Good Samaritan	205

3. The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Lukan Journey Section	207
4. A Narrative Analysis of the Parable of the Good Samaritan	208
5. The Significance of the Journey Section for Interpreting the Parable	209
6. The Significance of the Parable for Interpreting the Journey Section	214
7. Further Research	218
Bibliography	221

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ACCS	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers. 1946–
<i>Adv. Jud.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Adversus Judaeos</i>
<i>AJBI</i>	<i>Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute</i>
<i>AJT</i>	<i>American Journal of Theology</i>
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
<i>Apoc. Bar.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Baruch</i>
<i>Ass. Mos.</i>	<i>Assumption of Moses</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>AThR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
ATLA	American Theological Library Association
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BAC	Biblioteca de autores cristianos

BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium
BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BiBh</i>	<i>Bible Bhashyam</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>BVC</i>	<i>Bible et vie chrétienne</i>
BWAT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament
BWNT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Neuen Testament
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CB</i>	<i>Cultura bíblica</i>
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CChr.SL	Corpus Christianorum - Series Latina
<i>Comm. Jo.</i>	Origen, <i>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis</i>
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica, New Testament
<i>CTM</i>	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>
<i>Di</i>	<i>Dialog</i>
<i>Doctr. chr.</i>	Augustine, <i>De doctrina christiana</i>

EdF	Erträge der Forschung
<i>EgT</i>	<i>Eglise et théologie</i>
EHS	Europäische Hochschulschriften
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>Enc</i>	<i>Encounter</i>
<i>ETR</i>	<i>Etudes théologiques et religieuses</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FC	Fathers of the Church. Washington, D.C., 1947–
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>Git.</i>	<i>Gittin</i>
<i>Haer.</i>	Irenaeus, <i>Adversus haereses</i>
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>Hom. Luc.</i>	Origen, <i>Homiliae in Lucam</i>
<i>Hom. Matt.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>

<i>Jeev</i>	<i>Jeevadhara</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>J.W.</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish War</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
<i>LB</i>	<i>Linguistica Biblica</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
<i>Mart. Ascen. Isa.</i>	<i>Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah</i>
<i>MSJ</i>	<i>The Master's Seminary Journal</i>
NIBCNT	New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
<i>NIDNTT</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> . Edited by C. Brown. 4 vols. Grand Rapids, 1975–1985
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers

NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>Princ.</i>	Origen, <i>De principiis</i>
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>Pss. Sol.</i>	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>
<i>Quaest. ev.</i>	Augustine, <i>Quaestionum evangelicarum libri II</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RCT</i>	<i>Revista catalana de teologia</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RivB</i>	<i>Rivista biblica italiana</i>
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
<i>Roš Haš.</i>	<i>Roš Haššanah</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
<i>Šabb.</i>	<i>Šabbat</i>
SacPag	Sacra Pagina
<i>Sanh.</i>	<i>Sanhedrin</i>
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>SBFLA</i>	<i>Studii biblici Franciscani liber annus</i>
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>SE</i>	<i>Studia evangelica I, II, III</i> (= TU 73 [1959], 87 [1964], 88 [1964]. etc.)

SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
Str-B	Strack, H. L., and P. Billerbeck. <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</i> . 6 vols. Munich, 1922–1961
<i>SubBi</i>	<i>Subsidia biblica</i>
<i>Super Sent.</i>	Thomas Aquinas, <i>Scriptum super libros Sententiarum</i>
<i>SwJT</i>	<i>Southwestern Journal of Theology</i>
<i>TBT</i>	<i>The Bible Today</i>
<i>TD</i>	<i>Theology Digest</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>TJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TPINTC	TPI New Testament Commentaries
<i>TSK</i>	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
<i>TTZ</i>	<i>Trierer theologische Zeitschrift</i>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WW	<i>Word and World</i>

VC *Vigiliae Christianae*

VT *Vetus Testamentum*

ZNW *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der
älteren Kirche*

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORY OF RESEARCH

1. Introduction

In this study I will provide a history of research on the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). I will identify the main questions biblical exegesis has dealt with, and how these questions have been addressed.

Modern exegesis tends to divide the history of the interpretation of the parables into two periods.¹ The first starts with the preaching of Jesus and terminates at the end of the nineteenth century. The second period begins with the publication of Adolf Jülicher's work and the subsequent discussion that this work provoked. In this study, I will follow this division.

2. The Allegorical Interpretation

The first period of the interpretation of the parables is usually portrayed as the period of allegorical interpretation.² Since allegory conveys a meaning other than the literal, the allegorical interpretation of the parables consisted in revealing their hidden symbolic

¹ Warren S. Kissinger, *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography* (ATLA Bibliography Series 4; Metuchen: Scarecrow, 1979) xiii; Charles W. Hedrick (*Many Things in Parables: Jesus and His Modern Critics* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004] xiv) notes, "since the time of Jesus, the history of parables study has been marked by six major shifts in understanding the parables." At the same time, however, he admits "a truly modern study of the parables did not begin until the end of the nineteenth century with Adolf Jülicher."

² Adolf Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976) 1:56-64; Mary A. Tolbert, *Perspectives on the Parables. An Approach to Multiple Interpretations* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 23; Dmitri Royster, *The Parables. Biblical, Patristic and Liturgical Interpretation* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary, 1997) 34-36; Roland Meynet, *Język przypowieści biblijnych* (Kraków: WAM, 2005) 50-54.

meaning. Early Christian writers, following the example of Jesus and influenced by Greek philosophy and Hellenistic culture, frequently used the allegorical interpretation to explain the parables.³ Thus, they endeavored to go beyond the literal meaning of the text. This procedure was particularly compelling in cases where the characters' actions seemed to be morally questionable.⁴ In antiquity the most prominent center for this kind of interpretation was the Catechetical School of Alexandria. A selection of the most significant works, both in the East and the West, will illustrate this approach and highlight the problems the authors addressed in their inquiry.

2.1. Representatives of Patristic Allegorical Interpretation

2.1.1. Irenaeus of Lyon

Irenaeus of Lyon († 202) was the first early Christian writer to propose some guidelines for interpreting the parables. In his most important work, *Adversus Haereses*, he presented his view on the correct interpretation of the parables.

First, Irenaeus proposed that anyone of a “sound mind who is devoted to piety and the love of truth” can understand the Bible.⁵ In other words, Irenaeus maintained that a daily study of the things, which God placed within the power of mankind, could advance the knowledge of them. Second, he warned that the parables ought not to be adapted to

³ According to the Gospels, Jesus himself explained the parable of the Sower (Mark 4:13-20) and the parable of the Weeds (Matt 13:36-43) allegorically.

⁴ Craig L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990) 30.

⁵ *Haer.* II, 27.

ambiguous interpretations.⁶ He cautioned that subjectivism in interpreting the parables, whereby “every one discovers for himself as inclination leads him,” would lead to absurdity.⁷ If such were the case, continued Irenaeus, “man would always be inquiring, but never finding.”⁸

Irenaeus did not write a commentary on the parables, and he referred to them only incidentally, therefore, it is difficult to ascertain how he would have interpreted the parable of the Good Samaritan. The only instance when he refers to this parable is the section he dedicated to the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Jesus.⁹

In the third book of *Adversus Haereses* Irenaeus refuted the false teaching that the heavenly Christ inhabited the earthly Jesus at the moment of his baptism. Irenaeus noted that “the man, who had fallen among thieves” was commended to the Holy Spirit. In the same place, he hinted that the Good Samaritan who saw the man, had compassion on him, and bound his wounds was Christ himself.

Irenaeus, who maintained that Scripture and the parables were clear and did not need the use of allegory to explain them, did not refrain from using allegory. He presented the Samaritan as Jesus and the innkeeper as the Holy Spirit.¹⁰ Since he only incidentally refers to

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., III, 17.

¹⁰ Riemer Roukema (“The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity,” *VC* 58 [2004] 60) notes, “the fact that Irenaeus refers to the story of the Good Samaritan only in passing, without accounting for its allegorical interpretation, implies that he considers it as self-evident.”

the parable, however, it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which he accepted an allegorical interpretation.

2.1.2. Origen

Whereas Ireaneaus only inadvertently used allegory, Origen († 253) employed it more freely and naturally. He proposed that there were three levels in interpreting the Scripture.¹¹ The first level was bodily: the historical and literal sense of the text. Origen compared the second level to the soul: the moral sense of the text. Finally Origen called the third level, the only one able to disclose the true meaning of the text, the spiritual. He held that Scripture is full of mysteries, and exegetes need to decipher them in order to unveil their hidden truth. Consequently, he strove “to transform the sensible gospel into a spiritual one.”¹² Since the truth was hidden in the third spiritual level, Origen tended toward an allegorical interpretation of the parables.

Origen inherited the explanation of the parable of the Good Samaritan from a certain unnamed presbyter.¹³ In this exposition, almost every element of the parable received an allegorical meaning. For example, the man who was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho was Adam. Jerusalem represented paradise or heaven, and Jericho the world. The wounds represented man’s disobedience. The robbers who attacked, stripped, beat and left the man half-dead represented the hostile powers of the world. Even the priest, the Levite, and the

¹¹ *Princ.* IV, 1.

¹² *Comm. Jo.* I, 10.

¹³ Many ventured to establish the identity or at least provenience of this presbyter, but the results are rather unsatisfactory. Antonio Orbe (*Parábolas Evangélicas en San Ireneo* [BAC; Madrid: La Editorial Católica, 1972] 137-39) concluded that the presbyter must have preceded Origen and probably lived in the second century. Roukema (“The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity,” 62) accepts the results of Orbe’s study.

Samaritan had a symbolic meaning. The first two personified the law and the prophets, whereas the Samaritan was Christ who came down to help the wounded man. The inn where the wounded man was brought symbolized the Church that welcomed and accepted all who wished to enter. The two denarii given to the innkeeper represented the Father and the Son. Finally the Good Samaritan's promise to return and repay all the innkeeper might spend were understood as the Lord's promise to come at the end of time.¹⁴

Origen agreed, for the most part, with the interpretation given by the presbyter. However, he made some changes and additions. For example, he identified the robbers with the false prophets who came before Jesus. The wounds inflicted were not only disobedience but vices and sins. Finally, in Origen's opinion, not every human being goes down from Jerusalem to Jericho or, using allegorical language, not every human being falls.¹⁵

2.1.3. Augustine

The Catechetical School of Alexandria and its prominent leaders like Clement and Origen was not the only center where the allegorical interpretation of the parables prospered. Western Christianity had also theologians who skillfully employed allegory. The representatives of the Western Church not only kept pace with the allegorical interpretation proposed by the Alexandrian School, they also reached new levels of allegorization. One of the most notable representatives of allegory in the Western Church was Augustine of Hippo.

¹⁴ *Hom. Luc.* XXXIV, 3.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, XXXIV, 4-9.

Augustine († 430) frequently used the parable of the Good Samaritan in his works.¹⁶ Some of these references were short and simple. Others were more elaborate and complex. For example, in *De doctrina christiana*, Augustine briefly noted that Christians should behave like the Samaritan and succor everyone in need of compassion.¹⁷ Apart from several references to the Good Samaritan and his action, Augustine provided a fuller exposition of this parable in the second book of the *Quaestionum Evangelicarum*.¹⁸ In this work he also conferred a symbolic meaning on almost every element of this parable. For the most part Augustine's exposition resembles the interpretation proposed by Origen. Augustine only occasionally departed from Origen by attributing a new meaning to some elements of the parable.¹⁹

The allegorical reading of the parable was apt for preachers and caught the attention of the audience. Nevertheless, it was also problematic. For example, only Augustine knows how the innkeeper of the parable became the Apostle Paul. Consequently, Christians and

¹⁶ Roland Teske, "The Good Samaritan (Lk 10:29-37) in Augustine's Exegesis," in Frederick Van Fleteren and Joseph C. Schnaubelt (eds.), *Augustine: Biblical Exegete* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001) 347-67.

¹⁷ *Doctr. chr.* I, 30. This usage indicates that for Augustine the parable had a clear moral lesson that ought to be imitated by all.

¹⁸ *Quaest. ev.* II, 19.

¹⁹ According to Augustine (*ibid.*), the man going down represented Adam and by extension the whole human race. Jerusalem was the celestial city from which Adam fell, whereas Jericho represented his mortality. The thieves who attacked the man represented the devil and his angels who deprived the man of his immortality. The wounds were the sins of the man that needed to be forgiven. Commenting on why the man was left half-dead, Augustine explained that only the part of man corrupted by sin was dead; his soul was still intact and alive. The priest and the Levite were understood as the Old Testament, which was not able to bring salvation, whereas the Samaritan personified the Lord. The dressing of the wounds performed by the Samaritan signified the remission of sins, the pouring of the oil was the consolation of good hope, and the wine denoted the exhortation to action of a fervent spirit. For Augustine the inn represented the Church where Christians, travelers on their pilgrimage to eternal homeland, could find rest. The next day was the resurrection of the Lord, while the denarii were understood as the precepts of charity and the promise of future life. Finally, Augustine identified the innkeeper of the parable as the Apostle Paul. See the discussion in D. Sanchis, "Samaritanus ille. L'exégèse augustinienne de la parabole du Bon Samaritan," *RSR* 49 (1961) 406-25.

theologians realized that allegorical interpretation could not be the only way to clarify the meaning of the parables. Moreover, the allegorical approach read the parable apart from its context and focused primarily on interpreting each element of the parable as if it needed to be unveiled. At the same time, commentators neglected the rest of the parable and its message.

2.2. Ancient Critique of Patristic Allegorical Interpretation

Although the allegorical reading of the parables was widely practiced among early Christian writers, authors such as Ephrem the Syrian and John Chrysostom preferred a more literal reading of the parables.

2.2.1. Ephrem the Syrian

Ephrem the Syrian († 373) was one of the most prolific writers of the Syrian tradition. He attempted to expose the literal meaning of the Gospel and the internal dynamic of the text the parables included.²⁰ Commenting on the parable of the Good Samaritan, he noted that the statement, “a man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho,” was a clear indication that the wounded man was a Jew. In Ephrem’s opinion, if the man had not been a Jew, the whole parable would have lost its meaning.²¹ The Jewish identity of the traveler was crucial for the parable. If the wounded man had not been a Jew, the priest and the Levite would have been excused from helping him. This reasoning led Ephrem to the conclusion that the main point of the parable was the theme of compassion. The final answer of the lawyer, “the one who

²⁰ Roukema ("The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity," 71) notes, however, that in *Hymns on the Church* Ephrem applied the role of the Samaritan to Jesus. At the same time the author admits that Ephrem “does not have a detailed allegory.” Therefore it is safe to say that he did not make intentional recourse to the allegorical interpretation.

²¹ *Commentary on the Diatessaron*, XVI, 23.

had compassion” (Luke 10:36), made this clear. “Being a neighbor” was not limited to one’s compatriot but included all.²²

2.2.2. John Chrysostom

John Chrysostom († 407), one of the greatest and most influential preachers of the early Church, followed a similar method. In a homily on the Gospel of Matthew, he noted that Jesus taught in parables in order to get his audience’s attention, to provoke minds, and to make his discourses more vivid.²³ Chrysostom maintained that the parables should not be interpreted allegorically since such an interpretation would result in absurdities. In his opinion the interpretation of the parables should lead to the discovery of a single idea that the parable conveyed.²⁴

John Chrysostom commented on the parable of the Good Samaritan in a series of discourses against Judaizing Christians. To help his contemporaries, he presented the Samaritan as a model for all Christians. He invited his audience to imitate the Samaritan who showed concern for the wounded man. John explained that the Samaritan, who had pity on the wounded man and took him into the inn, might have been brought to court and held responsible for murder. The Samaritan, however, did not fear this since he was motivated by a desire to help the man in need. If the Samaritan was kind and gentle, Christians ought to help their own who are in much greater need.²⁵

²² Ibid., XVI, 24.

²³ *Hom. Matt.* XLIV, 3.

²⁴ Ibid., XLIV, 4.

²⁵ *Adv. Jud.* VIII, 9-10.

Although John Chrysostom explained the parable more literally than the Alexandrines, he did not completely escape the use of allegory. He called the Jews, who tempted the Christian community to follow the Jewish customs, more savage than highwaymen. They have not stripped their victims or inflicted wounds, as did the robbers in the parable, but they harmed their victims' souls and left them for dead.²⁶

The literal interpretation of the parable as practiced by Ephrem and John Chrysostom was rather limited. They did not deal with questions about the context of the parable, its internal structure, or its connection to other passages. Questions regarding the origin of the parable, the circumstances in which it originated, and its first audience were not at the center of their investigation. Despite the fact that their literal interpretation of the parable was rather limited, Ephrem and John Chrysostom made an important advance by noting the ethnic background of the victim. This observation opened the way to understanding the plot of the passage.

2.3. Representatives of Medieval Allegorical Interpretation

Medieval interpretation of the Scripture continued to employ allegory in the exposition of the parables.²⁷ However, what distinguishes the medieval approach to the parables from the ancient approach is that writers, guided by the needs of their time, used the allegorical interpretation of the parables to explain the significance of the sacraments.²⁸ Only

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Stephen L. Wailes, *Medieval Allegories of Jesus' Parables* (Barkley: University of California Press, 1987) 14-23.

²⁸ Kissinger, *The Parables of Jesus*, 41.

occasionally did writers such as Bonaventure or Thomas Aquinas engage in a more literal interpretation of the parables and substitute another approach for the allegorical. This does not mean, however, that medieval theologians completely abandoned the allegorical interpretation of the parables for a more literal one. They continued using allegory, though not to the same extent as the early Christian writers.

2.3.1. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio

Bonaventure of Bagnoregio († 1274), a medieval scholastic theologian and philosopher, is best known for his theological, philosophical, and hagiographical works. He also wrote a commentary on the Gospel of Luke in which he interpreted the parable of the Good Samaritan literally, verse by verse. Bonaventure's approach is noteworthy, for he made frequent use of other passages of the Scripture in order to support his exegesis, an approach that was rarely practiced in the exposition of the parable. A few examples will give a sense of his innovative work.

According to Bonaventure, the man going down from Jerusalem to Jericho was alone and fell into the hands of the robbers, thereby recalling what Qohelet wrote, “woe to the person who is alone. When he falls he has no one to lift him” (Qoh 4:10).²⁹ The Samaritan who stopped to help the man in need was moved with mercy in accord with what Job said, “My soul had compassion on the poor” (Job 30:25).³⁰ The Samaritan used oil to ease the pain

²⁹ Robert J. Karris (ed.), *Saint Bonaventure's Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (St. Bonaventure: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2001) 381.

³⁰ Ibid.

and wine to cleanse the wounds (Sir 38:7) in accord with advice found in Sirach.³¹ Finally, Bonaventure continued, the two denarii given to the innkeeper might have been all the Samaritan could spare at this time. If so, the Samaritan was following the teaching, “to the extent that you can, be merciful” (Tob 4:8-9).³²

Having explained the literal sense of the parable, Bonaventure alerted his readers that there was also a spiritual sense of the text. The spiritual exposition conducted by Bonaventure recalls the approach of the Church Fathers, especially Augustine. Influenced by the needs of his time, Bonaventure remembered the significance of the sacraments. He concluded that wine and oil used to treat the wounds symbolized the grace of the sacraments.³³

2.3.2. Thomas Aquinas

Thomas Aquinas († 1274) influenced both theology and biblical exegesis. Although he is best known for his *Summa Theologica*, he also authored the *Catena Aurea*, a verse-by-verse commentary and compilation of the comments of the Church Fathers. In this work Aquinas reported all of the major allegorical interpretations of the Fathers, including those on the parable of the Good Samaritan.

The *Catena Aurea* is not the only work of Aquinas in which he commented on the parable of the Good Samaritan. In his *Commentary on the Master’s Prologue to the Sentences*, Thomas acknowledged that the “Samaritan” stands for God and the name

³¹ Ibid., 385.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid., 391.

Samaritan means guardian. Furthermore, he proposed that “half-dead” meant that the man was robbed of grace by sin and wounded in his natural powers. Finally, the “two denarii” in Aquinas’ interpretation represents the two covenants.³⁴

The way Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas interpreted the parable of the Good Samaritan indicates that they did not reject the use of allegory. On the contrary, they valued the various allegorical interpretations of the Church Fathers and ventured to harmonize them with a literal interpretation of the parable. The literal interpretation they practiced, however, was partial and sought to address the needs of their time more than the actual problems of the passage. In other words, they did not give attention to the immediate context of the parable or to its background. Moreover, questions regarding time, audience, and the circumstances of the Good Samaritan parable did not concern them.

2.4. The Reformers’ Critique of Allegorical Interpretations

2.4.1. Martin Luther

In summarizing Martin Luther’s († 1546) approach to parables, we must distinguish two periods. First he interpreted the parables allegorically. He even became “a master of the allegories.” Later, however, he considered allegories “nothing but rubbish.”³⁵ This division, however, is in fact more conventional than actual.

³⁴ Thomas P. Mandonnet and Marie F. Moos (eds.), *Thomae Aquinatis Scriptum Super Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi Episcopi Prissiness* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1929) 1:20.

³⁵ Jaroslav J. Pelikan, Oswald C. Hilton and Helmut T. Lehman (eds.), *Luther’s Works* (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1955) 54:47.

In a sermon on the dropsical man healed on the Sabbath, Luther used the literal approach to the parable of the Good Samaritan to make a moral imperative.³⁶ He observed that the man must have fallen into the hands of the robbers on the Sabbath. The priest and the Levite, for the sake of preserving the Sabbath repose, did not stop to help the wounded and half-dead man.³⁷ In his conclusion Luther reminded the audience that the observance of the Sabbath does not excuse anyone from helping others. Christians should not pass by when their neighbor or a fellow Christian is in serious need. If they pass by as the priest and the Levite did, they will have murdered their brother.³⁸

Luther did not completely discard the allegorical interpretation of parables, even in his later works. In the last sermon he delivered in Wittenberg in 1546, he applied allegory to explain the passage of the Good Samaritan. He noted that even after baptism there was still much of Adam in each person. Adam sinned, fell among robbers, and implanted sin in all his descendants. If the Samaritan, that is Christ, had not come, “we should all have had to die.”³⁹

2.4.2. John Calvin

Whereas Luther was not able to disown the allegorical interpretation altogether, John Calvin († 1564) managed to do so. His *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists* shows that his approach to the parables was characterized by a rational interpretation and absence of

³⁶ Kissinger, *The Parables of Jesus*, 44.

³⁷ Pelikan, *Luther's Work*, 51:340-41.

³⁸ Ibid., 51:344.

³⁹ Ibid., 51:373.

allegory. Calvin criticized and refuted the use of allegory as absurd and, at the same time, he sought to summarize the main point of each parable he commented on.⁴⁰

Commenting on the parable of the Good Samaritan, Calvin made a series of important remarks. First, he recognized that the setting of this parable echoes other synoptic accounts, namely Matt 22:34-40 and Mark 12:28-34. For Calvin, this resemblance did not exclude the possibility that all three accounts may have originally come from the same narrative. All three evangelists agree that the scribe asked Jesus a question in order to test him. Second, since the disposition of the questioner varied in each of these accounts, Calvin suggested that Jesus might have been repeatedly tested on the subject of true righteousness.⁴¹

Having settled the question on the origin of the Lukan episode and its relationship to the other Synoptic accounts, Calvin elucidates the meaning of the parable. He begins by reminding his readers of the socio-cultural differences between Jews and Samaritans and their mutual hatred. This procedure permits him to conclude that the main point of the parable is to illustrate that the Samaritan, who was considered a stranger, became a neighbor. God has bound all together for the purpose of assisting each other.⁴²

In the course of explaining the parable, Calvin recalls the allegorical interpretation of the parable that was in vogue at his time. However, he rejects such an interpretation as

⁴⁰ Kissinger, *The Parables of Jesus*, 48.

⁴¹ David W. Torrance and A. W. Morrison (eds.), *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries: A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke: And the Epistles of James and Jude* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 134.

⁴² Ibid.

contrived. In his words, the allegorical interpretation was “too absurd to deserve refutation.”⁴³

Both Martin Luther and John Calvin approached the parable of the Good Samaritan in a similar way. Both admitted that the allegorical interpretation of the parable had its faults and should not be practiced. Both claimed that the parable needed a new approach that would unveil its full meaning. Both saw the need for a change and worked in a similar way. However, only Calvin was able to point to a new direction. His observation that the setting of the parable of the Good Samaritan resembles other Synoptic passages will become an important issue in later studies.

3. Modern Period

Having examined authors who championed the allegorical interpretation of the parable and those who attempted to initiate a more literal interpretation, it is time to examine how some recent studies approach the parable of the Good Samaritan. This modern period of parable research started with Adolf Jülicher,⁴⁴ a German scholar and professor of the University of Marburg who sought to end the allegorical interpretation of parables in order to recover their original meaning.

In the Patristic and Medieval periods, authors could choose between an allegorical interpretation and a literal approach of the parables. Many preferred the first approach. In the modern period, the progress of the historical-critical method enabled researchers to look at

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Kissinger (*The Parables of Jesus*, 72) notes, “the name of Adolf Jülicher looms like a colossus in the history of interpretation of Jesus’ parables.” Hedrick (*Many Things in Parables*, xiv) also recognizes that Jülicher initiated modern studies on the parables.

the parables from a new perspective. Studies on the parables flourished and scholars rediscovered the parables anew. Theologians, scripture scholars, and lay readers began to appreciate the parables not only for their message but for their literal value as well. Thus, there was a significant growth in the literature on the parables. The parable of the Good Samaritan, along with the parable of Prodigal Son, became one of the most commented parables. Since it is impossible to evaluate all of the works that have been written in this period, I will only choose those that show how the understanding of the parable changed and matured along the way. Scholarly research was now primarily concerned with the background of the parable and its composition. This study of background centered on the origin of the parable, its primary audience, and its connection with other passages. Research on the composition concentrated on the unity of the parable, its structure, and its context.

3.1. Historical-Critical Studies

3.1.1. Adolf Jülicher (1886)

Adolf Jülicher's foremost contribution to the study of the parables was his recognition that parabolic speech has two basic forms, simile (*Vergleichung*) and metaphor (*Metaphor*).⁴⁵ Although both forms were used to compare persons, things or events, there was an essential difference in how they functioned. "Simile" needed no further explanation, for it was self-evident and self-explanatory. "Metaphor," on the other hand, states one thing but means

⁴⁵ The first part of the commentary was published in 1886 and dealt primarily with the nature and purpose of the parables (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu in Allgemeinen*). A decade later, 1899, it was followed by a second part (*Auslegung der Gleichnisreden der drei ersten Evangelien*), which contained a systematic exposition of all the parables classified under three categories. Since its first publication, both parts of this work have seen numerous editions. In the present study I am following the one-volume edition: Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976).

another; therefore, it requires additional clarification.⁴⁶ Contrary to what the allegorical interpretation sought, Jülicher suggested that there was only one point of comparison between a parable and what it represented. This point should be given the widest and most general application. Thus, Jülicher argued that there was no need to decode the meaning of each element of the parable as if it were a cryptogram.⁴⁷ The parable had a meaning as a whole story. It was not a collage of elements that the interpreter had to decode.

Jülicher divided the parables into three groups. This innovative distinction shaped biblical studies on the parable of the Good Samaritan for decades. According to Jülicher the parabolic material found in the Synoptic Gospels could be classified into three different groups: similitude, parable, and example stories.⁴⁸ Jülicher assigned the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37), the Rich Fool (12:6-21), the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19-31), the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14) to the third group. According to Jülicher these parables were as clear and intelligible as they could be. They needed no further exposition, only application.⁴⁹

Jülicher observed that the final outcome of the story of the Good Samaritan was inconclusive. Questions as to whether or not the wounded man got better, or whether the Samaritan came back to pay what he promised, were irrelevant. The lack of answers to these questions did not prevent the lawyer from formulating the final verdict: the neighbor was the

⁴⁶ Ibid., 1:52-53.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 2:1-3.

⁴⁹ Jülicher (ibid., 1:114) notes, “sie vertragen keine Deutung, sie sind so klar und durchsichtlich wie möglich, praktische Anwendung wünschen sie sich.”

one who treated the wounded man with mercy. Jülicher thought it was irrelevant to investigate why the priest and the Levite passed by without helping the wounded man. All that mattered was the outcome of the narrative: the Samaritan stopped to assist the man in dire need.⁵⁰ The story, therefore, was intended to illustrate a general principle of self-sacrifice and unconditional love.⁵¹

3.1.2. Joachim Jeremias (1947)

Joachim Jeremias, professor of New Testament Studies at the University of Göttingen, continued the innovative work on the parables initiated by Adolf Jülicher. Today Jeremias is primarily known for his insightful works on the history of the Holy Land and his reconstruction of the milieu of the first century Palestine in all its complexity, but he also made a valuable contribution to understanding the New Testament and its language.⁵²

Studying the parables, Jeremias recognized that Adolf Jülicher had made an important contribution.⁵³ He ended the era of the allegorical interpretation of the parables, and he opened the way to investigate the original setting of the parables. Jeremias admitted that the

⁵⁰ Ibid., 2:586-88.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Joachim Jeremias published many books. His most important works are: *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu: Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1923), *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935), and *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (ATANT 11; Zürich: Zwingli, 1947), *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums* (KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980). In this study I am using an English translation based on the sixth German edition published in 1962: *The Parables of Jesus* (New York: Scribner, 1963).

⁵³ Jeremias (ibid.) also quotes Charles H. Dodd (*The Parables of the Kingdom* [London: Nisbet, 1935]). Dodd, however, limited his enquiry to the parables of the kingdom; therefore, he did not comment on the parable of the Good Samaritan. The only time Dodd mentioned the parable of the Good Samaritan was to give an example of the allegorical interpretation as practiced by Augustine or to argue that many parables had a climatic series of three, which was congenial to parables in the same way as it was to folk-tales.

parables “have a double historical setting,” the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* and the *Sitz im Leben* of the primitive community.⁵⁴ Jesus delivered parables in specific situations to address concrete issues during his ministry. In a second stage, the parables circulated in the primitive community and only later were written down. Since the parables have this double setting, the task of exegesis is to recover their original setting and discover what Jesus meant when he told each parable. Jeremias noted that since some parables were told so vividly, it was natural to assume that they may have developed out of actual events.⁵⁵ At the same time he acknowledged that the parables had undergone a long and complex process of editing. In order to recover the original meaning of the parables, then, one must take this process of transformation into account.⁵⁶

Based on the linguistic evidence, Jeremias assigned the parable of the Good Samaritan, along with several other parables exclusive to Luke, to a pre-Lukan tradition. He acknowledged that the parable (Luke 10:30-37) and the introductory verses (10:25-28) were not necessarily parallel to the question about the greatest commandment (Mark 12:28-34; Matt 22:34-40). Jesus, like many great teachers, might have repeated himself on different occasions. Jeremias found it surprising that a lawyer asked a layman, Jesus, what he must do in order to obtain eternal life. Nonetheless, he admitted that this question may have been the

⁵⁴ Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 23.

⁵⁵ Jeremias (*ibid.*, 23 note 2) quotes the parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-8), the Tares among the Wheat (Matt 13:24-30) and the Burglar (Matt 24:43-44). It is also possible that the same applies to two other parables, the Rich Fool (Luke 12:16) and the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-37).

⁵⁶ Jeremias (*ibid.*, 23-114) proposed ten principles of transformation: (1) translation into Greek, (2) representational changes, (3) embellishment, (4) influence of the Old Testament and of folk-story themes, (5) change of audience, (6) hortatory use of the parables by the Church, (7) influence of the Church's situation, (8) allegorization, (9) collection and conflation of parables, (10) setting.

original setting of the parable for two reasons. First, the teaching of Jesus might have disturbed the lawyer's conscience. Second, at the time of Jesus, the term πλησίον (neighbor) was in dispute. Various groups, Pharisees, Essenes and Sadducees, interpreted it differently. Some considered "neighbor" to refer to all Jews and proselytes, whereas others excluded from this category non-Pharisees, the sons of darkness, heretics, or even personal enemies.⁵⁷ Jeremias observed that according to "a triadic form of popular stories," the audience would have expected the third character of the story to be an Israelite layman instead of a Samaritan.⁵⁸ Jesus' choice of a Samaritan, a member of a hated and hostile community, must have been intentional.

Joachim Jeremias' studies on the language of the parable and its original setting are a valuable contribution to understand the parable. Since each parable has a double setting, studies on the parable of the Good Samaritan must keep in mind a long process of transmission and all the changes such a process entails.

3.1.3. John Dominic Crossan (1973)

Joachim Jeremias' study on the origin of the parables and their language enabled John Dominic Crossan to compare Jesus' parables to those found in rabbinical circles.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Ibid., 202-03.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 204.

⁵⁹ John D. Crossan, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973) 57-66; idem, "The Good Samaritan towards a Generic Definition of Parable," *Semeia* 2 (1974) 82-112. Several scholars have compared the parable of the Good Samaritan to the parables found in rabbinical circles: David R. Aus, *Weihnachtsgeschichte, Barmherziger Smarter, Verlorener Sohn. Studien zum ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1988) 67-84; Brad H. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching* (New York: Paulist, 1989) 45-48; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and Rabbinic Parables, Proverbs and Prayers," in idem (ed.), *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1995) 381-406.

According to Crossan, although there was a certain correspondence, there was also a difference. The rabbinical parables were often associated with a specific text of Scripture, whereas the parables of Jesus did not primarily serve to illustrate a text of Scripture. Crossan divided the parables into three categories: parables of advent, reversal, and action. In this division, the parable of the Good Samaritan belongs to the second category, parables of reversal.⁶⁰

The division proposed by Crossan reopens the question of the correct classification of the passage.⁶¹ Crossan admits that the Good Samaritan story could be understood as an example story. At the same time, however, he notes there is no certitude that this was its original literary setting. The present setting might have been original, but it might also be the work of a pre-Lukan tradition, or Luke himself. Two arguments—the absence of the parable in Mark and a diverse usage of the term “neighbor” both in the Lukan context and in the Lukan parable—support the hypothesis that the parable’s present literary context is not original. The literary differences and relationship to the double love commandment of the Synoptic tradition would be explained if there existed two versions of the same episode—“Q” and the Markan version.

Crossan maintains that two originally separated units (Luke 10:25-28 [29] and 10:30-36 [37]) were combined at some point. The common, yet diverse theme of “neighbor,” played a unifying role. Crossan believes that the unification was accomplished in a pre-

⁶⁰ Crossan, *In Parables*, 57-66.

⁶¹ Crossan (*ibid.*, 57) quotes the works of Joachim Jeremias, Eta Linnemann, Geraint V. Jones, Norman Perrin and Dan Otto Via. He notes that the only “striking exception” in this classification was Dodd who, however, did not discuss any of the example stories.

Lukan tradition. Luke preserved this unified tradition because of his special interest in the Samaritan mission.⁶²

Crossan thinks that the original parable, proclaimed by Jesus and addressed primarily to Jews in a Jerusalem setting, lost its impact once it was proclaimed to a Gentile audience. In a Gentile community the term “Samaritan” did not have the same connotation as it had for a Jewish community. As a result of this transmission process, a metaphorical level of the parable was lost. Not all of the teaching, however, became incomprehensible. The morally good action of the protagonist became an example to follow.⁶³

3.1.4. Jarmo Kiilunen (1989)

The discussion on the *Redaktionsgeschichte* of the parable of the Good Samaritan was opened anew in 1989 when Jarmo Kiilunen surveyed the theme of the double love commands in Mark 12:28-34 and its parallels.⁶⁴ In doing so, he took up a long discussed source-critical problem: the relationship between the double love commandment in Mark 12:28-34 and its parallel passages in Matthew 22:34-40 and Luke 10:25-37. In his opinion, the Two Source theory does not satisfactorily address the minor agreements. Having identified the problem, Kiilunen offers an exhaustive survey of the Matthean and Lukan version of the commandment.

⁶² Ibid., 60.

⁶³ Ibid., 64-66.

⁶⁴ Jarmo Kiilunen, *Das Doppelgebot der Liebe in Synoptischer Sicht: Ein Redaktionskritischer Versuch über Mk 12,28 - 34 und Parallelen* (Helsinki: Tiedeakat, 1989).

Kiilunen argues that the parable of the Good Samaritan is a unified Lukan masterpiece. The parable reveals Luke's theology and his peculiar interest in the poor, the needy, and those on the margins of society. At the same time it prepares the audience for a later mission in Samaritan territory. According to Kiilunen, there is no need to propose the existence of a source other than the Gospel of Mark and its double love command for the composition of the parable.⁶⁵

3.1.5. Luise Schottroff (2006)

The historical-critical studies proposed by Crossan on the parables of Jesus and their Jewish background found a continuation in the socio-historical analysis of the parable conducted by Luise Schottroff, a German scripture scholar. Schottroff does not believe that the lawyer's question should be subjected to an anti-Jewish reading. On the contrary, she says that the lawyer asked Jesus "to test the man he has chosen to be his teacher."⁶⁶ In this perspective the dialogue between the lawyer and Jesus looks more like a learned discussion between pupil and teacher that corresponds to Jewish tradition. According to Schottroff, this discussion fits well with the first century dispute on compassion as the expression of God's love and the practice of righteous deed. As a support, Schottroff quotes two texts on the care of the sick from Midrash *Leviticus Rabbah*.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 123-25. His assessment on the origin of the parable is contrary to what Gerhard Sellin postulates. Sellin ("Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: die Erzählung vom barmherzigen Samariter (Lk 10,25-37)," *ZNW* 66 [1975] 19-60) maintains that the parable of the Good Samaritan is the fruit of Luke's redaction.

⁶⁶ Luise Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006) 132.

Schottroff also considers why the priest and the Levite passed by without helping the man. She notes that their failure has often been interpreted in an “anti-Jewish fashion.”⁶⁷ The lack of charity on the part of both is considered to be a critique of first century Judaism. She however, does not share this view. On the contrary, she notes that apart from some negative statements about priests, Jewish literature and the Gospels in general do not criticize the priests or the Levites. Therefore, their presence in this parable serves to contrast their actions, or more precisely lack thereof, and the action of the Samaritan. The failure of the priest and the Levite to assist the wounded man prepares the audience for the final command, namely, “Go and do as the Samaritan did.” In other words, the audience should not look away, or pass by, as the priest and the Levite did, but should imitate the good example set by the Samaritan and put into practice the teaching on love.⁶⁸

3.2. Literary Studies

Historical-critical studies on the parables led scripture scholars to discover the originality of the parables. At the same time as historical-critical studies toiled to recover the original situation in which Jesus delivered the parable of the Good Samaritan, new literary and synchronic approaches that highlighted the literary value of the parable arose. Whereas diachronic studies investigate the parable in order to recover its historical development, synchronic studies focus on the parable in its present literary setting and attempt to analyze literary connections that unify the passages. Literary and synchronic studies on the parable of the Good Samaritan, then, focus primarily on the context and structure of the passage.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 135.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

3.2.1. Studies Regarding Context

The studies on the context of the parable of the Good Samaritan tend to discover what unites the parable of the Good Samaritan with the rest of the Gospel.

3.2.1.1. Llewellyn Welile Mazamisa (1987)

In her doctoral dissertation Llewellyn Welile Mazamisa studied the theme of “beatific comradeship.”⁶⁹ Her history of the research on the parable brings her to the conclusion that “profanity in parabolic interpretation has not received the attention it warrants.”⁷⁰ By profanity, she means the relationship between the Samaritan and the wounded man. She describes the Samaritan as a *dramatis persona* who fulfills an act he is not expected to do. By all religious and social standards, the Samaritan should have passed by as the priest and the Levite did before him. In the parable, however, the Samaritan, “an outcast and profanity incarnate,” shows mercy and becomes “a comrade to the wounded man.”⁷¹ Mazamisa admits that the parable betrays some allegorical tendencies. Notwithstanding some recent attempts to interpret the parable allegorically, she maintains that allegory does not appropriate the text and should not be forced.⁷²

⁶⁹ Llewellyn Welile Mazamisa, *Beatific Comradeship: An Exegetical-Hermeneutical Study on Lk 10:25-37* (Kampen: Kok, 1987).

⁷⁰ Ibid., 93.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Mazamisa (ibid., 92-93) does not reject a christological interpretation of the parable altogether. She quotes Birger Gerhardsson (*The Good Samaritan, the Good Shepherd?* [ConBNT 16; Lund: Gleerup, 1958]) and his christological interpretation of the parable. Gerhardsson studied the relationship between the parable of the Good Samaritan and the Good Shepherd in John 10:1-16. He argued that there is a wordplay between *rēa* ‘(neighbor) and *ro‘eh* (shepherd). In this perspective, the true intent of the parable of the Good Samaritan is “who is the true shepherd.” See also Birger Gerhardsson, “If We Do Not Cut the Parables out of Their Frames,” *NTS* 37 (1991) 321-35. According to Klyne R. Snodgrass (*Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the*

Having discussed the introductory matters in the study of the parable, Mazamisa examines the context of the parable. First, she considers the larger context, and then the immediate one. Presenting the larger context, the travel narrative, Mazamisa cites works of Christopher F. Evans, John Drury, and David P. Moessner, a group of scholars who attempt to read the central section as a Christian Deuteronomy.⁷³ According to them, the Lukan travel narrative functions as a handbook on the Christian life just as the Book of Deuteronomy was a guide for the devout Jew in his journey into the Promised Land.⁷⁴ Although Mazamisa admits the possibility that Luke used the Book of Deuteronomy as one of his sources, she asserts that it is not easy to verify the validity or falsity of “a Christian Deuteronomy” theory.

Mazamisa also notes that Jesus taught in Aramaic. His teaching, however, was later translated into Greek; therefore, the text in the Gospels is already an interpretation. Mazamisa applies a colometric approach to the parable and its context—a method that is used in the analysis of ancient West Semitic poetry. The text of the parable is divided into colons and then reconstructed in Hebrew, a language that was likely used by Jesus during his disputes with lawyers and scribes.⁷⁵

Parables of Jesus [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008] 348) “Gerhardsson’s study is the most serious modern attempt to argue for a christological intent with the Samaritan.”

⁷³ Christopher F. Evans, “The Central Section of St. Luke’s Gospel,” in D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955) 37-53; John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976); David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).

⁷⁴ Mazamisa, *Beatific Comradeship*, 110.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 123.

3.2.1.2. John R. Donahue (1988)

A synchronic approach to the Synoptic parables leads John R. Donahue to consider them as the Gospel in miniature. According to Donahue, the parables shape the Gospel in which they appear because their context helps to understand the theology of each Gospel.

Commenting on the parable of the Good Samaritan, Donahue notes, “the abrupt question of the lawyer in 10:25 interrupts the somewhat serene atmosphere of the preceding verses and seems relatively unrelated to the previous material.”⁷⁶ However, closer studies of the context, the missionary charges in 9:51–10:20 along with the episode of Martha and Mary in 10:38-42, permit Donahue to see a certain logic in the arrangement of the material. The parable of the Good Samaritan and the following episode of Mary and Martha (10:38-42) describe the essential qualities of discipleship.

Donahue notes that in the Gospel of Luke the dialogue pertaining to the greatest commandment appears in a different context than in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew. In the Gospel of Luke the dialogue seems to be more conciliatory and points to Luke’s positive judgment towards Judaism and its institutions. Furthermore, in Luke there is no distinction between the first and the second commandment. The two commandments are one. The mood of the dialogue changes when the lawyer tries to “justify himself” (Luke 10:29) and asks, “And who is my neighbor?”

Turning to the parable, Donahue notes its rapid movement from one scene to another and a series of dramatic tensions that catch the attention of the audience. As the story

⁷⁶ John R. Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable: Metaphor, Narrative, and Theology in the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 128.

unfolds, the audience experiences two surprises; the first occurs when the priest and the Levite see the injured man only to pass by, and the second when the Samaritan stops to help. These two surprises “challenges the hearers’ understanding of God and whom God approves.”⁷⁷

Donahue calls the episode of Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38-42) a “parabolic narrative.” Although the tradition regarding the two sisters is common to Luke and John, Donahue believes that the context of the passage and the narrative itself betrays “distinctive Lukan characteristics.”⁷⁸ Luke often juxtaposes two narratives. If a woman has a leading role in one narrative, a man has a leading role in another narrative.⁷⁹ Donahue notes that the Martha and Mary narrative shares many characteristics with the parable of the Good Samaritan. Both use an introductory formula. “A certain man” (Luke 10:29) in the parable of the Good Samaritan corresponds to “a certain woman” (10:38). The juxtaposition of these two passages, one related to a man and one to woman, and their literal similarities imply that Luke associates these two passages and wants them be read in one context, side by side.

3.2.1.3. Greg W. Forbes (2000)

Greg W. Forbes also stressed the connection between the parable of the Good Samaritan and the account of Mary and Martha. He studied the Lukan parables and tried to find a common theme that unites them. Commenting on the parable of the Good Samaritan,

⁷⁷ Ibid., 131.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Donahue (ibid., 134-35) quotes the annunciations to Zechariah and to Mary (1:8-23), the canticle of Mary 1:46-55 and of Zechariah (1:67-79), the centurion of Capernaum and widow at Nain (7:1-17), and some parables (13:18-21; 15:4-10 and 18:1-14).

Forbes notes that the setting of the parable moves from Jesus' private address to the disciples to a dialogue between the lawyer and Jesus.⁸⁰ Since the dialogue pertains to the love of God and love of neighbor, the parable of the Good Samaritan and the following episode in the house of Mary and Martha illustrate them accordingly.

Although Forbes briefly examines source-critical problems, background, and how the parable has been interpreted throughout centuries, his major contribution consists in highlighting the unity between the parable of the Good Samaritan and other Lukan passages. He does not exclude the possibility that Luke wanted to justify or prepare for a Samaritan mission; nevertheless he maintains that the parable of the Good Samaritan is a "further expression of the concern of God for the despised and marginalized."⁸¹ Luke presents such a concern throughout his Gospel. He portrays Jesus in the company of those who were considered to be outcasts (Luke 5:29-32; 7:36-39), and he reports how Jesus healed on the Sabbath (6:6-11).

In Forbes' opinion the concern for the outcast and misunderstood is not the only theme that unites the parable of the Good Samaritan to the rest of the Gospel. The Samaritan knew how to use his wealth to assist the wounded man. This action is another example of how Luke understands the proper use of wealth and possessions.⁸²

⁸⁰ Greg W. Forbes, *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 198; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000) 55.

⁸¹ Ibid., 70.

⁸² Ibid., 71.

3.2.1.4. Ulrich Busse (2005)

The parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) and the following episode of Mary and Martha (10:38-42) are also at the center of the study conducted by Ulrich Busse. His intention is to demonstrate that Luke arranges the narrative in his composition of the Gospel so that it is directed at the reader. Busse maintains that Luke uses the material at his disposal to present it as “didactic lessons.”⁸³ The similitudes in Luke’s Gospel start with a question, “which of you,” or “there was a man.” They serve to illustrate an example of Christian conduct, and the story of the Good Samaritan is one of them.

Busse argues that Luke relocated the discourse between the scribe and Jesus from its original setting, the Temple area in the Gospel of Mark, in order to introduce the parable of the Good Samaritan in a more appropriate context, that is, Jesus’ teaching on the way to Jerusalem. According to Busse, Luke avoids using disputes in the passion narrative, and this is an additional reason for utilizing this passage in a new setting.⁸⁴ Having explained why Luke relocated the discourse between the scribe and Jesus and utilized it in a new setting, Busse examines the episode of Mary and Martha (10:38-42). At the end of his query, he notes that the parable of the Good Samaritan and the episode of Mary and Martha clarify what it means to hear and do the word of God. The parable of the Good Samaritan exemplifies what it means to do the word of God, whereas the episode of the two sisters illustrates the need to hear God’s word.⁸⁵

⁸³ Ulrich Busse, “A Study of Luke 10 in Context,” *HTS* 61 (2005) 82.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 84.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 91.

3.2.2. Studies Regarding Structure

Studies pertaining to the context of the parable are not the only concern of modern research on the parable. These studies also focus on the internal structure of the parable.

3.2.2.1. Dan Otto Via (1967)

One of the most influential studies on the structure of the parable of the Good Samaritan is Dan Otto Via's contribution. Via suggested a modification to the interpreting guidelines proposed by Jülicher and Jeremias. He argued that since the Gospels were not biographical accounts of the life and teaching of Jesus, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the precise situation in which a parable was spoken.⁸⁶ In Via's opinion, the historical approach to the parables neglected the basic human element. In other words, he was convinced that the parables had a universal meaning despite their actual historical setting. Accordingly, he warned that a rigid application of the historical approach to the parables would imprison them in the past. As an alternative he proposed to recover their aesthetic nature.⁸⁷

Via published an article in which he proposed a literary-structuralist approach to the parables.⁸⁸ He distinguished two levels of narrative: story and discourse. The story, usually expressed in the third person, in the aorist and pluperfect tenses, has two levels: plot and

⁸⁶ Dan Otto Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967) 21. See also discussion in Georges Crispy, "The Parable of the Good Samaritan: An Essay in Structural Research," *Semeia* 2 (1980) 27-50.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 21-24.

⁸⁸ Kissinger (*The Parables of Jesus*, 218) notes that when Dan Otto Via published the article his understanding of the parables changed. Instead of his former "literary-existential" analysis, he called for a "literary-structuralist approach."

action divided into six facets, called actants.⁸⁹ Each story has no more than six actants. In order to explain how the actants function within the story, Via makes use of the *actaniel model*. According to this model, a subject desires to acquire an object or to communicate an object to a recipient proceeding from an ordainer. In this process the subject may be assisted by a helper or impeded by an opponent.⁹⁰

Having explained the basis for his methodology, Via noted that Luke 10:25-37 was a separate unit in Luke's story. This was preceded by a unit with disciples and followed by another dealing with Martha and Mary. Via distinguished a unit called a "discrete enclave of story" (10:30-35) in Jesus' discourse with the lawyer (10:25-37).⁹¹ Applying the actaniel model to Luke 10:30-35, he noticed that the main point of the story is how the Samaritan helps the traveler. The oil, wine, donkey, and the innkeeper facilitate the Samaritan's mission. In this perspective even the robbers are considered helpers; they offer the Samaritan the opportunity to help the traveler, while the priest and the Levite are understood as the Samaritan's opponents.⁹²

The literary-structuralist approach used by Via highlights the unity of the passage. Although his study did not end the diachronic investigations, or put an end to questions

⁸⁹ Dan Otto Via, "Parable and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach," *Semeia* 1 (1974) 107.

⁹⁰ The *actaniel model*, also known as actantial narrative schema, is a tool used in structural analysis to study the action that takes place in a story, whether real or fictional. The model was developed by the semiotician Algirdas Julien Greimas (*Sémantique structurale: recherche et méthode* [Paris: Larousse, 1966]).

⁹¹ Via, "Parable and Example Story," 111.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 112.

pertaining to the origin and transmission of the parable, it established a new direction in the study on the parable.

3.2.2.2. Craig L. Blomberg (1990)

Reopening the inquiry on the structure of the parable, Craig L. Blomberg notes that many of Jesus' parables have a triadic structure. Two characters compete, and the third one plays the role of a judge. This last character decides which one is good and which is bad. A king, a father, or a master assumes the role of a judge. Although it is true that several parables have more than three main characters, they exhibit the same dynamic. Sometimes good or bad behavior is represented by a single example, and occasionally a series of examples illustrate the same kind of conduct. There is no specific rule that regulates the pattern. Nevertheless, each subsequent representation serves to strengthen the idea, build a climax, and therefore facilitates the judgment. The parable of the Good Samaritan is an example of a complex three-point parable. It has more than three main characters and teaches three lessons.

Many earlier studies on the parable neglected or disregarded its unevenly balanced structure. Blomberg notes that a succinct description of the behavior of the priest and the Levite is contrasted with an extended account of the Samaritan's action. This strange structure does not prevent the message of the parable from being clear. On the contrary, a detailed description of the Samaritan's actions answers the initial question, "And who is my neighbor?" (v. 29). Blomberg argues that since both "halves" of the story (vv.25-28 and 29-37) parallel each other closely, it is better to take verses 25-28 as originally belonging to the parable that follows. In other words, contrary to what diachronic studies proposed, Blomberg

considers verses 25-37 “a carefully wrought unity.”⁹³ Furthermore, he is convinced that the unity of the parable precludes the assumption that verses 36-37 are a secondary addition. These two verses not only recall the lawyer’s original question in verse 25, they recall Jesus’ command to “do this and live” in verse 28. Finally, according to Blomberg, Luke 10:25-37 and its structure follow the style of “proem midrash known as *yelammedenu rabbenu*.”⁹⁴

3.2.2.3. Kenneth E. Bailey (2008)

Kenneth E. Bailey offers a literary-cultural approach that seeks to clarify the historical cultural setting of the parable. Although he employs a variety of sources and customs, he also contributes to an understanding of the structure of the parable.⁹⁵ Bailey notes that the parable of the Good Samaritan is “set in two rounds of dialogue.”⁹⁶ The first is Luke 10:25-28, and the second 10:29-30; 36-37. In between Jesus presents the parable of the Good Samaritan. The two dialogues are between Jesus and a certain lawyer, an expert in the religious law and customs. According to Bailey, this setting is vital for understanding the

⁹³ Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 230.

⁹⁴ According to Blomberg (ibid., 231), Luke 10:25-37 follows this pattern: (1) introductory question on a text of Scripture (vv. 25-27), (2) second Scripture (v. 28), (3) exposition, often by parables, linked with catchwords, here “neighbor” vv. 27, 29, 36 and “do” vv. 28, 37a, 37b, (4) final remarks alluding to initial text (v. 37).

⁹⁵ Kenneth E. Bailey (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes: Cultural Studies in the Gospels* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2008] 289) quotes a story of a Jewish community in Iraq. The story resembles the parable of the Good Samaritan, and in Bailey’s opinion it sheds light on the cultural setting of the parable. Bailey admits that the story may be nothing more than a legend that had been influenced by the parable, but at the same time he does not refrain from using this story to exegete the parable of the Good Samaritan. Such a study, however, seems anachronistic, for it employs a later text to exegete the parable.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 284.

message of the parable and should not be removed from it. He writes: “to strip away these settings is to substitute our own.”⁹⁷

Having presented a general context of the passage, Bailey examines two dialogues that constitute the setting of the parable. He notes that these dialogues have a similar structure. The lawyer asks Jesus a question (10:25; 10:29), then, Jesus asks a counter question (10:26; 10:30). Only after the lawyer has answered (10:27; 10:36) does Jesus offer his final response (10:28; 10:37). Both dialogues conclude with Jesus’ comment urging the lawyer to action. In the first case the lawyer is urged to observe the commandments, in the second he is to imitate the example of the one who showed mercy.

Bailey divides the parable of the Good Samaritan into seven scenes. The first presents a man going down from Jerusalem to Jericho (10:30). The second tells of a priest who happened to travel the same road. He saw the man but passed by doing nothing to help him (10:31). In a similar fashion, the third scene depicts the behavior of the Levite. He too saw the man, but he passed by and did nothing (10:32). The fourth scene presents a Samaritan who saw the man and was moved with compassion (10:33). The fifth discloses how the Samaritan aided the man by pouring wine and oil on his wounds (10:34a). The sixth scene tells how the Samaritan brought the wounded man to the inn (10:34b). The seventh and last scene presents the Samaritan who gives the innkeeper money and promises to pay more if necessary (10:35). According to Bailey, the fourth scene (the Samaritan helping the wounded man) is the climax, and the last three scenes parallel the first three. The Samaritan who stops to bind the wounds in scene five compensates for the Levite’s failure in scene three to assist

⁹⁷ Ibid.

the wounded man. Taking the man into the inn in scene six balances the priest's failure to transport the man into safety in scene two.⁹⁸ The two denarii paid by the Samaritan and his promise in scene seven to pay even more counterweights the money that the robbers stole from the man in the first scene.⁹⁹

Having presented the structure of the parable, Bailey examines its text in light of the Bible and Middle-Eastern culture. He makes a series of cultural annotations pertaining to teaching, legal purity, and innkeepers.¹⁰⁰

3.3. *Comprehensive Studies*

The choice I have made in selecting articles and monographs indicates the direction literary studies took to interpret the parable of the Good Samaritan. In addition to the historical-critical studies and literary investigation I have reviewed, there are also articles and monographs that take into account a variety of questions and investigate the parable of the Good Samaritan by emphasizing various points of interest.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Bailey (ibid., 292) argues that priests were a wealthy class. Therefore the listeners would have assumed that the priest in the parable had means to assist the man in need.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 290-91.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Bastiaan Van Elderen, "Another Look at the Parable of the Good Samaritan," in James I. Cook (ed.), *Saved by Hope* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 109-19; Robert W. Funk "Parable, Paradox, and Power: The Prodigal Samaritan," in Robert W. Funk (ed.), *Parables and Presence: Forms of the New Testament Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 55-65; Jan Lambrecht, *Le parabole di Gesù* (Bologna: Dehoniane, 1982) 78-97; Vittorio Fusco, *Oltre la Parabola* (Roma: Borla, 1983) 67-84; Norman H. Young, "The Commandment to Love Your Neighbor as Yourself and the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37)," *AUSS* 21 (1983) 265-72; Alfons Kemmer, *Le parabole di Gesù* (Brescia: Paideia, 1990) 103-43; Bruno Maggioni, *Le parabole evangeliche* (Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1993) 67-83; Janusz Trela, *Przypowieści Jezusa* (Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski, 1997) 89-102; Robert A. J. Gagnon, "A Second Look at Two Lukan Parables: Reflections on the Unjust Steward and the Good Samaritan," *HBT* 20 (1998) 1-11; John P. Meier, "The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans: What can be Said?" *Biblica* 81 (2000) 202-32; Ian A. McFarland, "Who Is My Neighbor? The Good Samaritan as a Source for Theological Anthropology," *Modern*

3.3.1. Klyne R. Snodgrass (2008)

In 2008 Klyne R. Snodgrass published a comprehensive guide to the parables of Jesus that describes the actual state of studies on the parables.¹⁰² In this extensive guide, he studies the nature of the parables and their relationship to the Old Testament writings, Early Jewish sources, Greco-Roman literature, and Early Christian writings. He divides the parables into nine categories. The parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) finds its place among the parables about discipleship. To the same group belongs the parable of the Two Builders (Matt 7:24-27 // Luke 6:47-49); the Workers in the Vineyard (Matt 20:1-16), and the parable of the Tower Builder and the Warring King (Luke 14:28-32).

Commenting on the parable of the Good Samaritan, Snodgrass compares the Lukan text with biblical and extra biblical sources, then, he provides some cultural information that helps to understand the parable. Finally, he identifies nine questions that summarize the main questions in the study of the parable of the Good Samaritan. Snodgrass' intention is to address each of these questions. First, what is the relationship between the parable itself and the dialogue? Second, what is the relationship between the present context of the parable and its parallel in the other Synoptic Gospels? Third, is this passage an example story or a genuine parable? Fourth, did the lawyer intend to trap Jesus with his question, or was he honestly looking for an answer? Fifth, is the story told from the perspective of the victim? Sixth, was the parable intended as a critique of cult and racism or a discussion about the most

Theology 17 (2001) 57-66; Néstor O. Míguez, "La Parábola del Buen Samaritano: Contexto, sujeto e interpretación," *Cuadernos de Teología* 22 (2003) 65-78; Michael P. Knowles, "What Was the Victim Wearing? Literary, Economic, and Social Contexts for the Parable of the Good Samaritan," *BibInt* 12 (2004) 145-74.

¹⁰² Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*.

important commandment? Seventh, did Jesus answer the lawyer's question or not? Eighth, is there any christological teaching in the story? Ninth, is this parable eschatological or ethical?¹⁰³ A general evaluation of Snodgrass' solutions will highlight his most important contribution.

Snodgrass admits that the plot of the parable has been modeled on the Old Testament story about the Samaritans who helped the Jews at a difficult time (2 Chr 28:8-15). He is also convinced that there are more reasons to argue that the lawyer's question and the parable form a unity.¹⁰⁴ Both texts allude to Lev 18:5 and the aorist participle ποιήσας (having done) in Luke 10:25 and 10:37 forms an inclusion that unites the entire passage. Moreover, apart from the use of the double-love commandment, the Lukan text has little similarity with either the Markan or the Matthean version. The parable of the Good Samaritan needed a setting, and the question of the "love of neighbor" provided an excellent opportunity to develop this theme.¹⁰⁵

Snodgrass observes that many scholars addressed the question of the correct classification of this passage. Since Adolf Jülicher, it has been understood as an example story. Scholars reject this classification for different reasons. Crossan argued that the four classical "example stories" were originally parables, and only later became examples. Others reject this classification for fear that it oversimplifies the message of the Gospel. Still others, like Jeffrey T. Tucker, reject the idea because features that distinguish the four example

¹⁰³ Ibid., 348-57.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 348.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 349.

stories are found in all the parables of Jesus.¹⁰⁶ Blomberg concludes that in the case of the Good Samaritan the label “example story” is not adequate and should be dropped.¹⁰⁷ As an alternative he proposes to call this passage a single indirect parable.¹⁰⁸ Snodgrass concludes that the most valuable approaches to this parable are those that emphasize the discrepancy between the lawyer’s question and Jesus’ answer. The lawyer wanted Jesus to identify whom he should call his neighbor; whereas the parable responds that there are no boundaries when it comes to defining one’s neighbor.

4. Conclusion

Although my history of research is not exhaustive, it highlights the most important issues and questions scholars have confronted in reading the parable of the Good Samaritan. We have seen that the period of allegorical interpretation initiated by the Early Church did not and could not interpret the parable in a uniform way. The allegorical interpretation led to a proliferation of interpretations that often veiled the message of the parable.¹⁰⁹ Writing in opposition to the allegorical approach, Adolf Jülicher inaugurated a historical-critical approach to the parable, its language and setting. Building upon the works of Jülicher, modern scholars have explored the parable’s historical background and studied the principles of transformation that changed the parable into an example story. Such research recovered

¹⁰⁶ Jeffrey T. Tucker, *Example Stories. Perspectives on Four Parables in the Gospel of Luke* (JSNTSup 162; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998) 264-74. The features that should distinguish them are a moral example to be followed, religious language and the naming of specific persons, groups or places.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 352.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ See the discussion in Hans-Joseph Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten* (NTbAh 13; Münster, Aschendorff, 1978) 8-16; Charles E. Carlston, “Parable and Allegory Revisited. An Interpretive Review,” *CBQ* 43 (1981) 228-42.

the original *Sitz im Leben* of the parable. Literary investigations have been conducted in terms of context and structure and have emphasized the relationship of the parable to its immediate context and the main theological themes of the Gospel.¹¹⁰

Despite the positive contributions that have been made a significant lacuna remains: scholars have not adequately explored the parable within the larger literary context of the Lukan journey section from a narrative-critical perspective. How does the parable fit into the narrative of the journey section, and how does the journey section influence the interpretation of the parable?

In the following chapters I will attempt to determine the meaning and function of the parable within the Lukan journey section (9:51–19:46). I will take into consideration the following factors.

First, the Lukan journey section begins with an episode in a Samaritan village. The inhabitants of that village do not accept Jesus, since he is on his way to Jerusalem (9:53). Toward the end of the journey section, however, the hostile attitude of the Samaritans changes. The gratitude of a Samaritan leper distinguishes him from others who were healed but did not give thanks to Jesus (17:11-19).

Second, the parable of the Good Samaritan begins with the question of what one must do to inherit eternal life (10:25). The same question occurs toward the end of the journey section when a rich man approaches Jesus and asks what he must do to attain eternal life

¹¹⁰ Jack D. Kingsbury, "Major Trends in Parable Interpretation," *CTM* 42 (1971) 579-96; idem, "The Parables of Jesus in Current Research," *Di* 11 (1972) 101-07; Wilfrid J. Harrington, "The Parables in Recent Study (1960-1971)," *BTB* 2 (1972) 219-241; Robert H. Stein, "The Parables of Jesus in Recent Study," *WW* 5 (1985) 248-57; Bernard Brandon Scott, *Parable Interpretation in America: The Shift to Language* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988) 67-68.

(18:18). This question appears throughout the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, especially in the ministry of John the Baptist (Luke 3:10) and in Peter's sermon at Pentecost (Acts 3:37). Accordingly, it is appropriate to ask how this question shapes the journey section

Third, the journey section is rich in parables. Some of these parables (the Rich Fool, the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, the Pharisee and Tax Collector) are exclusively Lukan, and share common themes that unite and distinguish them from other Lukan parables.

Fourth, the lawyer, the priest, the Levite, and the Samaritan are the main protagonists of the parable of the Good Samaritan. Previous studies have shown that the journey section is characterized by a growing conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders. If this is the case, what is the place of the parable of the Good Samaritan in that conflict and how does the parable illustrate this conflict?

My study will proceed in the following way. In the second chapter I will discuss the text, the most important textual variants, the structure of the passage and the historical background of the parable. In the third chapter I will consider the parable of the Good Samaritan within its larger literary context—the Lukan journey section (9:51–19:46). Here I will explore the literary connections that unite and shape the parable of the Good Samaritan and the Lukan journey section. I will then study how the plot of the parable influences and shapes the journey section. Having investigated the different aspects of the literary context of the parable, in the fourth chapter I will present a narrative-critical analysis of the parable.

In the fifth and final chapter I will synthesize the results of the previous chapters in order to determine the purpose and function of the parable within the Lukan journey section.

This chapter will explain how the journey section helps us to understand the parable, and how the parable illuminates the journey section.

CHAPTER TWO

TEXT AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PARABLE OF THE GOOD SAMARITAN

1. Introduction

Having sketched the *status quaestionis* of modern research on the parable of the Good Samaritan and having identified the main questions that need to be addressed in this study, it is time to analyze the text and the historical background of the parable. In this chapter I will proceed in the following way.

First I will discuss the limits of the text. Here I will examine the literary setting of Luke 10:25-37 in order to determine what sets this passage apart from what precedes and follows.¹ As I do this I will also highlight the elements that make Luke 10:25-37 a unit. Second I will discuss the Greek text and its most significant textual variants. Whenever relevant, I will describe the origin of the variants and their history. Since I will make use of the *New American Bible*, I will not provide a new translation of the text. However, when necessary, I will comment on the *New American Bible* translation and provide an optional way to express what the Greek conveys.²

I will conclude this chapter with a presentation of the structure of the passage and a summary of the historical background of the parable. The sketch of the historical background, which includes the origin of the double love command (Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18),

¹ A more detailed study of the immediate, proximate and larger context of the parable will be conducted in the next chapter.

² The English translation of the text is taken from the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Holy Bible. The New American Bible Revised Edition* (Charlotte: Saint Benedict: 2011).

the concept of ‘neighbor,’ and the situation of Samaritans at the time of Jesus, will be important for the study of the parable.

2. The Limits of the Text

Luke 10:25-37 can be distinguished as a separate unit from what precedes and follows both on grammatical and literary grounds. The introductory formula “and behold” (καί ἰδοὺ) unites Luke 10:25-37 with the previous passage (10:21-24). At the same time the interjection “behold” (ἰδοὺ) sets Luke 10:25-37 apart and indicates the beginning of a new unit.³ In a similar way, another formula “as they continued their journey” (ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι) in Luke 10:38, used here in a temporal sense, begins a new episode as Jesus makes his way to Jerusalem.⁴ The change of place and audience also indicates that Luke 10:25-37 is a separate unit. Luke 10:1-24 presents the mission of the seventy-two disciples. First, Jesus sends the disciples to preach (10:1-12), next he criticizes the Galilean cities that did not welcome his message (10:13-16), and then he rejoices in the success of the mission of the seventy-two (10:17-24). The scholar who approaches Jesus to test him interrupts the previous scene and begins a new one. The presence of the scholar, his testing of Jesus, and his question about what he must do to obtain eternal life signal the start of a new unit in Luke 10:25. The dialogue between Jesus and the scholar ends in Luke 10:37. He sends forth the scholar of the law to imitate the Samaritan’s actions, “Go and do likewise.” The change of

³ The formula καί ἰδοὺ is often used when something new is introduced at the close of a narrative, or at the beginning of a new narrative. It is used to strengthen the vividness of the text by inviting the reader to attend to what is said. According to Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke* [AB 28; New York: Doubleday 1981] 1:121) the introductory καί ἰδοὺ may have come from “Q,” but “in most cases it is part of “L” or Lukan redaction.

⁴ Some codices and manuscripts (A, C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, *f*¹, *f*¹³ latt, sy^{p,h}) read ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν, which often starts a new section in Luke and Acts.

place and audience (the house of Martha and her sister Mary) indicates that Luke 10:38 marks the beginning of a new unit.

Some authors separate the parable proper of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:29-36) from the introductory dialogue between Jesus and the scholar of the law (10:25-28) and treat them independently.⁵ However, since the teaching in Luke 10:30-35 originated with the scholars' question in 10:29, it is better to consider the whole of 10:25-37 as a unit.⁶ Luke 10:25-37 can be further subdivided, but these subdivisions do not preclude the unity of the passage.

The same persons (Jesus and the scholar of the law) at the beginning and at the end of the unit (10:25; 37), the common theme of doing what is right, and common vocabulary (ποιήσας in 10:25; ὁ ποιήσας and ποίει in 10:37) indicate that Luke 10:25-37 is a unit and not two independent episodes. From a historical-critical and redactional-critical point of view it is possible that the traditions behind Luke 10:25-37 were subjected to a long and complex process of editing.⁷ In the present composition of the Gospel, however, Luke 10:25-37

⁵ For example Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (Paris: Gabalda, 1927) 178-79; Howard I. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978) 440-50; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:876-90; Christopher F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (TPINTC; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990) 464-71.

⁶ More recent studies treat Luke 10:25-37 as a unit. François Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (EKKNT III; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996) 2:81-99; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 424-32; Arland J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (The Bible in Its World; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 92-103; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 338-62.

⁷ The dialogue between Jesus and the scholar of the law (Luke 10:25-28) could have been modeled on the Synoptic episode, "what is the greatest commandment" (Matt 22:35-40; Mark 12:28-31). However, scholars are divided on this and it is not certain if Mark's Gospel, "Q," or an independent Lukan tradition was the source of the Lukan passage. See Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:84; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:877-88.

constitutes a compact, logical literary unit. Disregarding the dialogue between the scholar of the law and Jesus would empty the parable of the meaning Luke intended.⁸

3. The Greek Text⁹

²⁵Καὶ ἰδοὺ νομικός τις ἀνέστη ἐκπαιράζων αὐτὸν λέγων· διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; ²⁶ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; ²⁷ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. ²⁸εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ὀρθῶς ἀπεκρίθης· τοῦτο ποιεῖ καὶ ζήση.

²⁹ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτὸν εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον; ³⁰Ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἄνθρωπός τις κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Ἱεριχὼ καὶ λησταῖς περιέπεσεν, οἱ καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν καὶ πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες ἀπῆλθον ἀφέντες ἡμιθανή. ³¹κατὰ συγκυρίαν δὲ ἱερεὺς τις κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐκεῖνη καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἀντιπαρῆλθεν. ³²ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Λευίτης γενόμενος κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ἀντιπαρῆλθεν. ³³Σαμαρίτης δὲ τις ὁδεύων ἦλθεν κατ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἰδὼν ἐσπλαγχνίσθη, ³⁴καὶ προσελθὼν κατέδησεν τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ ἐπιχέων ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον, ἐπιβιβάσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτήνος ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς πανδοχεῖον καὶ ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ. ³⁵καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὖριον ἐκβαλὼν ἔδωκεν δύο δηνάρια τῷ πανδοχεῖ καὶ

⁸ John J. Kilgallen (*Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke* [SubBi 32; Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2008] 290 notes that “both parts of the dispute with the lawyer must be considered (What must I do? Who is my neighbor?), so that the meaning of the parable, as Luke wants it interpreted, can be understood.”

⁹ The Greek text is taken from *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001).

εἶπεν· ἐπιμελήθητι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅ τι ἂν προσδαπανήσης ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι. ³⁶τίς τούτων τῶν τριῶν πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς ληστάς; ³⁷ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πορεύου καὶ σὺ ποίει ὁμοίως.

4. English Translation

²⁵There was a scholar of the law¹⁰ who stood up to test him and said, “Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?” ²⁶Jesus said to him, “What is written in the law? How do you read it?” ²⁷He said in reply, “You shall love the Lord, your God, with all your heart, with all your being, with all your strength, and with all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself.” ²⁸He replied to him, “You have answered correctly; do this and you will live.”

²⁹But because he wished to justify himself, he said to Jesus, “And who is my neighbor?” ³⁰Jesus replied, “A man fell victim to robbers as he went down from Jerusalem to Jericho. They stripped and beat him and went off leaving him half-dead. ³¹A priest happened to be going down that road, but when he saw him, he passed by on the opposite side. ³²Likewise a Levite came to the place, and when he saw him, he passed by on the opposite side. ³³But a Samaritan traveler who came upon him was moved with compassion at the sight. ³⁴He approached the victim, poured oil and wine over his wounds and bandaged them. Then he lifted him up on his own animal, took him to an inn and cared for him. ³⁵The next day he took out two silver coins and gave them to the innkeeper with the instruction, ‘Take care of

¹⁰ The Greek text has νομικός, which in ancient sources such as Plato and Aristotle means someone *pertaining to the law*. The noun νομικός can also be used in reference to someone who is *learned in the law* or works as *an interpreter and teacher of the law*. Either way, the noun denotes someone who is an expert of the law, in this case the Mosaic law.

him. If you spend more than what I have given you, I shall repay you on my way back.’

³⁶Which of these three, in your opinion, was neighbor to the robbers’ victim?” ³⁷He answered,

“The one who treated him with mercy.” Jesus said to him, “Go and do likewise.”

5. Textual Variants

The parable of the Good Samaritan only appears in the Third Gospel. However, the passage begins with the scholar’s question, “teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?” (Luke 10:25), which echoes another Synoptic passage. According to Matthew and Mark, the Pharisees and the scribes approach Jesus to ask, “which is the greatest of the commandments” (Matt 22:35-40; Mark 12:28-31). In all three Gospels the answer to these questions is the commandment to love God and neighbor (cf. Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18). Thus, it is plausible that in the course of time the texts of Matthew and Mark, along with the text of the OT commandments in their Hebrew or Greek forms, have indirectly influenced the transmission of the Lukan text and are at the origin of some of the textual variants in the text. With this premise in mind, I will analyze the most significant textual variants that occur in the parable of the Good Samaritan.

5.1. *Luke 10:27*

The first significant textual variant appears in verse 27.¹¹ This verse contains a mixed quotation taken from Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18. Apart from the discrepancies between the

¹¹ Luke, like Mark, lists four human capacities to love God, whereas Deut 6:5, both in the LXX and the Hebrew text, lists only three. Luke and Mark add, although in a different order, “mind” (διάνοια). Luke and Mark also use “strength” (ἡ ἰσχὺς) instead of “might” (ἡ δύναμις) for its Hebrew equivalent נַחֲמָה. Although Matt 22:37 has only three capacities, he introduces “mind” (διάνοια) and does not mention “might” (ἡ δύναμις).

commandment to love God and neighbor as it appears in the Hebrew text, the LXX, and Luke, there are four different readings that need to be discussed.

1) ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆ σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν – “from all your heart, in all your being, in all your strength, and in all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself.” – \aleph , C, L, W, Θ , Ψ , 33, the Vulgate and part of the Old Latin tradition.

2) ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχυί σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν – “from all your heart, in all your being, in all your strength, and in all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself.” – \wp ⁷⁵, B, Ξ , 070, 124, 579, 1071, ℓ 844, and a few other manuscripts.

3) ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ ἰσχυί σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν – “in all your heart, in all your being, in all your strength, in with all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself.” – f ¹, ℓ 2211, and a few other manuscripts.

4) ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς εαυτὸν – “from all your heart, from all your being, from all your strength, and from all your mind, and your neighbor as himself.” – A, N, f ¹³, 28, 157.

The differences between these readings can be summarized in the following way. The first three readings differ in how they employ the preposition “from” (ἐξ) and the preposition “in” (ἐν) in the quotation taken from Deut 6:5. The first reading uses the preposition “from”

(ἐξ), the second reading uses both prepositions, and the third reading uses only the preposition “in” (ἐν). The second reading with two different prepositions seems to be the most difficult reading.¹² The first and the third reading could be either a correction or harmonization. It is possible that the copyist tried to remove the difficulty of the text by using the same preposition throughout the quotation. Some used the preposition “from” (ἐξ), and others used the preposition “in” (ἐν). However, this is not the only possible explanation and to evaluate these readings it is necessary to look at the text in Deut 6:5.

The Hebrew text of the *Shema* uses the preposition “in” (ב), whereas the LXX employs the preposition “from” (ἐξ). Therefore, it is possible that the variant readings were meant to correct the text of the commandment in the Gospel to resemble its Hebrew form. It is also possible that the variant readings were introduced to harmonize the Lukan text with the commandment to love God and neighbor as they appear in Matt 22:37. Either way, the readings with only one preposition seem to be corrections and improvements of the second reading insofar as they harmonize the difficult reading and make it uniform.¹³ The second reading does not seek to harmonize the text; therefore it is the preferred reading.

The fourth reading has “himself” (ἑαυτον), whereas others have “yourself” (σεαυτον). This variant is most likely an error of the copyist. The copyist may have mistaken the last letter of ως with the first letter of σεαυτον.

¹² According to Marshall (*The Gospel of Luke*, 443), the reading with two different prepositions is “the harder reading and transcriptionally more probable.” If this is the case, the reading without the article should be preferred according to the principle *lectio difficilior potior*. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 64.

¹³ John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC 35; Dallas: Word Books, 1993) 2:579.

5.2. Luke 10:29

There are two variant readings of this verse:

1) ο δε θελων δικαιωσαι εαυτον ειπεν προς τον Ιησουν· και τις εστιν μου πλησιον; – “but because he wished to justify himself, he said to Jesus, And who is my neighbor?” – ϕ ⁷⁵ \aleph , B, 157, 579, 1071, and a few other manuscripts. This is the reading adopted by Nestle-Aland.

2) ο δε θελων δικαιουν εαυτον ειπεν προς τον Ιησουν· και τις εστιν μου πλησιον; – “but because he wished to justify himself, he said to Jesus, “And who is my neighbor?” – A, W, Θ , Ψ , f^1 , f^{13} , 33.

The second reading with the present infinitive (δικαιουν) in place of the aorist infinitive (δικαιωσαι) envisions the action of “justifying” as ongoing or prolonged. The present infinitive expresses ongoing, continuous, or repeated action, whereas the aorist infinitive conveys the idea of action that started and has concluded.¹⁴ Since the aorist infinitive indicates that the action occurred without reference to its duration or lasting effect, it is possible that the present infinitive was intended to add vividness to the text. The reading with the aorist infinitive, however, is better attested and so the preferred reading.

¹⁴ Max Zerwick, *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples* (Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici 114; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001) § 242-45.

5.3. Luke 10:30

There are two sets of variant readings in this verse. The first set:

1) ανθρωπος τις κατεβαινεν απο Ιερουσαλημ – “A certain man was going down from Jerusalem.” - ϕ^{75} , \aleph , B, D, Γ, 579. This is the reading adopted by Nestle-Aland.

2) ανθρωπος τις καταβαινει απο Ιερουσαλημ - “A certain man is going down from Jerusalem.” – C.

The only difference between these two variant readings is the verbal form. The first reading has an imperfect (κατεβαινεν), whereas the second has a present (καταβαινει). The entire story of the Good Samaritan is told in the aorist and the present form would make the second reading the more difficult one. Since the reading with the imperfect has better textual support, it is the preferred reading.

The second set:

1) οι και εκδυσαντες αυτον και πληγας επιθεντες απηλθον αφεντες ημιθανη – “They stripped and beat him and went off leaving him half-dead” – ϕ^{45} , ϕ^{75} , \aleph , B, D, L, Θ, Ξ, f^1 , 33, 700, 1241, 1424, ℓ 2211 and a few other manuscripts. This is the reading adopted by Nestle-Aland.

2) οι και εκδυσαντες αυτον και πληγας επιθεντες απηλθον αφεντες ημιθανη τυγχανοντα¹⁵ – “They stripped and beat him and went off leaving him half-dead as indeed he was” – A, C, W, Ψ, 070, f^{13} , 157, 1071, 1424, and the Syriac version Harklensis.

¹⁵ BDAG (s.v. “τυγχάνω,” 829) translates the present participle τυγχανοντα “as indeed he was.”

It is possible that the present participle “as indeed he was” (τυγχανοντα) in the second reading was intended to emphasize the half-dead state of the wounded man.¹⁶ It is also possible that the participle has been introduced as a comment to explain why the priest and the Levite did not stop to help the wounded man. They passed by and left the wounded man without helping him, for indeed he was dead. However, many witnesses do not support the longer reading with the participle “as indeed he was” (τυγχανοντα). As interesting as the idea of emphasis may be, the shorter reading “went off leaving him half-dead” (ἀπῆλθον ἀφέντες ἡμιθανῇ), has better textual support. Furthermore, the shorter reading is normally the preferred reading.

5.4. *Luke 10:32*

There are four different readings of this verse:

1) ομοίως δε και Λευιτης γενομενος κατα τον τοπον ελθων και ιδων αντιπαρηλθεν – “likewise a Levite coming to the place, coming and seeing, he passed by on the opposite side” – C, W, Θ, Ψ, *f*¹³, Syriac versions Harklensis and Peshitta. This is the reading adopted by Nestle-Aland.

2) ομοίως δε και Λευιτης κατα τον τοπον ελθων και ιδων αντιπαρηλθεν – “likewise a Levite, coming to the place and seeing, he passed by on the opposite side” – ϕ ⁷⁵, B, L, *f*¹, 33, 892, 700, 1241, and a few other manuscripts.

¹⁶ According to Nolland (*Luke*, 2:588), the participle was added “presumably to insist on the reality of the man’s half-dead state.”

3) ομοίως δε και Λευιτης γενομενος κατα τον τοπον και ιδων αντιπαρηλθεν – “likewise a Levite coming to the place and seeing, he passed by on the opposite side” – \wp ⁴⁵, D, Π, ℓ 2211, and a few other manuscripts.

4) ομοίως δε και Λευιτης γενομενος κατα τον τοπον ελθων και ιδων αυτον αντιπαρηλθεν – “likewise a Levite coming to the place coming and seeing him, he passed by on the opposite side” – A, Γ, Δ, 124, 1071, 1424, Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic versions.

These four readings are the most difficult to evaluate. Before I attempt to explain them, it should be noted that the whole verse is absent from codex Sinaiticus and the Boharic witness of the Coptic versions. The absence of the verse may be the result of *homoioteleuton*. The same or similar ending in verses 31 (καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἀντιπαρήλθεν) and verse 32 (καὶ ἰδὼν ἀντιπαρήλθεν) may have caused the phenomenon known as *haplography* – inadvertent omission of a repeated letter, word or words. Therefore, the absence of the whole verse in two witnesses is of concern to us, unless this absence of the verse is a sign of a textual difficulty the copyist intended to solve.¹⁷

The first reading has two aorist participles γενόμενος and ἐλθών, whereas the second and third reading have only one participle either γενόμενος or ἐλθών. The fourth reading has both participles and the pronoun personal αὐτόν. This last reading, however, is not as problematic as the other three. The presence of the pronoun αὐτόν could be either a stylistic correction of the text or an error of the copyist. The pronoun could have been introduced to resemble the construction in 10:31 (καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἀντιπαρήλθεν), or it

¹⁷ Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:887; Bruce Manning Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1994) 129.

could have been the result of dittography. The copyists wrote twice what should have been written only once.

The first three variant readings can be explained in the following way. It is possible that the first reading with two participles is original. Two participles *γενόμενος* and *ἐλθών* do make this reading somewhat redundant. However, the difficulty and redundancy of the text does not preclude its originality, quite the contrary. If this reading is original, it is possible that copyists tried to remove the redundancy. Some deleted the participle *γενόμενος*, whereas others deleted the participle *ἐλθών*. This gave rise to the second and third reading with only one participle.

However, the opposite scenario is also probable. It is possible that the readings with one participle are original. The existence of some manuscripts with *γενόμενος* and others with *ἐλθών* could have resulted in conflation of the text. This gave origin to the first reading with two participles.¹⁸

In order to evaluate the aforementioned readings it is important to note that *γενόμενος κατὰ τὸν τόπον* resembles another characteristic Lukan construction. The verb *ἔρχομαι* followed by *κατά* and the accusative is found twice in the passage under discussion (10:32.33) and once in the Acts (16:7).¹⁹ The presence of this construction argues for the

¹⁸ According to Metzger (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 129), “it is difficult to decide whether the longer text, being redundant, was shortened by copyists, or whether the longer text is the result of conflation.”

¹⁹ Adelbert Denaux, and Rita Corstjens, in collaboration with Hellen Mardaga, *The Vocabulary of Luke. An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel* (Biblical Tools and Studies 10; Leuven: Peeters, 2009) 250 list this construction as characteristic of Luke. It is possible that the construct *γενόμενος*, *ἐρχόμενος* and *ἐλθών* are Hebraismus. If this is the case, the presence of that construct in Luke 10:32.33 could support the authenticity of the parable.

authenticity of γενόμενος κατά. Moreover, the expression γενόμενος κατά is attested to in at least one other Lukan passages (Acts 27:7). The first reading with two participles has traits of Lukan style. Therefore, in light of the internal and external evidence, the first reading with the two participles, although problematic, is the preferred reading.²⁰

5.5. *Luke 10:36*

There are three different readings of this verse:

1) τις τουτων των τριων πλησιον δοκει σοι γεγονεναι του εμπεσοντος εις τους ληστας; – “Which of these three was neighbor, in your opinion, to the robber’s victim?” – ϕ ⁷⁵, B, \aleph , L, Ψ . This is the reading adopted by Nestle-Aland.

2) τις τουτων των τριων δοκει σοι πλησιον γεγονεναι του εμπεσοντος εις τους ληστας; – “Which of these three, in your opinion, was neighbor to the robber’s victim?” – ϕ ⁴⁵, *f*¹, 579, 2542, 700, ℓ 2211, and a few other manuscripts.

3) τινα ουν δοκεις πλησιον γεγονεναι του εμπεσοντος εις τους ληστας; – “Who then was neighbor to the robber’s victim?” – D.

In the first reading the noun “neighbor” (πλησίον) precedes the verb “to seem” (δοκέω) and the personal pronoun “to you” (σοι), whereas in the second reading the noun follows the verb and the personal pronoun. Thus, in the first reading the emphasis falls on “neighbor,” whereas in the second reading the emphasis falls on the personal judgment of an

²⁰ Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:887. According to Marshall (*The Gospel of Luke*, 448-49), the longer form depicts the Levite “reaching the spot, then actually going up close to the man to see him, but not stopping to help.” In this way, the redundant form may be a sign of vivid language aiming to bring the whole story alive by describing in detail what was happening. It is also a sign of artful storytelling.

interlocutor. Finally, the third reading changes the question altogether. According to this third reading, supported only by codex Bezae, the question was not, “Which of these three was neighbor, in your opinion,” but “Who then seems neighbor” (τινα ουν δοκεις πλησιον). In other words, the third reading is a more general question. This last reading is most likely an early effort to remove the discrepancy between the scholar’s question (Luke 10:29) and Jesus’ question (10:36). The first reading leaves the apparent discrepancy of the text, focuses on the “neighbor” and has better manuscript support; therefore it is the preferred reading.

My analysis shows that the text of Luke 10:25-37 is well preserved. The variant readings can be classified into three groups. The first set of readings (10:27) provides a harmonization either with the text of the *Shema* as it appears in the Torah (Deut 6:5), or with the Synoptic discussion of the greatest commandments (Matt 22:35-40; Mark 12:28-31). The second (10:29), third (10:30) and fourth (10:32) set of readings improve the grammar, style, or remove the redundancy of the language. Finally, the fifth set of readings (10:36) removes the apparent discrepancy between the question of the scholar of the law, “And who is my neighbor” (Luke 10:29), and the question of Jesus, “which of these three, in your opinion, was neighbor to the robbers’ victim” (10:36).

6. The Structure of the Passage

The structure of Luke 10:25-37 has been a central issue in the research on the parable for a long time. Traditionally, it has been considered as two independent passages: the discussion between the scholar of the law and Jesus (10:25-28) and the parable of the Good

Samaritan (10:29-37).²¹ This view has been challenged by modern research and, for the most part, is no longer followed. Studies conducted by Dan Otto Via, Craig L. Blomberg, and Kenneth E. Bailey have shown the unity of the passage. Thus, what was previously considered two independent passages is now viewed as two closely connected and interacting parts of the same passage.²² In this way it is clear that Luke 10:25-37 has a more complex and multifaceted structure than heretofore supposed.

Following the grammar of the passage as well as changes of theme, scenes, place, time, and main protagonists, the passage can be divided into two parts.²³ The first part is 10:25-28 and the second 10:29-37. This two-part division does not question the unity of the passage. They are not two different passages but two parts of the same passage. Luke 10:29-37 continues the same dialogue between the scholar of the law and Jesus that was initiated in 10:25-28.²⁴ In the first part the dialogue deals with the question, “Teacher, what must I do to

²¹ For example Marshall (*The Gospel of Luke*, 445) prefers to consider Luke 10:25-28 and 10:29-37 as two independent passages. In his opinion “the linking tends to downgrade the conversation with the lawyer, making it merely an introduction to a discussion of the meaning of neighbor.” For a more detailed discussion on the unity of Luke 10:25-37, see my history of research in Chapter One.

²² Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:81-99; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 427. This, however, does not mean that all scholars accept this division and that there are no modern attempts to divide the parable in different ways. For example, Bailey (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes*, 284) distinguishes three parts in Luke 10:25-37. In his exposition two dialogues between Jesus and the scholar of the law frame the parable of the Good Samaritan.

²³ For a general outline of the passage I follow Robert Traina (*Methodical Bible Study* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980] 51-52). According to Traina the study of the structure of narrative discourses, parables included, should keep in mind the biographical progression (lives of protagonists) historical progression (the events and their progress throughout the entire narrative), chronological progression (the progress of the narrative with direct or indirect time indicators), geographical progression (any changes of place), and finally ideological progression (the development of ideas).

²⁴ For arguments for the unity of the two parts of the passage, see Evans, *Saint Luke*, 467; Richard J. Bauckham, “The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan: Jesus’ Parabolic Interpretation of the Law of Moses,” *NTS* 44 (1998) 475-89; Peter Rhea Jones, *Studying the Parables of Jesus* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 1999) 296.

inherit eternal life,” whereas in the second part, the dialogue deals with the question, “And who is my neighbor.” The verb “to do” (ποιήσας in 10:25; ποίει in 10:28 and ποίει in 10:37b) frames the whole passage, whereas the theme of “life” (ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω in 10:25 and ζήση in 10:28) and the noun “neighbor” (πλησίον in 10:29 and 10:37a) frame the first and the second part of the passage.²⁵

The first part of the passage, the question pertaining to what the scholar of the law must do to inherit eternal life, can be further divided. The change of subject (the scholar of the law and Jesus) and verbal forms (ἀνέστη λέγων in verse 25; εἶπεν in verses 26 and 28; ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν in verse 27) divide the first part of Luke 10:25-37 into four units. In the first unit (10:25) a short presentation of the main protagonists (“there was a scholar of the law”) is followed by a brief description of the motive that guides the scholar (“to test Jesus”) and his question (“Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life”). In the second unit (10:26) Jesus poses a counter question (“what do you read in the law”). In the third unit (10:27) the scholar of the law shows that he is trained in the Mosaic law and provides an apt reply to Jesus’ question by quoting the *Shema*. Then, in the fourth unit (10:28) Jesus commends on the scholar’s ability and his reply (“you have answered correctly”). At the same time, Jesus also answers the scholar’s initial question (“go and do this”).

The second part of the passage (10:29-37) can be divided into five units. Although the main reason for these divisions is grammatical (change of subject or verbal forms), changes of place and time contribute to the division of the passage. Thus, the first unit of the second

²⁵ Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 425; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 344; Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HNT 5; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck) 391.

part (10:29) begins with a comment on the scholar's disposition ("he wished to justify himself") and his question ("and who is my neighbor"). In the second unit (10:30-35) Jesus tells the parable proper of the Good Samaritan. Then, in the third unit (10:36a) he poses his counter-question ("which of these two, in your opinion was neighbor"). In the fourth unit (10:36b) the scholar of the law indirectly admits that the Samaritan proved to be neighbor ("the one who treated him with mercy"). Finally in the fifth and last unit of the second part (10:37) Jesus invites the scholar of the law to do the same ("go and do the same").

Both parts of the passage resemble each other so closely that there is a parallelism in the structure of the passage.²⁶ In both parts of the passage (10:25-28; 10:29-37) the question of the scholar of the law (10:25 and 10:29) is followed by Jesus' counter-question (10:26 and 10:36). The scholar's reply (10:27 and 10:37a) is followed by Jesus' reply and imperative to action (10:28 and 10:37b). Although the general structure of the passage is parallel, there are some differences. First, in the first part the scholar of the law quotes from Scripture (10:26), whereas in the second Jesus tells the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35). Second, Jesus' comment "you have answered correctly" in the first part of the passage (10:27) does not have an equivalent in the second part (10:37). Third, when Jesus answers the scholar's first question he leaves him perplexed. Therefore the scholar of the law, who seeks to justify himself, asks a second question. The second part of the passage (10:29-37) does not tell what

²⁶ For example John D. Crossan, "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus," *NTS* 18 (1971-72) 290; idem., *In Parables*, 62-63; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 427; Nolland, *Luke*, 2:591-92; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 344. Bovon (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:81-82) admits that the passage has a parallel or symmetrical construction, but he also points out its asymmetrical structure. The asymmetry is visible in the second question and in the absence of the praise "you have answered correctly."

the reaction of the scholar of the law was when he heard the answer to his second question. Was he perplexed, or confused? Did he want to ask Jesus a further question?

These differences between the composition of the first (Luke 10:25-28) and the second part (10:29-37) do not alter the general structure of the passage. However, there is one difference that does affect the general structure: in the second part Jesus' counter question is preceded by the long and complex parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35). The structure of the whole passage would have been a simple and straightforward parallel if not for this element. Since the parable of the Good Samaritan is the element that distinguishes both parts, it is important to consider its structure independently.²⁷

The unit with the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-35) can be subdivided into seven subunits.²⁸ The first subunit (10:30) begins with a short presentation of the main protagonist. A certain man is going down to Jericho. He falls into the hands of brigands who leave him half-dead. The second (10:31) and third subunit (10:32) present the attitude of the priest and the Levite when they come upon the victim. Both officials of the temple are introduced in the same way (both happened to be traveling the same road). Both come to the place, both see the victim, and both pass on the other side (ἰδὼν ἀντιπαρῆλθεν). The use of

²⁷ Crossan (*In Parables*, 62-63) considers Luke 10:30-36 by itself, apart from the present setting, and he proposes a chiasmic structure (a) Luke 10:30a; (b) 10:30b; (c) 10:31-33; (b') 10:34-35; (a') 10:36. Thus, the initial "a certain man who fell among the robbers" corresponds to the final question, "Who was neighbor to the man who fell among the robbers?" The detailed description of how the robbers treated the man corresponds to the description of what the Samaritan did when he saw the victim. The presence of the priest and the Levite prepare for the climactic point, which is the appearance of the Samaritan. The chiasmic structure, as presented by Crossan, has its advantages and supporters. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 427.

²⁸ Snodgrass (*Stories with Intent*, 344) divides the parable into four movements: initial scene (10:30), the priest (10:31), the Levite (10:32), and the Samaritan (10:33-35). Bailey (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes*, 289-97) distinguishes seven scenes. I follow this seven-fold structure. This subdivision better presents the plot of the narrative and the dynamics of the whole passage.

the same verbs (ὁράω and ἀντιπαρέρχομαι), the same order and grammatical forms, and their lack of interest in the victim portray their similar attitude. The fourth unit (10:33) depicts the attitude of a Samaritan who, like the two officials, comes to the place and sees the victim. However, unlike the previous two, the Samaritan does not pass on the other side. Instead, he stops, and moved with pity (ἐσπλαγγνίσθη), he takes care of the victim.²⁹ The next two subunits, five (10:34a) and six (10:34b), depict how the Samaritan dresses the man's wounds and takes him into the inn to care for his needs.³⁰ Finally, the seventh subunit returns to the theme of the journey. Before the Samaritan leaves the inn to continue his journey, he promises to pay the expenses needed to heal the victim (10:35).

Taking into consideration the grammatical and literary devices used in the composition of this passage, the structure of Luke 10:25-37 can be presented in the following way:

First part: “Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life” (10:25-28)

The scholar's question: “Teacher, what must I *do* to inherit eternal life?” (10:25)

Jesus' counter-question: “What is written in the law? How do you read it?” (10:26)

The scholar's reply from the *Shema* (10:27)

Jesus' answer and imperative: “*Do* this and you will live” (10:28)

²⁹ According to Maarten J. Menken (“Position of σπλαγγνίζεσθαι and σπάγγνα in the Gospel of Luke,” *NovT* 30 [1988] 111), ἐσπλαγγνίσθη in 10:33 is preceded by 68 words and followed by 67, which makes it the center of the unit.

³⁰ Blomberg (*Interpreting the Parables*, 121) notes that a succinct description of the behavior of the priest and the Levite is contrasted with an extended account of the Samaritan's action.

Second part: “And who is my neighbor” (10:29-37)

The scholar’s question: “And who is my *neighbor*” (10:29)

The proper parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35)

A certain man on his way to Jericho fell into hands of robbers (10:30)

The priest came, saw, and passed by on the other side (10:31)

The Levite came, saw, and passed by on the other side (10:32)

The Samaritan came, saw, and was moved by pity (10:33-35)

Dressing the man’s wounds (10:34a)

Taking the man into inn (10:34b)

Final matters (10:35)

Jesus’ counter-question: “Which of these three was *neighbor*” (10:36)

The scholar’s reply (10:37a)

Jesus’ answer: “Go and *do* likewise” (10:37b)

7. The Historical Background

Having discussed the text of the parable, its limits, the textual variants and the structure of the passage, I will now investigate the historical background of the parable. The study of structure has shown that the parable falls into two parts, each manifesting a key theme. In the first part (Luke 10:25-28) the key theme is found in the question “Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life,” and in the second part (10:29-37) the key theme is

found in the question “And who is my neighbor.” Both parts of the parable provide answers to these questions. First, the scholar must follow the commandants to love God and neighbor. Second, he must follow the example of the Samaritan who proved to be a neighbor. Since the commandment to love God and neighbor and the command to follow the example of the Samaritan play such an important role in the parable, I will investigate how the love commandment, the concept of “neighbor,” and the Samaritans were viewed at the time of Jesus. The study of these three points will be crucial for an understanding of the internal dynamics of the parable, and it will contribute to my analysis of the larger context of the parable.

7.1. The Commandment to Love God and Neighbor

The Torah commands its adherents to love God and their neighbor. “You shall love the Lord, your God, with your whole heart, and with your whole being, and with your whole strength” (Deut 6:5), and “You shall love your neighbor as yourself. I am the Lord” (Lev 19:18). In the parable of the Good Samaritan, however, these two commandments are quoted side-by-side as if they formed a single commandment.

7.1.1. The Old Testament Evidence

The commandant to love God (Deut 6:5) plays a central role in the Jewish prayer known as *Sh'ma Yisrael*, or simply *Shema*. All Jews were obligated to recite this prayer twice a day; early in the morning and later in the evening.³¹ The *Shema* and the commandment to love God reminded Israel of God’s great deeds in the past and his prescriptions and blessings.

³¹ Apart the commandant to love God, the *Shema* included two other texts (Deut 11:13-21; Num 15:37-41). See Frédéric Manns, *La preghiera d'Israele al Tempo di Gesù* (Bologna: Dehoniane, 1996) 140.

Accordingly, it regulated the life and daily activities of the pious Jew. The prescription to teach the commandment (Deut 6:7) shows the centrality of the commandment to love God for Judaism.³²

The commandment to love one's neighbor (Lev 19:18) was another well-known commandment. It appears in the context of rules to be followed by the whole community. According to these rules the people had to respect mother and father (19:3) and care for the poor and alien (19:10). The Israelites were not to exploit their neighbors (19:13), nor to act dishonestly (19:15), nor to remain idly when their neighbor's life was at stake (19:16). They were not to hold a grudge against a fellow countryman or son of the people, but to love their neighbor (רֵעַ) as themselves (19:18). Although the Hebrew form used here for neighbor (רֵעַ) can be translated as your fellow man, associate, or friend. Given the context (one's own people) it is more likely that this noun refers to a member of one's own nation or relative rather than to an alien or foreigner.³³ Thus, the commandment to love one's neighbor and the concept of neighbor itself was rather limited. It only concerned the members of one's own people and did not include those who belonged to other nations.

The prophetic and wisdom literature explain how the commandment to love God and neighbor should be put into action.³⁴ For example, when Tobit was about to start his journey

³² The book of Deuteronomy commands that children should be taught diligently to love God (Deut 6:7).

³³ *THAT*, 2:786-90; According to Walther Günther ("πλησίον," *NIDNTT* 6:312), "the command to love one's neighbor applies unequivocally towards members of the covenant of Yahweh and not self-evidently, towards all men." A separate commandment not to mistreat an alien in Lev 19:34 suggests that Lev 19:18 deals primarily with one's own people and not with all neighbors in general.

³⁴ Snodgrass (*Stories with Intent*, 340-41) provides a collection of Greco-Roman and Early-Christian writings on the love of neighbor.

he was advised to give some of his food to the hungry and some of his clothing to the naked. He was also told to pour out wine and offer bread to the righteous but not to share them with sinners (Tobit 4:16-17). In a similar way the Book of Sirach commands one to do good to the righteous, give food to the good, and refuse it to sinners (Sir 12:1-7). Based on these two texts, it is clear that the Jews were to care for those who acted righteously and devoutly, and to avoid sinners and wrongdoers.

7.1.2. The New Testament Evidence

The Gospels of Mark and Matthew quote the commandment to love God and the commandment to love one's neighbor in the context of a debate between Jesus and a scribe (Matt 22:34-40; Mark 12:28-34). In the Gospel of Luke the commandment to love God and neighbor appears in the context of the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). All three texts have some similarities and differences that can be used to argue for a common source or for their independence.³⁵ Apart from the discussion whether the text of Luke comes from Mark, Matthew, "Q," or a special Lukan source, there are two striking differences between the text of Matthew and Mark and the text of Luke.

First, all three accounts start with a question. In Matthew and Mark the question is, "Which commandment in the law is the greatest?" (Matt 22:36; Mark 12:29), whereas in Luke the question is, "Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" (Luke 10:25). In the

³⁵ The comparison of the accounts, their similarities, differences and origin has been investigated by many scholars. Apart from Kiilunen (*Das Doppelgebot der Liebe in Synoptischer Sicht*) who recently argued for Mark as the source of the Lukan passage, the problem has also been studied by Fitzmyer, *The Gospel of Luke*, 2:876-78; Thomas W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979) 258-60; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 202; Sellin, "Lukas als Gleichniserzähler," 19-60; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2001) 4:522-28.

Matthean and Markan accounts it is Jesus who provides the answer and quotes the commandment to love God and neighbor, whereas in the Lukan account it is the scholar of the law who provides the answer by quoting the same commandments. Thus, both, Jesus and the scholar agree, that the commandments to love God and neighbor are the most important.

The second striking difference between the text in Matthew and Mark and the text in Luke is how the two commandments are quoted. In Matthew and Mark the commandment to love God and neighbor appears as two commandments. First Jesus identifies the call to love God as the greatest and the first commandment, then, he says that the commandment to love one's neighbor is the second greatest commandment. In Luke, however, the scholar of the law quotes the commandments to love God and neighbor as if they were one commandment. There is no distinction between the first and the second commandment. Of course it is possible that the difference depends on the nature of the question (since in Luke the question differs from the question in Matthew and Mark). This objection, however, misses the point. In the Lukan Gospel there is no distinction between loving God and loving one's neighbor. The two commandments are one and cannot be separated.³⁶

It is rather difficult to determine who was the first to join the two love commandments. According to Matt 22:37 and Mark 12:29-31 it was Jesus who quoted the two love commandments one after another, whereas in Luke 10:27 it was the lawyer who quoted

³⁶ According to Meier (*The Marginal Jew*, 4:527), such union comes from the prophetic, eschatological context of the gathering of Israel. In this vision "the first commandment naturally 'begets' the second." Rudolf Pesch ("Jesus und Hauptgebot," in Helmut Merklein [ed.], *Neues Testament und Ethik* [Freiburg: Herder, 1989] 107) makes a similar point.

them together.³⁷ The union of the two love commandments may have been the result of a traditional reading and interpretation.³⁸ It is possible that the same verbal form (ואהבת) used in the commandment to love God (Deut 6:5) and the commandment to love one's neighbor (Lev 19:18) contributed to their unification. The union of the two commandments may have been widespread, for Jesus and the scholar of the law quoted the two commandments together as if such union already existed and was generally known. However, the union of the commandment to love God and neighbor on the basis of the same verbal form is rather doubtful. The text of Leviticus 19:34, which commands to love the alien and not to mistreat those who reside in the land, also uses the same verbal form "you shall love" (ואהבת). Despite the same verbal form, there is no text, either biblical or extra-biblical, that unites the commandment to love the alien with the commandment to love God and neighbor. Thus, it seems that a common reading and interpretation did not see the commandment not to mistreat an alien who resided in the land as being of the same importance as the commandment to love God and one's own people. If such was the case, then, a common reading and interpretation of the Torah, treated the love for aliens and the love for one's own people differently. When Jesus (Matt 22:37; Mark 12:29-31) and the scholar of the law (Luke 10:27) quote the two love commandments they do not include the commandment to love the alien

³⁷ Snodgrass (*Stories with Intent*, 349) notes, "almost certainly Jesus was not the first to join the *Shema* (Deut 6:4-9; 11:13-21; Num 15:37-41) with its call for love of God to the call in Lev 19:18 for the love of neighbor. Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18 use the same Hebrew form (*we'ahabta*) for the commands for love." Since the same verbal form was used, it is possible that early Jewish interpretation connected the two commandments together, but the reasons for this union are not entirely sure.

³⁸ Jewish sources, the Dead Sea Scrolls and early Christian texts either attest to the commandment to love God and to love neighbor side by side (*Jub.* 36:4-8; 1 QS 1:9-10; *Didache* 1:2) or provide a summary of the Law which reminds one of the love of God and the love of neighbor (Deut 10:12-13; Isa 58:6-7; Jer 3-4). See Serge Ruzer, "The Double Love Precept in the New Testament and the Rule of the Community," in Steven R. Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker (eds.), *Jesus' Last Week: Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) 1:81-106.

who resides in the land. Nevertheless, in a certain way the parable of the Good Samaritan extends the common interpretation of the commandments and tries to unite all three commandments into one; the commandment to love God, the neighbor, and the alien.

7.2. “Neighbor” at the Time of Jesus

Generally speaking, the term “neighbor” could be used to denote a fellow human being, or someone who is close to the speaker. It could refer to someone living close by or to someone who is near in a figurative sense. Since the noun has many connotations it can refer to a large or small group.

When the Book of Leviticus commands one to love and not to cherish a grudge against a fellow neighbor, it uses the noun רֵעֵ. This noun comes from a rare verb רָעָה, which means “to have to do with another.”³⁹ In the Bible the noun רֵעֵ assumes many different meanings. For example, it is used to indicate a friend (Deut 13:7; 2 Sam 13:3; Prov 14:20), a companion (Judg 11:38; Job 30:29), a fellow-citizen, another person with whom one stands in a reciprocal relationship or a person with whom one enters into contact on a daily basis (Prov 6:1; 18:17; 25:8). In a metaphorical sense the noun can also denote a lover, or a paramour (Jer 3:1; Hos 3:1). Thus, the noun covers various nuances and denotes different kinds of encounters and interactions among people. In most cases this encounter is between the members of the same people who worship the same God and follow the same Law.⁴⁰

³⁹ According to Ulrich Falkenroth (“πλησίον,” *NIDNT* 1:259), “in the vast majority of cases *plēsion* in the LXX represents *rēa* ‘or its derivatives of the root *rāâh*, which means to have to do with another.”

⁴⁰ Fichtner “πλησίον,” *TDNT* 6:315; BDAG, s.v. “πλησίον,” 830.

In the majority of cases, the LXX translates the Hebrew עַר with πλησίον.⁴¹ The Greek πλησίον can be used either as a noun or as a preposition. Used as a noun it means the one standing near, neighbor, fellow man, the nearest, and in a vague sense, the other or a fellow human being.⁴² Thus, πλησίον indicates a person who lives close by and becomes part of a group. When πλησίον is used as a preposition it means “nearby.” Given the idea of living together closely, or in proximity with others, the noun πλησίον conveys a notion of closeness but not necessarily an ethical and cultural connection between the members of a group.

In the NT, apart from the parable of the Good Samaritan, the noun “neighbor” occurs thirteen other times. Nine of these appear in the context of the commandment to love one’s neighbor (Matt 5:43; 19:19; 22:39; Mark 12:31; 12:33; Rom 13:9,10; Gal 5:14; Jas 2:8), once in the story of Moses told by Stephen (Acts 7:27), and three times in a reference to a fellow Christian brother (Rom 15:2; Eph 4:25; Jas 4:12).

7.2.1. The Limits of the Term “Neighbor”

The OT commandment to love one’s neighbor (Lev 19:18) was primarily understood as love for one’s own people. Since one could become a member of the chosen people by following the law, it is possible that this commandment also included proselytes and so-called God-fearers or Gentiles who followed the practices of Judaism without becoming full converts (Acts 10:2; 13:16; 13:26).⁴³ If such was the case, a Jew in Jerusalem could consider

⁴¹ Occasionally the noun עַר is translated as φίλος, ἕτερος, πολίτης, ἀδελφος, or συνεταιρίς.

⁴² Falkenroth, “πλησίον,” *NIDNTT* 1:259.

⁴³ Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 202; Fichtner (“πλησίον,” *TDNT* 6:315) notes, “the commandment applies only in relation to Israelites and full proselytes. Samaritans, foreigners and resident aliens who do not join the community of Israel within 12 months are excluded.”

a neighbor another Jew living either in Galilee or in the diaspora (for example, in Parthia, Mede, Elam, and Mesopotamia, or in any other place wherever there was a Jewish community).⁴⁴ In other words, in first century Palestine, a Jew could consider a fellow Jew or proselyte living next door, or a Jew living a hundred or a thousand miles away, as a neighbor. Paradoxically, in this conception there was no place for an alien who was living nearby. An alien, or any Gentile traveller who happened to cross the country, was not considered to be a neighbor. The only requirement for being viewed and treated as a neighbor was to be of Jewish descent, or in the case of a proselyte or God-fearers, to be a convert to Judaism or willing to convert.

The scholar's question in Luke 10:29, "And who is my neighbor," suggests that in Second Temple Judaism there was an ongoing discussion on who was to be considered a neighbor and who was to be excluded from the group. Josephus, speaking about three philosophical sects within Judaism, testifies that the Pharisees were friendly to each other, whereas the behavior of the Sadducees towards one another and their conversation with each other were barbarous as if they were strangers to each other.⁴⁵ Evidence shows that despite

⁴⁴ See Acts 2:8-11. For the extension of the Jewish diaspora in the first century, see A'haron Oppenheimer and Benjamin H. Isaac, *Studies on the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Tel Aviv: Ramot, 1996).

⁴⁵ Josephus (*War*, 2:119) writes: "there are three philosophical sects among the Jews. The followers of the first of whom are the Pharisees; of the second the Sadducees; and the third sect, who pretends to a severer discipline, are called Essenes." The presence of the first two groups in the Gospels could testify that they were among the most influential groups within the Second Temple Judaism and this is why Jesus interacted with them. See the discussion on Jesus in relation to competing Jewish groups in Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 3:289-613.

the internal quarrels, the Pharisees and the Sadducees considered the member of that same group as neighbor, but not necessarily those who did not follow their way of life.⁴⁶

A similar practice may have been in vogue among other communities or groups in first century Palestine. The writings of the Qumran community, although they do not use the term “neighbor,” prove that those who do not adhere to the group are to be treated in a different way than the members of the community. According to the *Community Rule* only the children of light should be loved, whereas the children of darkness should be hated.⁴⁷ An echo of that situation can be seen elsewhere in the Gospels. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus says, “You have heard that it was said, you shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy (Matt 5:43).” The way Jesus quotes the commandment and includes hating the enemy, which is absent from the Torah, shows that according to traditional rabbinic interpretation of the Torah the personal enemies of the people of Israel were not considered to be neighbors.

7.2.2. The Extension of the Term “Neighbor”

In spite of all the prescriptions dealing with neighbor, such prescriptions did not specify how the Israelites should treat other nations with whom they would come into contact. The commandment to love one’s neighbor contemplated only the people of the covenant. The line between who should be considered a neighbor needed to be clarified.

⁴⁶ See Josephus, *War*, 2:162-66; Str-B, 2:515-16. Daniel Constantin (“Les Esséniens et l’arrière-fond historique de la parabole du Bon Samaritain,” *NovT* 11 [1969] 71-104) argues that in the parable of the Good Samaritan the victim was a member of an Essene community, whereas the robbers were Zealots, the priest, and the Levite. None helped the man, for all belonged to different groups and had different concepts of neighbor.

⁴⁷ According to Meier (*A Marginal Jew*, 3:528), “Qumran positively inculcates hatred for all those outside the community. Such outsiders were “the sons of darkness,” comprising both Gentiles and all those Jews who did not accept the views and practices of the Qumranites (“the Children of Light”).” “(The Master) is to teach them both to love all the Children of Light, each commensurate with his rightful place in the council of God, and to hate all the Children of Darkness” 1QS 1:9-10.

According to Leviticus, a stranger (גר), that is, a temporary dweller or newcomer who resides in the land of Israel, should be given the same treatment as a fellow countryman. In other terms, a foreigner residing in the land of Israel should not be mistreated (Lev 19:33-34). Thus, the commandment to love one's neighbor assumed a new interpretation that included a larger group.⁴⁸

The commandment not to mistreat an alien who dwells in the land assumed a new meaning after the destruction of the Temple and the exile. Before the destruction of the Temple the Jews lived in a primarily Jewish context and the Temple of Jerusalem provided a reference point for all Jews. The exile into Babylon ended that era and began a new one. In exile, Jews had to live in a non-Jewish environment. Life among foreigners presented new challenges that needed to be addressed.⁴⁹ The Jews faced a new situation and came into closer contact with different nations and groups that did not share the same concept of neighbor they did. The problem of interaction with the nations and Gentiles grew greater when the Jewish people were allowed to return and rebuild the Temple. The conquests of Alexander the Great and the arrival of the Romans exposed the Jews to contact with the Gentiles. Thus, in the time of Jesus the question was not how to live as a minority among other nations but how to communicate with people who had diverse practices, professed a different religion, and whether to treat them as neighbors or as strangers living temporarily in the land of Israel. Since it was impossible to ignore these Gentiles, there was an urgent need to interpret the

⁴⁸ According to Fitzmyer (*The Gospel of Luke*, 2:886), Lev 19:33-34 was already an answer to where one should draw the line in loving the neighbor.

⁴⁹ Darrell L. Bock, *Studying the Historical Jesus: A Guide to Sources and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002) 81.

prescriptions of the Torah, including the teaching on neighbor, and to adopt them to a new situation. Various groups within Judaism proposed different responses, and the limits between “neighbor” and “stranger” were anything but settled.

The parable of the Good Samaritan and the picture of Judaism it presents fits Second Temple Judaism. The question “And who is my neighbor” seeks to determine if the commandment to love the alien is to be treated in the same way as the commandment to love God and one’s neighbor.

7.3. The Samaritans at the Time of Jesus

In order to examine the picture of the Samaritans at the time of Jesus (their contacts with Jews and how the OT commandment to love one’s neighbor and not to mistreat the alien who resides in the land was applied to them), it is necessary to start with the OT evidence and then turn to the extra-biblical sources that regulated contacts between these two groups. The history of the contacts between the Samaritans and the Jews will shed some light on the picture of the Samaritans at the time of Jesus and on the internal dynamics of the parable.

7.3.1. The Samaritans and the Jews in the Biblical Tradition

The origins of the Samaritans and their contacts with the Jews are obscure. The sources at our disposal are limited. Those that do exist are often contradictory or inconsistent.⁵⁰ A major difficulty is that the term Samaritan is vague and can be understood in

⁵⁰ Robert T. Anderson, “Samaritans,” *ABD*, 5:940. According to Meier (*A Marginal Jew*, 3:535), “both Samaritans and Jews created narratives describing the Samaritans’ origin, but neither narrative tradition is historically reliable.”

three different ways. It can be used in a geographical, an ethnic and a religious sense.⁵¹

Despite the difficulties in tracing the history of the contacts between Jews and Samaritans, it is possible to point to a few episodes that shaped and influenced the contacts between these two groups for centuries to come. The first such episode happened shortly after the death of Solomon. The uncompromising attitude of Rehoboam resulted in two independent states; the kingdom of the North, known later as the kingdom of Israel or Samaria, and the kingdom of the South known as the kingdom of Judah (1 Kgs 12:1-20).⁵²

The division of Solomon's kingdom into two independent states led to a deeper division between the northern and southern tribes. The existence of two independent states caused a religious schism and the creation of two sanctuaries in the northern kingdom, one in Dan and one in Bethel (1 Kgs 12:26-31). The OT describes many episodes that aggravated the contacts between northern and southern kingdoms and so contributed to the animosity between the inhabitants of these two regions. Although not all of these episodes are relevant to the parable of the Good Samaritan, the story of the captives that the Israelites took into

⁵¹ According to Meier (*A Marginal Jew*, 3:533-35), in a geographical sense the Samaritans are inhabitants of the region called Samaria. In an ethnic sense, the Samaritans are presumed decedents of the Israelite tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh that used to occupy the Samaria before the capture of the northern kingdom by the Assyrians mixed with the non-Israelite groups that settled in the region. In a religious sense, the Samaritans form a group that worships God on Mount Gerizim, maintains that it is the only true place of worship, rejects the priesthood in Jerusalem, and accepts only five books of Moses.

⁵² Although the Samaritans cannot be identified with the northern Kingdom, it should not be overlooked that the religion the Samaritans practiced was partially shaped by the inhabitants of the northern kingdom. For this reason it is important to remember the split of the two kingdoms and the consequences that followed.

Samaria, and who were later brought back to Jericho (2 Chr 28:5-15) has some similarities with the parable of the Good Samaritan.⁵³

While these episodes were only the remote origins of the animosity between Jews and Samaritans, the following history shaped the contacts between these two groups in a more direct way. In B.C. 722 the Assyrians conquered the northern kingdom, deported its inhabitants into exile, and brought other nations to occupy the territory heretofore occupied by the northern tribes. While it is not certain if the whole population was deported, it is possible that some may have remained and continued to identify themselves as the true Israel.⁵⁴ According to 2 Kgs 17:24-25 and Josephus (*Ant.* 9:290), the Assyrian king Sargon II brought people from Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, Hamath, and Sepharvim to settle in the northern territory he conquered. The new inhabitants did not know or worship the God of Israel. Eventually they turned to the God of Israel, but they also established shrines to other gods, most likely the gods of their native lands. It is in this context that 2 Kings calls the new-comers the Samaritans for the first time: “But these peoples began to make their own gods in the various cities in which they were living; in the shrines on the high places which the Samarians had made, each people set up gods” (2 Kgs 17:29). Thus, in the eyes of the Jews both in exile and in the southern kingdom of Judah, the religion practiced by those who

⁵³ See Scott F. Spencer, “2 Chronicles 28:5-15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan,” *WTJ* 46 (1984) 317-49. According to Bailey (*Through Peasant Eyes*, 49) the parable of the Good Samaritan could also be a Midrash on Hosea 6. He lists at least twelve similarities between Hosea 6 and the parable of the Good Samaritan.

⁵⁴ According to the inscription of Sargon, the deportation of Israel amounted to 27,290 inhabitants. See James B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950) 284-85. Moreover, the invitation to the Passover, issued in Judah by king Hezekiah inviting the remnant of Israel to come to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover (2 Chr 30:1–31:6), indicates that there was a group who remained in Israel and was not deported into exile.

remained in what used to be the northern kingdom, and by the colonists who were brought from other nations was not viewed as true worship. On the other hand, the Samaritans regarded themselves as the legitimate descendants of the northern tribes, the direct descendants of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, and the true keepers (*šāmērîm*) of the law given to Moses.⁵⁵

Another episode, which may have shaped the relationship between Samaritans and Jews, happened after the Persian emperor Cyrus the Great permitted the Jews in exile to return to their homeland and ordered the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem (2 Chr 36:22-23; Ezra 1:1-11). According to Ezra 4:4, the local inhabitants “discouraged the people of Judah and frightened them off from building.” The text does not specify who the local inhabitants, called “people of the land,” were, or if they were Samaritans or another group.⁵⁶ Nevertheless the contacts between the Samaritans and the Jews deteriorated, and eventually the Samaritans built a temple on Mount Gerizim.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Anderson, “Samaritans,” 5:940; Richard J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975) 10-11.

⁵⁶ In Biblical Hebrew the singular form עַם־הָאָרֶץ refers to a social group within the kingdom of Judah, whereas the plural עַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ refers to foreigners, either the nations or the native Canaanite population living within Israel. In a later period, after the Babylonian exile, the עַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ were contrasted with those who returned from exile. It is debatable whether the term refers to the people of Judah who never went into exile and adopted syncretistic views, or to non-Hebrews and by extension to Samaritans. See A’haron Oppenheimer, *The ‘Am Ha-Aretz: A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (ALGHJ 8; Leiden: Brill, 1977).

⁵⁷ The exact date when the temple was built is still disputed. Some date the construction during the Persian period, others at the beginning of the Hellenic. Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 539. According to Yitzhak Magen (“The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in the Light of the Archaeological Evidence,” in Oded Lipschitz, Gary N. Knoppers and Rainer Albertz [eds.], *Judah and Judeans in the Fourth Century BC* [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007] 75) the temple on Mount Gerizim may have been built in the first half of the 5th century BC. According to Josephus (*Ant.* 11:8), the temple on Mount Gerizim was built by Sanballat during the Persian period.

The biblical tradition remembers an altar built in the region of Shechem, therefore, in the vicinity of Gerizim, by Abram (Gen 12:6) as well as another altar erected by Jacob in the sight of the city on a piece of land bought from the descendants of Hamor (Gen 33:18-20). However, in none of these episodes is Mount Gerizim mentioned as a place of worship. Mount Gerizim appears for the first time in the biblical tradition in the story of the Israelites entering the promised land under the leadership of Joshua. After crossing the Jordan the Israelites were supposed to gather on mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal to pronounce benedictions and curses (Deut 11:29; 27:12). An altar was also to be built on a mountain. In the biblical tradition this mountain was Ebal (Deut 27:4), whereas in the Samaritan Pentateuch, this mountain was identified as Mount Gerizim. The legitimacy of the cult on Mount Gerizim is presented in the Samaritan Chronicles. According to this text, it was the priest Eli (recorded in the biblical tradition in 1 Samuel) who abandoned the original sanctuary on Mount Gerizim and organized a new place of worship in Shiloh and a new priesthood.⁵⁸ However, the Samaritan Chronicles were written at a much later period and tend to legitimize or explain the present situation.

Under the Hellenic influence the temple was named as the temple of Zeus the Host of Strangers (2 Macc 6:2). The circumstances leading to that name are not entirely clear. According to biblical text and Josephus, the Samaritans themselves petitioned the Seleucid king to name the temple.⁵⁹ In the wake of the Maccabean Revolt, John Hyrcanus (135-104

⁵⁸ John Macdonald, *The Samaritan Chronicle* (BZAW 107; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969) 68-70.

⁵⁹ *Ant.* 12:5. Meier (*A Marginal Jew*, 3:540) notes, however, “the historical fact may simply be that the Samaritans, feeling themselves in a perilous position, did not resist Antiochous’ Hellenizing policies with the same zeal as that shown by Judas Maccabeus and his followers.”

B.C.) destroyed the temple, a fact that only worsened the strained relationship between the Samaritans and the Jews.

7.3.2. The Samaritans and the Jews in Extra-Biblical Sources

The extra-biblical sources confirm that Jews and Samaritans did not always see eye to eye. The Mishnah contains texts that codify the relationship between the Jews and Samaritans.⁶⁰ For example, the Samaritans like the Gentiles, were not allowed to enter the Temple precinct in Jerusalem.⁶¹ The testimony given by a Samaritan had no value,⁶² and eating with a Samaritan was compared to eating with swine.⁶³ A Jew who withheld wages from or killed a Samaritan was not liable to the death penalty.⁶⁴ In other words, the Samaritans were not considered to be equal to the Jews, and the law of retaliation was not applicable if a Samaritan was injured in a dispute.

Josephus draws a similar picture of the relationship between the Samaritans and the Jews. According to him there were serious accidents that worsened the contacts between these two groups and generated mistrust. For example, shortly before Passover in 9 A.D., the Samaritans dishonored the Temple of Jerusalem by dispersing the bones of animals in the

⁶⁰ Some texts in the Mishnah may have been redacted after the time of Jesus and so portray a more Rabbinic Judaism than Second Temple Judaism. Nevertheless, these texts present historical events that are known from other sources. Moreover, these texts contain oral traditions and disputes between the rabbinic sages that either go back, or reflect the traditions, spirit and atmosphere of Second Temple Judaism.

⁶¹ *m. Šeqal.* 1.5.

⁶² *m. Giṭ.* 1:5.

⁶³ *m. Šeb.* 8.10.

⁶⁴ *b. Sanh.* 57a.

Temple area.⁶⁵ On another occasion, the Samaritans killed several Jews traveling to Jerusalem for the Passover.⁶⁶

The relationship between Jews and Samaritans was not always one of rivalry, mistrust, and hatred. There are also texts that portray a more peaceful coexistence between them. For instance, one was allowed to buy provisions from a Samaritan or engage in business with a Samaritan.⁶⁷ Moreover, a Samaritan could say a grace before a common meal.⁶⁸

7.3.3. The New Testament Evidence

The Samaritans, although known from Jewish literature and from Josephus,⁶⁹ do not appear frequently in the NT. There are only ten instances where they or their territory is mentioned.⁷⁰ Almost half of these occurrences are found in Luke; three in the Gospel and one in the Acts of the Apostles. The reason for the absence of the Samaritans in the NT has to do with the mission of Jesus. According to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus did not preach in the Samaritan territory. His mission was directed to those who belonged to the house of Israel. Although Jesus did not engage directly in a mission among Samaritans, the Synoptic Gospels

⁶⁵ *Ant.* 18:29-30.

⁶⁶ *Ant.* 20:118-36.

⁶⁷ *b. Git.* 28a; *b. 'Abod. Zar.* 15b; *y. 'Abod. Zar.* 5.4.

⁶⁸ *m. Ber.* 5.8; 8.8.

⁶⁹ For example, *Ant.* 12:10; 13:275-81; 18:29-30; 20:118-36.

⁷⁰ Matt 10:5; Luke 9:52; 10:33; 17:16; John 4:9 (2x); 4:39.40; 8:48; Acts 8:25.

record occasional encounters between Jesus and the people of Samaria. These encounters were, for the most part, less than cordial.

The most notable encounter between Jesus and the Samaritans is reordered in the Gospel of John. The episode of the Samaritan woman who meets Jesus at the well of Jacob (4:4-41) reveals that the Gospels use the term Samaritan in a geographical, an ethnic, and a religious sense. Samaritan denotes the inhabitants of Samaria (4:4), but it also refers to a religious group who worship God on a mountain (4:20), and expects the coming of the Messiah (4:25). Furthermore, the term Samaritan also refers to an ethnic group that recognizes Jacob as their father (4:12). The Samaritans, the descendants of Jacob, and the Jews shared a messianic expectation. Nonetheless the evangelist notes that Jews used nothing in common with Samaritans (4:9), and he equals being a Samaritan with being possessed (8:48).

In Luke the portrait of the Samaritans is slightly different. First, it is a Samaritan traveller who assists a man in need when a priest and a Levite fail to do so (10:25-37). Second, a Samaritan is praised for returning to Jesus and giving thanks after being healed of his leprosy (17:16). The Acts of the Apostles also presents a positive picture of the Samaritans who, according to Acts 8, received the good news of salvation. Although Luke makes positive statements about the Samaritans, there is also an echo of the animosities between Jews and Samaritans. The Samaritans, knowing that Jesus is going to Jerusalem and its temple forbid him to pass through their territory (9:52).

7.3.4. The Consequences of the Relationship Between Jews and Samaritans for the Time of Jesus

The evidence discussed above shows that in the time of Jesus, the relationship between the Samaritans and the Jews were estranged. Although the origin of that situation was remote and not entirely clear to all involved, it was viewed as an injury recently inflicted. The occasional signs of peaceful and serene co-existence did not allow parties to forget the centuries of animosity that separated them. The Samaritans were considered to be alien people living in the land of Israel. They were foreigners, sinners and wrongdoers who should be avoided. From time to time relations between Jews and Samaritans may have improved. The sources at our disposal, however, indicate that in first century Palestine the relations between Jews and Samaritans were strained at best.

Occasionally the Jews may have even considered the Samaritans as proselytes under Jewish tutelage, but for the most part they were despised as heretics and sinners.⁷¹ The Samaritans accepted the Torah (though in a different form), but they did not have the *Nevi'im* and the *Ketuvim*. Their refusal to accept the Temple in Jerusalem as the only true place of worship was a sign of schism and heresy. The Samaritans, following the tradition of their ancestors (John 4:20), continued to worship on Mount Gerizim. Notwithstanding the general animosity, antagonism, and resentment, Jews had to interact with Samaritans on a regular basis. The shortest and the easiest way from Galilee to Jerusalem was through Samaritan territory, and many Jews chose to pass through Samaria on their pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

⁷¹ Ibid., 342. According to Walter Wink ("The Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan: A Communal Exegesis Approach," *RevExp* 76 [1979] 210), the relations between the Samaritans and the Jews were very bad. The Jews even cursed the Samaritans and prayed that they would not share in the coming life.

There may have been sporadic accidents of hatred along the way. The refusal to receive Jesus on his way to Jerusalem is an example of continual clashes in the relations between Jews and Samaritans.⁷² The biblical and extra biblical evidence show that the Samaritans, for the most part, avoided Jews, and Jews avoided them. In the best-case scenario both groups tolerated each other, but not as equals.

8. Conclusion

In this chapter I have shown that the text of Luke 10:25-37 does not present any serious textual problems. There are minor textual variants that correct the text, its syntax and grammar, or remove redundancies. The textual variant in 10:36 tends to remove the discrepancy between the question of the scholar of the law, “And who is my neighbor” (10:29), and the question of Jesus, “which of these three, in your opinion, was neighbor to the robbers’ victim” (10:36).

In terms of structure the passage can be divided into two parts. The first part (10:25-28) may have derived from other sources than Luke’s own traditions (possibly Matt 22:35-40; Mark 12:28-31, or “Q”), but in its present setting the discussion between the scholar of the law and Jesus is an integral part of the parable of the Good Samaritan. The two parts of the passage are best understood if taken together. The commandment to love one’s neighbor in the first part (10:25-28) cannot be fully comprehended without its application in the example of the Good Samaritan exemplified in the second part of the passage (10:29-37). In the same way the need to follow the example of the Samaritan who helps the man in need

⁷² According to Meier (*The Marginal Jew*, 3:545), Luke 9:53 may echo “the competition between the rival sanctuaries of Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion, each one being the goal of pilgrims at Passover.”

cannot be appreciated without the previous reference to the commandment to love one's neighbor. Both parts of the passage complement each other and shed light on the meaning of the passage.

The study of the historical background of Luke 10:25-37 shows that the parable of the Good Samaritan reflects the cultural dynamics of first century Palestine. The biblical and extra biblical evidence show that the commandment to love God and one's neighbor was very important for Jews. While the commandment to love God remained unchanged throughout the centuries, the commandment to love one's neighbor underwent development. The history of Israel and sociocultural changes required an interpretation of the commandment to love one's neighbor that reflected the new situation the people faced.

There were various interpretations of the commandment to love one's neighbor but in none of them were the Samaritans viewed as neighbors. The presence of the Samaritan traveler in the parable, who helped an anonymous man, is crucial for the plot of the parable. (The presence of the Samaritan in the parable not only emphasizes the unusual character of the story, it also provides a revolutionary interpretation.) The double commandment to love God and the neighbor should be combined and read alongside the commandment not to mistreat an alien who resides in the land. In the chapter that follows I will illustrate how this interpretation fits the larger context of the text, which is the Lukan journey section.

CHAPTER THREE

THE PARABLE OF THE GOOD SAMARITAN IN THE LUKAN JOURNEY SECTION

1. Introduction

In this chapter I will study the literary context of the parable of the Good Samaritan. I will discuss its remote (9:51–19:46), proximate (9:51–13:20) and immediate context (10:21–24; 38–42). I will also discuss some key episodes within the remote context that are helpful for interpreting the parable.

2. The Remote Context of the Parable of the Good Samaritan

The parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25–37) falls into the fourth part of the Gospel (9:51–19:46).¹ This part of the Gospel is identified in different ways: the Samaritan section,² the Perean section,³ the central section,⁴ or, in more recent studies, as the journey

¹ The structure of the Gospel is still debated. Scholars have proposed various structures. For example Charles H. Giblin (*The Destruction of Jerusalem according to Luke's Gospel* [AnBib 107; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1985] 1–9) proposes a division into three major parts. Benedetto Prete (*L'opera di Luca* [Torino: Elledici, 1986] 34–79) prefers six main divisions. Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke*, 1:134–42) divides the Gospel of Luke into seven parts preceded by a prologue (1:1–4): the infancy narrative (1:5–2:52), the preparation for the public ministry (3:1–4:13), the Galileean ministry (4:14–9:50), the journey to Jerusalem (9:51–19:27), the ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem (19:28–21:38), the passion narrative (22:1–23:56a), and the resurrection narrative (23:56b–24:53). Adelbert Denaux (“The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Luke,” in Camille Focant [ed.], *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* [BETL 110; Leuven: Peeters, 1993] 389–92) provides a survey of the various structures of the Gospel. All agree in dividing the public ministry of Jesus into three parts; Jesus’ ministry in Galilee, the journey to Jerusalem, and Jesus’ ministry in Jerusalem. For the most part I follow the structure presented by Fitzmyer, which I believe respects the change of geographical data and the change of place, scenes, and protagonists.

² Julius Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien* (Berlin: Reimer, 1905) 52.

³ C. West-Watson, “The Peraen Ministry,” *JTS* 11 (1910) 269–74.

⁴ Evans, “The Central Section of Luke’s Gospel,” 37–53; James L. Resseguie, “Point of View in the Central Section of Luke (9:51–19:44),” *JETS* 25 (1982) 41–48.

section or travel narrative.⁵ In this chapter I will discuss the limits of the Lukan journey section and its structure. These two factors, as I will show, are helpful for understanding the meaning of the journey section, which affects the meaning of the parable of the Good Samaritan.

For the most part, the material in the fourth part of the Gospel comes from “Q” and Luke’s own source “L.” The bulk of the material is composed of speeches, discourses, and parables. Many of the parables in the journey section are exclusively Lukan; the Good Samaritan (10:25-37), the Friend at Midnight (11:5-13), the Rich Fool (12:16-21), the Barren Fig Tree (13:6-9), the Lost Coin (15:8-19), the Prodigal Son (15:11-32), the Unrighteous Steward (16:1-9), the Unrighteous Judge (18:1-8) and the Pharisee and Tax Collector (18:9-14). Some of these parables contain interior monologues on the part of the characters, a feature that exists only in these Lukan parables.⁶

2.1. The Beginning of the Journey Section

Scholars agree that the journey section begins at 9:51.⁷ There are at least three reasons for this. First, scholars argue that based on vocabulary 9:51 represents Luke’s

⁵ Denaux, “The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative,” 359-92. The name “journey section” or “travel narrative” derives from a few distinctive notices that depict Jesus on the move from Galilee to Jerusalem (9:51, 53, 56; 13:22; 17:11; 18:31; 19:28).

⁶ The parables which make use of interior monologue are: the Rich Man (Luke 12:16-21), the Unfaithful Servant (12:42-46), the Prodigal Son (15:11-32), the Dishonest Steward (16:1-8a), the Persistent Widow (18:2-5), and the Tenant Farmers (20:9-16). See the discussion in Philip Sellew, “Interior Monologue as a Narrative Device in the Parables of Luke,” *JBL* 111 (1992) 239-53.

⁷ This consensus is seen in major modern commentaries, which place the beginning of the journey section at 9:51. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 26-27; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 433-35; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 823-30; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 394-99; Nolland, *Luke*, 2:527-31; Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 364-68.

redactional work.⁸ Second, Luke 9:51 is the first time that the Evangelist notes Jesus' decision to go to Jerusalem. Once Jesus makes the decision to go to Jerusalem, there is a major change in the way he carries out his mission. Starting in 9:51 Jesus no longer limits his mission to one territory, as he did during the Galilean ministry, but he sets Jerusalem as the goal of his journey and teaches along the way. Third, Luke 9:51 announces the purpose of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem.

The Galilean section of the Gospel (4:14–9:50) presented the activity of Jesus in Galilee as a peripatetic ministry without a specific geographical goal in view. Jesus goes from one place to another, but always within the same region or territory.⁹ After an unsuccessful inaugural speech in Nazareth, he is forced to leave his hometown and seek another, more favorable, venue for his mission (4:16). He withdraws to Capernaum and begins to teach in the local synagogue (4:31). While in Capernaum he enters the house of Simon (4:38) and teaches by the lake of Gennesaret (5:1). The next day Jesus teaches in an unnamed town (5:12) and returns to Capernaum to dine in the house of Levi (5:29). After time spent in prayer on a mountain, Jesus chooses those who will be his apostles (6:12-16) and teaches a great crowd of those who come from all parts of Judea and Jerusalem and the

⁸ According to Nolland (*Luke*, 2:534), the verse contains Luke's favorite verb ἐγένετο as well as πορεύομαι which aligns with Luke's use of this verb for the journey section (9:53; 13:33; 17:11). Finally, τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήριξεν followed by an infinitive "is not quite a LXX idiom, but is an easy development from Ezek 21:7 and definitely close enough to fit Luke's desire to write in biblical Greek." See also Michi Miyoshi, *Der Anfang des Reiseberichts Lk 9,51–10,24* (AnBib 60; Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1974) 6-10; Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums* (KEK: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980) 179; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 1:826; Denaux, "The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative," 377-79.

⁹ According to Luke 4:44, Jesus "was preaching in the synagogues of Judea." Some codices and papyri correct Judea (Ἰουδαίας) to Galilee (Γαλιλαίας). According to Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke*, 1:558), the variant "is an obvious correction to harmonize the text with the thrust of the Lukan story at this point in the Gospel." He argues that Judea in Luke 4:14 should be understood "in the comprehensive sense of all the country of the Jews." Wolter (*Das Lukasevangelium*, 208) and Nolland (*Luke*, 1:217) read the text in the same way.

coastal regions of Tyre and Sidon (6:17). The next episodes portray Jesus returning to Capernaum (7:1), visiting Nain (7:11), and going to the region of the Gerasenes, opposite Galilee (8:26). A short visit in the territory of Gerasenes is the only time during the Galilean ministry when Jesus leaves Galilee. After the healing of the Gerasene demoniac, Jesus returns to Capernaum and heals the daughter of Jairus and a woman with a hemorrhage (8:40-56).

After the feeding of the 5000 (9:10-17), Luke recounts Peter's confession (9:18-21), but he does not identify where it occurs. According to Mark 8:27-30 and Matt 16:13-20, Peter confesses Jesus as the Messiah in the regions of Caesarea of Philippi. In Luke's account Peter's confession takes place somewhere in Galilee, in a place where Jesus was praying alone (9:18), about eight days before the transfiguration (9:28-36). Peter's confession in Luke is more comprehensible than it is in Mark. Whereas in Luke the confession of Peter follows the feeding of the five thousands (9:10-17), in Mark the confession comes somewhat unexpectedly, given the incomprehension of the disciples. The redactional changes made by Luke provide a rationale for Peter's confession and reveal Luke's intention in composing the Galilean section of the Gospel. Luke omits Jesus' travels outside Galilee and presents the beginning of Jesus' public ministry as centered in Galilee and the villages along the lake of Gennesaret.¹⁰ In Mark and Matthew the Galilean ministry occupies respectively eight (Mark 1:14–9:50) and fourteen (Matthew 4:12–18:35) chapters. But Mark and Matthew dedicate

¹⁰ Luke omits Mark 6:45–8:26, which eliminates Jesus' journey outside the Jewish territory into the regions of Tyre and Sidon, the healing of the daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mark 7:24-30; Matt 15:21-28), his passing through the territory of Decapolis (Mark 7:31), and his subsequent visit to Caesarea of Philippi (Mark 8:27; Matt 16:13).

only one (Mark 10) or two chapters (Matthew 19-20) to describe Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. In Luke the journey section is much longer and becomes the central part of the Gospel.

Luke 9:51 marks a change in Jesus' ministry. From 9:51 on Jesus has a pre-determined goal in mind, namely, Jerusalem. There will be no more travelling in Galilee or teaching in the synagogue of Capernaum. The beginning of this new chapter in Jesus' ministry has not only a geographically pre-determined goal but a purpose as well. According to Luke 9:51 "the days for his being taken up were fulfilled" (ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως).¹¹ In order to fulfill his destiny Jesus "resolutely determined" (πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν) to go to Jerusalem (9:51).

As soon as Jesus initiates a new chapter of his ministry he sends disciples into a Samaritan village, but the people of that village refuse to welcome him (9:52-56). The rejection by the Samaritans recalls Jesus' rejection at the beginning of his public ministry in Galilee (4:28-30). Just as the people of Nazareth rejected Jesus, so the Samaritans refuse to let him pass through their territory.

2.2. The End of the Journey Section

Whereas there is general agreement that 9:51 begins the journey section, there is little agreement about the end of that section.¹² Several solutions have been proposed. The first is

¹¹ Luke 9:51 is the only place in the Bible where the noun ἀνάλημψις is used. The noun is found in the Psalms of Solomon (*Pss. Sol.* 4:18). According to Denaux ("The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative," 373 footnote 53), a similar "verb ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι is used to describe the assumption of Enoch (Sir 49,14) and Elijah (4 Kgs 2,9-11; 1 Macc 2,58; Sir 48,9)."

¹² W. Gasse, "Zum Reisebericht des Lukas," *ZNW* 34 (1935) 293-99; Walter Grundmann, "Fragen der Komposition des lukanischen Reiseberichtes," *ZNW* 50 (1959) 253-70; G. W. Trompf, "La section médiane de l'évangile de Luc: l'organisation des documents," *RHPR* 53 (1973) 141-54; E. Mayer, *Die Reiseerzählung des Lukas (Lk 9,51-19,10): Entscheidung in der Wüste* (EHS 23/554; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996) 16-22; Reinhard Von Bendemann, *Zwischen Δόξα und Σταυρός*. Eine Exegetische Untersuchung der Texte des

to end the journey section at 18:14 where Luke begins to follow his Markan source once again. This proposal was widely accepted in the past. However, the major problem with this proposal is that 18:14 is not the end of the journey as is evident from the geographical data pointing to Jerusalem in the following episodes. In 18:15 Luke resumes to follow Mark, but if Luke resumes to follow Mark's account, it does not mean that he sets aside his own literary plan.¹³ Rather, Luke uses the material found in the Gospel of Mark for his own literary plan.

The second proposal is to end the journey section with Jesus' entry into the holy city. However, there is another problem.¹⁴ The Gospel of Luke lacks clear and straightforward indication that Jesus enters Jerusalem. Unlike the parallel passage in Mark, which reads, "he entered Jerusalem and went into the temple area" (Mark 11:11), the Lukan Gospel fails to note that Jesus entered the city at the end of his journey. In Luke, Jesus enters the temple area but not the city. Despite a series of repeated indications such as the following: "Jesus resolutely determined to journey to Jerusalem" (9:51); "he passed through towns and villages

sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukasevangelium (BZNW 101; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001) 45-56; Nello Casalini, *Iniziazione al Nuovo Testamento* (Analetta 53; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 2001) 60-67; Filip Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9,51-19,28* (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België, 2004) 23-54.

¹³ Rektor Schaarschmidt, "Der Reisebericht im Lukasevangelium (Luk. 9,51-18,14)," *TSK* 82 (1909) 12-28; idem., "Die Einschaltung im Lukasevangelium (9,51 bis 18,14) als Grundlage der biblischen Geschichte von Jesus," *TSK* 101 (1929) 357-80; William H. Cadman, *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem: Its Purpose in the Light of the Synoptic Gospels* (London: Oxford University Press, 1923) 105; Erich Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1929) 110; K. A. Busch, "Das Evangelium im sogenannten Reisebericht des Lukas (9,51-18,14)," *Sächsisches Kirchen und Schulblatt* 85 (1935) 430-38. The proposal has not been completely abandoned and occasionally finds supporters: X. De Meeüs, *La composition de Lc. 9,51-18,14* (Diss.doct.Théol; Leuven, 1954) 14-15; Louis Girard, *L'Evangile des voyages ou la section Lc. 9,51-18,14 de Saint Luc* (Paris: Gabalda, 1964) 24-26; Paul I. Fransen, "La montée vers Jérusalem (Lc. 9,51-18,14)," *BVC* 11 (1965) 68-87.

¹⁴ Hans Conzelmann (*Die Mitte der Zeit* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1954] 68-71) argues that Jesus enters only the temple not the city. The problem has been studied by many scholars. J. H. Davies, "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in F. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica II* (TU 87; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1963) 168; Michael Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel* (BWANT 109; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980) 146.

teaching as he went and making his way to Jerusalem” (13:22); “as he continued his journey to Jerusalem, he traveled through Samaria and Galilee” (17:11), Luke does not explicitly say that Jesus enters the city of Jerusalem at the end of his journey.

The absence of a clear indication that Jesus enters Jerusalem and so concludes the journey he initiated in 9:51 is remarkable and has been addressed in different ways.¹⁵ While there is no doubt that Jesus was in the city of Jerusalem, Luke never explicitly says that Jesus entered the city. Although this may appear to be a minor point, it has implications for my study, namely, that purpose of the journey section is not the city of Jerusalem but Jesus’ being taken up into heaven.¹⁶ The Lukan redaction of the Markan texts, then, seems to be a deliberate choice rather than a mistake.

Since there is no clear indication of Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem, some scholars end the journey section with the parable of the Pounds (19:11-27),¹⁷ while others conclude it with

¹⁵ Denaux (“The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative,” 388) notes, “It was possible for Jesus to avoid the city when entering and leaving the temple.” The eastern walls of the temple coincided with the walls of the city, so technically speaking one could enter the temple without entering the city. John Wilkinson, *Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1982) 50-54.

¹⁶ A whole series of clues such as the Passover meal (22:14-20), the trial before the Sanhedrin (22:66-70) and Pilate (23:1-5), as well as Jesus’ appearance before (23:6-16), indicate that Jesus stayed in the city. The chronology of Jesus’ ministry in the last few days before his passion has been the subject of various studies. See the discussion in: Annie Jaubert, *La date de la Cène* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957) 45-47; N. Walker, “Concerning the Jaubertian chronology of the Passion,” *NovT* 3 (1959) 317-320; A. Giglioli, “Il giorno dell’Ultima Cena e l’anno della morte di Gesù,” *RivB* 10 (1962) 156-81; Harold W. Hoehner, *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977) 67-68; Willibald Bösen, *Der letzte Tag des Jesus von Nazaret. Was wirklich geschah* (Freiburg: Herder, 1999) 54-78; Italo Zedde, “Il racconto della Passione nei Vangeli Sinottici,” in M. Làconi (ed.), *Vangeli sinottici e Atti degli Apostoli* (Tornio: Leumann, 1999) 361-79; François Bovon, *The Last Days of Jesus* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006) 57-60.

¹⁷ Frank Stagg, “The Journey towards Jerusalem in Luke’s Gospel. Luke 9:51–19:27,” *RevExp* 64 (1967) 499-512; Roger Lapointe, “L’espace-temps de Lc 9,51–19,27,” *EgT* 1 (1970) 275-90. A group of scholars, who include Luke 19:28 in the parable and consider it to be the final verse of the parable forming the inclusion with the opening verse in Luke 19:11, end the journey section in 19:28. Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928); Gerhard Sellin, “Komposition, Quellen und Funktion des lukanischen Reiseberichtes (Lk. IX 5–XIX 28),” *NT* 20 (1978) 100-135; José L. Espinel, “La vida-viaje de Jesús hacia Jerusalén (Lc 9,51–19,28),” *CB* 37 (1980) 93-111; Walter Radl, *Das Lukas-Evangelium* (EdF 261; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988) 46-48;

Jesus' lament over Jerusalem (19:41-44),¹⁸ his entry into the temple area (19:45-46),¹⁹ or Jesus' teaching and cleansing of the temple (19:47-48).²⁰

If 18:14 were the end of the journey section, the last episode of the journey section would be the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14). This parable has been interpreted as a critique of the Pharisaic way of life, or as a critique of those who pretend to be righteous but despise others. It is important to note that the two main characters of the parable (the Pharisee and the tax collector) are on their way to the temple to pray. Thus, the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector not only recalls Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, it echoes the parable of the Good Samaritan at the beginning of the journey section.²¹ The journey is not the only common feature of these two parables. The main protagonists of both parables represent two different worlds. The Samaritan and the tax collector portray a sinner,

Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke*, 54-56.

¹⁸ Floyd V. Filson, "The Journey Motif in Luke-Acts," in Gasque W. Ward and Ralph P. Martin (eds.), *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970) 68-77; David W. Gill, "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages," *HTR* 63 (1970) 199-221; Edward E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981) 35-36; Jean-Noël Aletti, *L'art de raconter Jésus Christ* (Paris: Seuil, 1989) 112-16; Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 172.

¹⁹ Josep Rius-Camps, "Questions sobre la doble obra lucana: Lc 10:25-18:30: una perfecta estructura concèntrica dins la Secció del Viatge (9,51-19,46)," *RCT* 8 (1983) 283-357; Paul Kariamadam, *The End of the Travel Narrative Lk 18,31-19,46* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1985) 111-30; Matera, "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem," 57-77.

²⁰ John M. Creed, *The Gospel According to Saint Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1960) 139-41; Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 79-85; Helmuth L. Egelkraut, *Jesus' Mission to Jerusalem: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke, Lc 9,51-19,48* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1976) 48-51.

²¹ Craig L. Blomberg, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke's Central Section," in R. T. France and David Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives III: Studies in Midrash and Historiography* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1983) 217-61.

whereas the priest, the Levite, and the Pharisee, are examples of a faithful and obedient Jew.²²

The common motif of a journey and a parallel presentation of the protagonist could serve as an ending for the whole journey section. However, at the end of the parable Jesus continues his journey and is still far from Jerusalem.

If 19:27 were the end of the journey section, then, the last episode of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem would be the parable of the Pounds (19:11-27). The parable begins with the omniscient narrator's comment that Jesus was close to Jerusalem and many expected the kingdom of God to be revealed immediately (19:11). The introductory verse could form a chiasm with the beginning of the journey section and the announcement that the time for Jesus' to be taken up was fulfilled (9:51). The chiasm, however, is difficult to prove.²³

The kingdom of God is a key expression in the Gospel of Luke, but it is not easy to explain its precise meaning.²⁴ There is a certain tension within the Gospel concerning the

²² Commentators often define tax collectors as sinners because of their profession. Tax collectors and publicans could be forgiven for their sins only after a long penance accompanied by full return of dishonestly earned money. Josef Ernst, *Il vangelo secondo Luca* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1985) 2:701; Eta Linnemann, *Gleichnisse Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961) 66; Gérard Rossé, *Il vangelo di Luca* (Roma: Città Nuova, 2001) 696; Benedetto Prete, *Le parabole della preghiera nel vangelo di Luca* (Torino: Elledici, 2003) 56-58; John R. Donahue, "Tax Collector," *ABD* 6:337-38; idem., "Tax Collector and Sinners: An Attempt at Identification," *CBQ* 33 (1977) 39-45; Gerald Downing, "The Ambiguity of 'The Pharisee and the Tax Collector' (Luke 18:9-14) in the Greco-Roman World of Late Antiquity," *CBQ* 54 (1992) 86.

²³ Scholars have tried to present the journey section in terms of a chiasm and establish a plausible connection between materials in the journey section. According to Nolland (*Luke*, 2:530) many structures have been proposed, but they "have not a single item of parallelism in common." Chiastic structures have been studied by Robert Morgenthaler, *Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis* (ATANT 15; Zürich: Zwingli, 1949) 156-57; Michael D. Goulder, "The Chiastic Structure of the Lukan Journey," *SE* 2 (1964) 195-202; Bailey, *Poet & Peasant*, 79-85; Paul Kariamadam, "The Composition and Meaning of the Lukan Travel Narrative (Lk 9,51-19,46)," *BiBh* 13 (1987) 179-98.

²⁴ There are sixty-five occurrences of "kingdom of God" in the New Testament, predominantly in Luke-Acts. It is used 5 times in Matthew, 14 times in Mark, 32 times in Luke, 2 times in John, 6 times in Acts. In Luke some of these texts come from "Q," some from Mark, and others from "L" or Luke's redaction. The kingdom of God has been the subject of extensive scholarly research. See Daniel L. Chrupcala, *Il regno opera*

kingdom of God. Jesus proclaims the kingdom of God (4:43; 8:1), and he sends the twelve to proclaim it (9:2). The kingdom is a future reality, and yet Jesus' own activity is a sign that the kingdom of God is already present among his listeners. The kingdom of God is a future reality, and some who listen to Jesus will not taste death until they see it (9:27). The kingdom of God is also a present reality inasmuch as Jesus' healings indicate that the kingdom of God is at hand (10:9). Furthermore, according to Jesus the kingdom of God does not come with signs to be observed (17:20); it is already present among his listeners in the person of Jesus (17:21). The declaration that the kingdom of God is already present among his listeners may have caused some of Jesus' followers to think that the kingdom of God would appear immediately in its fullness. It cannot be excluded that the teaching about the coming of the Son of Man (17:22-24), or the threefold prediction of the passion (two predictions before the beginning of the journey section 9:18-22; 9:43-45, and one toward the end 18:31-34) may have also played a role in the expectation of the people that they would see the revelation of the kingdom.

The theme of the kingdom of God appears throughout the journey section, but the expectation in 19:21 that the kingdom would appear immediately does not indicate the ending of that section.

The parable of the Pounds presents a nobleman, a group of servants who multiply the money entrusted to them, and a group of servants who do not wish the nobleman to be granted kingship. The parable ends with the return of the nobleman, a reward given to the faithful servants, and the execution of the wicked ones. The theme of a nobleman (19:11)

della Trinità nel vangelo di Luca (Analecta 45; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 1998); idem., *The Kingdom of God* (Analecta 69; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 2007).

who goes to obtain kingship (βασιλεία) prepares for Jesus' triumphal entry into the holy city (19:38) and the crowd that greets him as king (βασιλεύς). At the same time, the delegation of compatriots who follow the nobleman and oppose his kingship (βασιλεία) foreshadows the Pharisees who will try to stop the crowds from calling Jesus king (βασιλεύς) and recalls the opposition Jesus meets on his way to Jerusalem.²⁵

The parable as such could serve as the closing of the journey section. However, subsequent episodes continue to portray Jesus on his way to Jerusalem (19:28-29, 41, 45), thereby indicating that the parable of the Pounds does not end the journey section.

References to Jesus' journey to Jerusalem are more explicit at the beginning and end of the journey section.²⁶ Luke 19:28-44 contains a series of notices suggesting that Jesus is still on the move and has yet to finish his journey. According to these notices Jesus "drew near" (ἤγγισεν) and "saw the city" (ιδὼν τὴν πόλιν), but there is no indication that he finished his journey or that he entered (εἰσῆλθεν) Jerusalem. In Luke's account, Jesus enters the temple area.²⁷ "Jesus entered the temple area (εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν) and proceeded to drive out (ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν) those who were selling things" (19:45). The entry into the temple area is expressed by a participle (εἰσελθὼν), whereas the driving out of the sellers is expressed by a finite verb (ἤρξατο). Thus, Jesus' main activity, as described here, is

²⁵ Matera ("Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem," 74) notes that the journey section "heightens the reader's appreciation of the conflict between Jesus and Israel."

²⁶ Ibid., 58.

²⁷ The temple of Jerusalem plays a very important role throughout the Gospel of Luke as well as the Acts of the Apostles. The Gospel of Luke opens with Zechariah performing his duties in the temple (1:5-25) and ends with the apostles praising God continually in the temple (24:50-53).

expelling those who oppose the will of God rather than entering the temple area. He drives out those who make the temple a den of thieves rather than a “house of prayer” (19:46).

The entry into the temple area is the beginning of Jesus’ ministry in Jerusalem. The beginning of that ministry starts with a confrontation with the opposition. The questioning of Jesus’ authority (20:1-8) echoes the beginning of the journey section when Jesus’ intention to pass through Samaritan territory caused the Samaritans to oppose him (9:52-56), as well as the beginning of Jesus’ public ministry when he was rejected at Nazareth (4:28-30). In each case the beginning of a new section of the Gospel begins with opposition to Jesus. This pattern suggests that the entry into the temple area and the cleansing of the temple constitute the last episode of the journey section.

That Luke 19:45-46 ends the journey section becomes more evident when Jesus’ activity in Jerusalem and his teaching in the temple area are taken into account. Luke 19:47-48 provides a summary of Jesus’ activity in the temple area: “and every day he was teaching in the temple area.” A similar summary can be found at the end of Jesus’ activity in Jerusalem (21:37): “during the day, Jesus was teaching in the temple area.” Thus, references to Jesus teaching daily in the temple area (τὸ καθ’ ἡμέραν ἦν διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) form a literary inclusion, which marks the beginning (19:47) and the end of Jesus’ ministry in Jerusalem (21:47).²⁸

From a narrative point of view 19:47 marks a change of audience. During the whole journey section Jesus primarily interacts with three groups: the disciples, the Pharisees, and the crowd. Occasionally, the audience is composed; the seventy-two (10:2-6), Pharisees and

²⁸ Matera, “Jesus’ Journey to Jerusalem,” 57-58.

the scholars of the law (11:39-52), or Pharisees, scribes and disciples. In one instance, toward the end of the journey section, the audience is vague and remains unspecified: “while *they* were listening” (19:12-27). Beginning with 19:47 a new audience enters the scene. The chief priests, the Scribes, and the leaders of the people are the main antagonists of Jesus, who seek a way to put him to death, whereas the people “were hanging on his words” (19:48). The appearance of the new audience, a new group of interlocutors, indicates that the teaching in the temple area begins a new section of the Gospel, which will lead to a deteriorating situation between Jesus and his opponents.²⁹

If the journey section ends in the temple area and not in Jerusalem, there are some intriguing questions that need to be answered. Why does Luke edit Mark’s notice that Jesus entered Jerusalem and went into the temple? How does his editorial activity effect the Gospel? Is the journey section to be viewed as an open-ended journey that has not reached its destination so that the final goal of the journey has yet to be accomplished? In answering these questions two factors need to be kept in mind; the geographical goal and the purpose of the journey presented in Luke 9:51.

One possible solution would be to disregard the difference between Luke and Mark and assume that Luke is correcting the redundancy in the Gospel of Mark, namely, entry into the temple area equals entry into Jerusalem. It is possible, therefore, that Luke omits what seems to be redundant in Mark’s version. Another possibility is that the temple area and Jerusalem are used interchangeably at the author’s discretion. In other words, if one thinks of Jerusalem one thinks of the temple of Jerusalem. Luke’s concern for style and his desire to

²⁹ Aletti, *L’art de raconter Jésus Christ*, 114-16.

eliminate redundancies, however, are not the only possible explanations for the change. It is also possible that he makes a clear distinction between the temple of Jerusalem where Jesus teaches as Messiah and the city, which rejects him.³⁰ It is necessary to see how Luke uses these terms elsewhere in the Gospel.

Luke is the only evangelist who records the journeys to Jerusalem that Jesus made as a child. The first journey took place when Mary and Joseph took the infant Jesus up “to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord” (2:22). According to Luke, when Mary and Joseph brought the child, Simon came in the Spirit “into the temple” (2:27). A prophetess Anna who “never left the temple” was also present when Jesus was being presented (2:37). The second journey to Jerusalem took place when the twelve-year old Jesus visited the temple. According to Luke, “each year the parents of Jesus went to Jerusalem for the feast of Passover” (2:41). It was during one of these annual visits that Jesus remained “behind in Jerusalem” (2:43). Once Mary and Joseph realized that Jesus was neither in the caravan nor in the company of relatives or acquaintances, they “returned to Jerusalem to look for him” and they found him “in the temple sitting in the midst of the teachers” (2:45-46).

The passages mentioned above show that Luke uses the terms Jerusalem and temple in the course of the same episode. At first it seems that there is no difference and that the two names can be used interchangeably. There is, however, a remarkable difference in the way Luke uses these terms. Luke portrays Jerusalem as a place where people go to present a child to the Lord, to celebrate the feast, and to be close to God. Jerusalem is a place chosen by God to celebrate the most important events in the lives of the people. For Mary, Joseph, and Jesus,

³⁰ The solution was proposed by Denaux, “The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative,” 388.

who live in Galilee, Jerusalem is also a distant place. Luke uses the term “Jerusalem” to describe a journey that needs to be made in order to reach that place. On the other hand, the term “temple” defines a place within the city of Jerusalem where the presentation of the infant Jesus takes place and where the twelve year’s old Jesus remains in the city. Once Mary and Joseph reach the city of Jerusalem, Luke no longer uses the term Jerusalem. Instead, he uses terms that describe the exact location of the events within the city. The absence of the name Jerusalem at the end of the journey section seems to respect this pattern.

In light of the above I propose that in 9:51 and throughout the journey section the term “Jerusalem” is used in reference to the journey that must be made. But once Jesus reaches the city, Luke does not use the term Jerusalem any more. Instead he uses a term that describes the place where the action unfolds, namely, the temple area.

The last factor to be kept in mind when considering the limits of the journey section is the purpose of the journey. Luke 9:51 states that Jesus goes to Jerusalem because the days for his “being taken up” (ἀνάλημψεως) were fulfilled. Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem is not just another journey such as he has undertaken in the past but a journey that has a pre-determined goal and purpose. Thus the ending of the journey depends on whether or not the entry into Jerusalem fulfills a predetermined purpose.

The noun ἀνάλημψις, which Luke uses to present the purpose of Jesus’ journey, can be understood in different yet complementary ways. The basic meaning of the noun is “to take up.” Based on evidence found in the *Psalms of Solomon* and a few other texts such as the *Assumption of Moses* and the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, many scholars conclude that

ἀνάλημψις refers to “death.”³¹ Other scholars, however, argue that in Luke the noun points to a whole series of events: Jesus’ passion, crucifixion, and resurrection.³² Finally, a third group of scholars contends that ἀνάλημψις refers to “bodily ascension.”³³ The major difficulty in understanding the exact meaning that Luke attributes to the noun is that Luke 9:51 is the only occurrence of the noun in the entire Bible. Although the noun is a *hapax*, there are a few passages that help to understand its meaning in the Gospel of Luke. These passages are the transfiguration (Luke 9:28-36), the three predictions of the passion (9:22; 9:43-45; 18:31-34), and Jesus’ ascension (Acts 1:9-11).

When the disciples saw Jesus transformed before their eyes, they also saw Moses and Elijah who were conversing with him about the “exodus that he was going to accomplish in Jerusalem” (9:31). Reading Luke 9:51 in light of the transfiguration story it is possible to draw a connection between Jesus’ exodus and his being taken up. Both events will take place in Jerusalem and both imply a departure or absence of Jesus. The nature of the exodus and taking up becomes intelligible in the three passion predictions. According to these predictions, Jesus will “suffer greatly and be rejected by the elders” (9:22); he will be “handed over to men” (9:44); and he “will be mocked and insulted and spat upon; and after they have scourged him they will kill him, but on the third day he will rise” (18:32-33). Thus,

³¹ *Pss. Sol.* 4:18; *As. Mos.* 10:12; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 46:7. That ἀνάλημψις refers to death is the view of Josef Schmid, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (RNT 3; Regensburg: Pustet, 1955) 176; Gerhard Friedrich, “Lk 9,51 und die Entrückungschristologie des Lukas,” in Paul Hoffmann (ed.), *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker* (Freiburg: Herder, 1973) 48–52.

³² Craig A. Evans, “He Set His Face: A Note on Luke 9:51,” *Bib* 63 (1982) 545-48; idem., “He Set His Face: Luke 9:51 Once Again,” *Bib* 68 (1987) 80-84.

³³ John G. Davies, *He Ascended into Heaven* (New York: Association, 1958) 40; Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts und Erhöhungs-texten bei Lukas* (SANT 26; München: Kösel, 1971) 212.

it becomes clear that Jesus' exodus and taking up will be consummated through a series of events that lead to his passion and resurrection after three days. Note the progressive nature of the passion predictions, which appear shortly before the beginning (9:22.43-45) and towards the end of the journey section (18:31-34). The taking up, understood as Jesus' exodus accomplished in Jerusalem, which is preceded by suffering, rejection and death, reveals its full meaning and significance in the ascension of the risen Lord. The Gospel of Luke ends (24:51) when the risen Lord parts from the disciples and is "taken up to heaven" (διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν). The same event is recorded at the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 1:9): Jesus "was lifted up, and a cloud took him from their sight" (ἐπήρθη καὶ ὑπέλαβεν).

This does not mean that the journey section ends with the ascension into heaven. Jesus' entry into the temple of Jerusalem and the cleansing of that temple clearly indicate that from a literary point of view the journey section ends at 19:46. The purpose of the journey, however, will not be completed until Jesus is taken up into the heaven and his disciples become his witnesses to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8).³⁴ Only after Jesus is taken up into heaven will the disciples receive the gift of the Spirit and begin a new journey, which will guide the development of the Acts of the Apostles. The same grammatical construction, "the days were fulfilled" (ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι), signals the beginning of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51), as well as the beginning of a journey that the disciples must

³⁴ According to Giovanni Claudio Bottini (*Introduzione all'opera di Luca* [Analecta 35; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 137-39] 53), Jesus' journey to Jerusalem becomes a theological "motif" that finds its fulfillment with his entry into glory (24:26) and the ascension (24:50-51).

undertake in order to bring the good news to the entire world (Acts 2:1).³⁵ The journey of the disciples, however, unfolds in reverse order. First they will give testimony in Jerusalem (Acts 1:13-8:3), then in Samaria (8:4-9:43), and finally the mission of Paul will bring the good news to the Gentiles in Rome, which was considered to be the center of the known world.

2.3. The Structure of the Journey Section

The limits of the journey section are not the only problem for the central part of the gospel. For centuries scholars have tried to outline what seems to be a collage of heterogeneous episodes.³⁶ Various attempts have been made and different solutions have been proposed, but none has gone unchallenged. For example scholars who have tried to follow a chronological scheme of the journey have come to the conclusion that the Lukan journey section is a compilation of various journeys, or a compilation of different accounts recording those journeys.³⁷ Since following the chronological order of the journey has not yielded satisfactory results, it has been proposed that the Lukan journey section does not

³⁵ According to Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke*, 1:827), “the expression is Lukan, and the filling up of the days has to be understood of God’s plan beginning to move to a new stage of its realization.”

³⁶ Karl L. Schmidt (*Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969] 246-54) argues that the formlessness of the journey section is the result of the inclusion of the additional material at Luke’s disposal. According to Stagg (“The Journey towards Jerusalem in Luke’s Gospel,” 499), “it is most difficult if not impossible to outline.” Evans (“The Central Section of Luke’s Gospel,” 40) thinks of the central section as “apparently amorphous.”

³⁷ The journey section is an account of several journeys to Jerusalem: E. J. Cook, “Synoptic Indications of the Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem,” *ExpTim* 41 (1929-30) 121-23; L. C. Girard, *L’Evangile des voyages de Jésus, ou la section 9:51–18:14 de Saint Luc* (Paris: Gabalda, 1951) 45-56. Different accounts of the same journey: G. MacKinlay, “St. Luke’s Theefold Narrative of Christ’s Last Journey to Jerusalem,” *The Interpreter* 7 (1910) 261-78; G. Ogg, “The Central Section of the Gospel according to St. Luke,” *NTS* 18 (1971-72) 39-53. A journey through Perea or Samaria: Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York: Harper, 1968) 363-64; Dean R. Wickes, *The Sources of Luke’s Perean Section* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1912) 20-34; A. D. Baum, *Lukas als Historiker der letzten Jesusreise* (Zurich: Brockhaus, 1993) 123-34.

record an actual journey but is a theological-christological account.³⁸ This has resulted in a series of studies dealing with the theology of the journey section. Thus, the journey serves a christological purpose. Jesus is going to Jerusalem to suffer. It is a time when he instructs and admonishes his disciples,³⁹ or a journey toward his being taken up as were Moses and Elijah.⁴⁰ Finally, the growing conflict between Jesus and the Jews along the way explains why he was rejected in Jerusalem and had to suffer.⁴¹ All of these proposals have their merit. They propose the development of a common theme throughout the whole section. They also have their limitations inasmuch as they do not answer the question why Luke would place this heterogeneous material in the journey section, and what is the purpose of the geographical data spread throughout the journey section.

2.3.1. An Evaluation of Some Proposed Structures

In the past few decades of Lukan research, scholars have proposed various structures for the journey section. The three most popular proposals are: (1) a structure based on major travel notices, (2) a chiasmic structure with one central point, and (3) a structure based on parallelism with the Book of Deuteronomy.

³⁸ C. C. McCown ("The Geography of Luke's Central Section," *JBL* 57 [1938] 63-64) was probably the first to propose a new, non-chronological approach, and initiate a new reading of the Lukan journey section, which was more concerned with its internal logic than with its chronology.

³⁹ Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, 58-64; Johannes Schneider, "Zur Analyse der lukanischen Reiseberichtes," in J. Schmid and A. Vogtle (eds.), *Synoptische Studien. Alfred Wikenhauser zum siebzigsten Geburtstag, dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* (München: Zink, 1953) 207-29; Eduard Lohse, "Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach dem Evangelium des Lukas," *TLZ* 10 (1954) 1-13; Bo Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," in Kurt Aland (ed.), *Studia Evangelica I* (TU 87; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959) 206-16; Grundmann, "Fragen der Komposition des lukanischen Reiseberichts," 252-70; P. von der Osten-Sacken, "Zur Christologie des lukanischen Reiseberichts," *EvT* 33 (1973) 476-96.

⁴⁰ Evans, "The Central Section of Luke's Gospel," 37-53; Davies, "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," 164-69; Goulder, "The Chiasmic Structure of the Lukan Journey," 195-202.

⁴¹ Egelkraut, *Jesus' Mission to Jerusalem*, 213-15; Resseguie, "Point of View in the Central Section of Luke (9:51-19:44)," 41-48; Matera, "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem," 57-77.

The journey section has five travel notices that explicitly mention Jerusalem as the final goal of the journey (9:51; 13:22; 17:11; 18:31; 19:28).⁴² Following the major travel notices, the journey section is divided into unequal parts. The first stage of the journey is 9:51–13:21, the second stage 13:22–17:10, the third stage 17:11–18:30, the fourth stage 18:31–19:27, and the fifth stage from 19:28 to the end of the journey.⁴³ This outline has been adopted in many studies, commentaries, and monographs as a convenient way to present the material.⁴⁴ The outline based on travel notices has its merits. It divides the longer sections into more manageable units, and it reminds the audience of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. This outline, however, fails to highlight a major theme for each section, or to explain why Luke introduces travel notices at these points in his Gospel. Moreover, this outline does not highlight the progress of the journey or note major shifts in the narrative.

Modern scholarship has also tried to explain the meaning and structure of the journey section by proposing a chiasmic structure. Michael D. Goulder was one of the first to propose a chiasmic structure for the Lukan journey section.⁴⁵ He argues that the journey section can be arranged as a chiasm, which begins at 10:25 and ends at 18:30. The question of the scholar of the law, "what must I do to inherit eternal life" (10:25), and the question of the official,

⁴² James L. Resseguie, "Interpretation of Luke's Central Section (Luke 9:51–19:44) since 1856," *SBT* 5 (1975) 3–36.

⁴³ Blomberg ("Midrash, Chiasmus and the Outline of Luke's Central Section," 217) notes that many modern commentaries on Luke follow the travel notices and "make no attempt at all to outline this section, save for dividing it in thirds by travel notices." For example John Gillman (*Luke: Stories of Joy and Salvation, Spiritual Commentaries on the Bible* [New York: New City, 2002] 24–33) divides the travel narrative into three parts; Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (9:51–13:21); the journey to Jerusalem continues (13:22–17:10); the end of the travel narrative and Jesus' teaching in Jerusalem (17:11–21:38).

⁴⁴ According to Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke*, 1:825), the structure of the journey section in the light of the main references to Jesus moving to Jerusalem is "however, a mere convenience, since the division at these points is otherwise insignificant and somewhat arbitrary."

⁴⁵ Goulder, "The Chiasmic Structure of the Lukan Journey," 195–202.

“what must I do to inherit eternal life” (18:18) form an inclusion and are the limits of the chiastic structure.⁴⁶ The chiasm reaches its climax with the rejection of Israel at 13:10.⁴⁷ The study of Goulder does not answer why the beginning of the journey (9:51–10:24) should be excluded from that chiasm. Nevertheless, his study inaugurated a new approach to the journey section, and scholars have tried to build upon it in a way that deals with all the material in the journey section. Studies on the chiastic structure of the journey section were corroborated by the observation that all of the parabolic material of the journey section can be arranged in pairs.⁴⁸ Some of the proposed structures are more convincing than others, but they have few parallels in common, and this calls in question their validity. Often, the proposed chiastic structures seem forced, imaginary, or too general.⁴⁹ Moreover, the corresponding parts of chiastic structure do not have the same degree of similarity and can be arranged in different ways. Even scholars who propose the chiastic structures perceive the difficulty that such structures omit certain passages in order to make the structure work. Nevertheless, for lack of a better alternative, many have adopted a chiastic approach.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Ibid., 202.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 196.

⁴⁸ Blomberg, “Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke’s Central Section,” 217-61; M. C. Parsons, “Landmarks Along the Way: The Function of the “L” Parables,” *SwJT* 40 (1997) 33-47.

⁴⁹ Nolland, *Luke*, 2:530.

⁵⁰ Robert K. Farrell (“The Structure and Theology of Luke’s Central Section,” *TJ* 7 [1986] 33-54) carefully analyzes the two most commonly followed chiastic structures by Bailey and Talbert, lists the value of chiastic structure and tries to defend the chiastic structure in spite of its imperfections. He also admits that these structures are not “the last word.” The chiastic structure of the journey section has also been studied by H. Baarlink, “Die zyklische Struktur von Lukas 9.43b–19.28,” *NTS* 38 (1992) 481-506; Giuseppe Giurisato, “Come Luca struttura il viaggio e le altre parti del suo Vangelo: Una composizione paradigmatica: 12,13-34; 35-48; 16,1-18; 19-31,” *RivB* 46 (1998) 419-84; T. P. Osborne, “Deux grandes structures concentriques centrales et une nouvelle approche du plan global de l’Évangile de Luc,” *RB* 110 (2003) 197-221.

The two most popular chiastic structures are those of Kenneth E. Bailey and Charles H. Talbert.⁵¹ Both authors mark the beginning of the journey section in 9:51, but they disagree as to whether the cleansing of the temple (19:45-48) is part of that section or not. For Bailey the cleansing of the temple is the last episode of the journey section, whereas for Talbert it is the first episode of the last days of Jesus in Jerusalem. The limits of the section are not the only difference between these authors. According to Bailey, the description of the eschatological events in 13:22-35 is the central unit of the chiasm. Talbert, for the most part, agrees with Bailey. He excludes, however, Jesus' saying on the narrow door in 13:22-30. For Talbert, Herod's desire to kill Jesus (13:31-33) and Jesus' lament over Jerusalem (13:34-35) are the central elements of the unit. Despite the difference, both authors agree that the pivot of the chiastic structure is Jesus' saying, "I must continue on my way today, tomorrow, and the following day, for it is impossible that a prophet should die outside of Jerusalem" (13:33).⁵² Since Jesus' saying on the necessity of continuing to journey to Jerusalem to die is the pivot of the structure, the saying expresses the most important idea of the journey section. Thus, according to this chiastic structure, the purpose of the journey section is to stress that Jesus is going to Jerusalem to die. However, this saying stands in tension with what the omniscient narrator says about the purpose of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (9:51). The

⁵¹ Bailey (*Poet & Peasant*, 79-85) admits that the chiastic structure he proposes covers ninety percent of the material in the travel narrative. Charles H. Talbert (*Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary* [Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2002] 118) anticipates a possible objection to the loose arrangement of the material and notes, "to anyone who knows the characteristics of the narrative art of the ancient Mediterranean world, neither the balanced form nor the otherwise loose arrangement of the material comes as any surprise."

⁵² Bailey, *Poet & Peasant*, 83; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 117-18.

chiastic structure also raises more questions than it answers.⁵³ Moreover, the parallelism of the passages in the journey section is not necessarily an indication of the chiastic structure inasmuch as the presentation of parallel episodes is one of the characteristics of Luke's style.⁵⁴

The chiastic structures of Bailey and Talbert have their merits. Both authors show that the journey section (or "a Jerusalem document" as Bailey calls it) is a unit organized according to its internal logic. The journey section is not a composition of amorphous material as some have postulated. The chiastic structure also has the merit of highlighting the importance of Luke 13:22-35 for understanding the journey section. The function of that passage will be discussed later.

The understanding of ἀνάλημψις in 9:51 in light of the transfiguration, the passion predictions, and the ascension into heaven suggests that the purpose of the journey goes beyond Jesus' death in Jerusalem. The ἀνάλημψις, which Jesus must accomplish in Jerusalem, entails his passion, death, resurrection, and his ascension into heaven. The chiastic structures as presented by Bailey and Talbert do not include Jesus' resurrection and

⁵³ A chiastic structure presupposes that the element "A" be repeated by another element "A'" and does not appear in any other place. Otherwise, the parallelism is disrupted, or not perceptible. In the chiastic structure proposed by Bailey and Talbert, the question "what must I do to inherit eternal life," which plays an important role in the chiastic structure and sets off 10:25-42 and 18:30 as parallel units, also appears in other parts of the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. In Luke 3:14 soldiers approach John the Baptist and ask him "what is it that we should do?" In Acts 2:37 the crowd asks Peter "what shall we do?" If such is the case, does it not disrupt or weaken the alleged chiastic structure of the journey section? Bailey (*Poet & Peasant*, 83) admits that the structure raises questions, but he does not address them. Nevertheless, he thinks that the chiastic structure is a very strong one and does not need comment. Blomberg ("Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke's Central Section," 233-39), however, argues that the material could be arranged in a different manner and some parallels are very general. For example, he sees a parallel between the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) and the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14).

⁵⁴ Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974) 15-65; Robert T. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 1:13-42.

ascension in their analysis. Rather, both authors focus what they see as the central characteristic of that journey: Jesus' going to Jerusalem to meet the fate of the prophets and die.

Scholars who study the journey section in light of the OT interpret the journey section as a midrash on the Book of Deuteronomy. They base the structure of the journey section on the sequence of events in the Book of Deuteronomy.⁵⁵ Thus, the journey section is a reinterpretation of the major events that took place during the pilgrimage to the promised land. For example, the mission of the seventy two disciples (Luke 10:1:3; 17-20) echoes the appointment of the Elders (Deut 1:1-46), the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:29-37) echoes the instruction about how to treat the foreign nations (Deut 7:1-26), and the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14) recalls the instruction given to the people about how to carry out the thanksgiving for the harvest (Deut 26:1-19).⁵⁶ For the most part, however, this parallelism is rather vague and does not go beyond the mere resemblance of a general theme.⁵⁷ The similarity of the passages does not necessarily mean that Luke used Deuteronomy as a guide for the journey section. A presentation of Jesus' teaching as a repetition and reinterpretation of Moses' teaching would be more appropriate for Matthew. It

⁵⁵ The list of scholars who either propose or defend this approach includes the following: Evans, "The Central Section of Luke's Gospel," 37-53; John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976) 12-15; Michael D. Goulder, *The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1978) 146-53; James M. Dawsey, "Jesus' Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," *PRSt* 14 (1978) 217-32; Moessner, *The Lord of the Banquet*, 82-222.

⁵⁶ These are only a few examples of how the passages are arranged. The arrangement of the passages varies from author to author. These examples come from Evans, "The Central Section of Luke's Gospel," 42-50.

⁵⁷ See the discussion in Blomberg, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke's Central Section," 217-61.

does not suit Luke who has in view a wider audience that includes all the nations, even to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8).

2.3.2. A Narrative Approach

Although various structures have been proposed, they do not capture the unique character of the journey section or highlight the gradual development of its plot. A narrative approach that takes into account the grammatical indices as well as a whole series of narrative devices, however, may fill that lacuna. Following the change of location, audience, and circumstances in which Jesus taught gives the impression of progress towards the city and justifies the use of such heterogeneous material.

2.3.2.1. Travel Notices

Before an outline is proposed, it is necessary to look once more at the travel notices in Luke. If the journey to Jerusalem is the most striking part of the Lukan Gospel, and if the travel notices come from Luke, perhaps these data have a function that goes beyond a simple reminder that Jesus is on his way to Jerusalem.⁵⁸ This, however, does not mean that the travel notices are to be taken at face value and are the only indicators for structuring the journey section. Other factors must also be taken into consideration.

⁵⁸ The travel related passages have been studied by Davies ("The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," 164-69), Gill ("Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages," 199-221) and Gerhard Sellin ("Komposition, Quellen und Funktion des Lukanischen Reiseberichtes Lk 9:51-19:28," *NovT* 20 [1978] 100-35). Scholars recognize the value of these travel notices but not all give them the same value. According to Nolland (*Luke*, 2:528), "at the end of the day the presence of all the other material in this travel section still remains unexplained."

3.3.2.1.1. The Travel Notices at the Beginning and the End of the Journey Section

In 9:51 Luke states that Jesus is determined to go to Jerusalem. That journey, from a geographical point of view, ends in 19:46 when Jesus enters the temple of Jerusalem, cleanses the temple, and faces opposition from the elders of the people. However, if a firm decision to go to Jerusalem begins the journey section and the entry into the temple ends that section, one would expect that the geographical data would guide the journey section from beginning to end. The geographical progression of the events is one of the features of the Lukan Gospel. Surprisingly, however, the journey section has only a few explicit geographical statements about Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. Apart from 9:51 there are only four instances where Jerusalem is mentioned as the final goal of the journey: 13:22; 17:11; 18:31; 19:28. According to 17:11 Jesus is still somewhere on the boarder between Samaria and Galilee (therefore still far from Jerusalem) so that real geographical progress begins only at 18:35. Once Jesus approaches Jericho, almost every one of his steps is recorded. He draws near to Jericho (18:35), he enters Jericho (19:1), he is near Jerusalem (19:11), he draws near to Bethpage and Bethany (19:29), and finally he is near and sees the city (19:41). In many ways the detailed presentation of the last part of the journey section resembles the early stages of that journey. At the beginning of the journey section Luke notes that Jesus intended to pass through Samaria (9:52), but since he was not welcomed there he went to another village (9:56), entered a village (10:38), and taught in a synagogue (13:10).

The geographical data present at the beginning and end of the journey section resemble each other, and yet there is a subtle difference between them. The data in the early stages of the itinerary are vague and general, whereas the data at the end tend to be more precise. Information such as Jesus entered a Samaritan village (9:53), went to another village

(9:56; 10:38), or was teaching in one of the synagogues (13:10) is not as precise as that at the end; Jesus entered Jericho (19:1), or Jesus was near Jerusalem (19:41). There is agreement among scholars that the travel notices are intended to give the impression of a journey to Jerusalem.⁵⁹ If the purpose of the travel notices were only to remind of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, Luke would use the same kind of notices at the beginning and the end of the journey section. Given the different kinds of travel notices at the beginning and at the end of the journey section, the following question should be asked. What is the function of the more detailed notices at the end of the journey section? It is possible that some of these details were already present in the sources and Luke preserved them as they were.⁶⁰ Another solution is also possible. Luke may have used a more detailed geographical data, or increased their intensity at the end of the journey section as a literary device intended to alert the audience that the geographical goal of the journey is approaching. The way Luke used the travel notices in the healing of the beggar in 18:33-34 indicates that Luke edits and rearranges the material at his disposal.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, 246-54; Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968) 334-38.

⁶⁰ According to Denaux ("The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative," 382), "Luke's journey motif has indeed been inspired by Mk 10:1-52. Luke shows knowledge of the Markan travel notices 10:1.17a.32a(33).46a; 11:1a. Although the verses Mk 10:1.17.32a do not have a direct parallel in Luke, Mk 10:1.17 may have influenced Lk 17:11-12a, and Mk 10:32 has an echo in Lk 19:28. Mk 10:33 (ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) finds its direct parallel in Lk 18:31, and the mention of Jesus' passage through Jericho in Mk 10:46 is taken over in Lk 18:35 and 19:1."

⁶¹ In Mark Jesus heals the beggar when he leaves Jericho (10:46-52), whereas in Luke the cure of the blind beggar in Jericho takes place before Jesus approaches the city (18:35). According to Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:1213), Luke adjusted the chronology of the events in view of the next episode in which Jesus meets Zacchaeus in Jericho.

2.3.2.1.2. *The Travel Notices in the Middle of the Journey Section*

If the travel notices at the end of the journey section prepare for the end of the journey what about the detailed travel notices in the middle of the section? What is their purpose? In order to answer these questions it is necessary to look at their immediate context. In 13:22 Luke notes that Jesus “passed through towns and villages, teaching as he went and making his way to Jerusalem.” Apart from 9:51-57, there have been only two rather vague travel notices. In 10:1 Jesus sends disciples ahead of him, and in 10:38 he enters an unnamed village where two sisters Mary and Martha welcome him. Luke 13:22, however, recalls the final goal of the journey. Saying that Jesus was teaching as he was making his way to Jerusalem calls for additional clarification. What was he teaching on his way to Jerusalem? The beginning of the immediate context is the travel notice (13:22), and the end of that context is Jesus’ lament over Jerusalem (13:35). The unit (13:22-35) includes Jesus’ teaching about the narrow door (13:23-30), Herod’s desire to kill Jesus (13:31-33), and the lament over Jerusalem (13:34-35).⁶²

In response to the question if only a few will be saved, Jesus warns his audience to enter through the narrow door. Although many will try to enter that door, they will not be strong enough. Jesus warns that people from the east and the west will recline at table in the kingdom of God. Thus, the last will be first, and the first will be the last. The teaching on the

⁶² The lament over Jerusalem also appears in Matthew (23:37-39). Matthew, however, places Jesus’ lament over Jerusalem during Jesus’ ministry in Jerusalem. Since Luke places the lament near the center of the journey section, the change suggests that it plays a different role for Luke than it does for Matthew.

narrow door calls for repentance. It also envisions the universal banquet in the kingdom of God. People from the four corners of the world will attend the banquet of the kingdom.⁶³

Salvation will be accomplished in Jerusalem, and Jesus reminds his audience of the need to go to Jerusalem: “I must continue on my way today, tomorrow and the following day, for it is impossible that a prophet should die outside Jerusalem” (13:33). The impersonal verb “it is necessary” (δεῖ) suggests a divine plan.⁶⁴ What was expressed by the fulfillment of time and Jesus’ firm decision to go to Jerusalem at the beginning of the journey section (9:51) is now expressed by the necessity to continue the journey for three days.⁶⁵ Thus, the immediate context tells us that the travel notice in 13:22 not only reminds the audience of the need to go to Jerusalem, it highlights the universal dimension of the salvation Jesus will bring as well.

Luke 17:11 is the second travel notice that expressly mentions Jerusalem as the final goal of the journey section: “As he continued his journey to Jerusalem he traveled through Samaria and Galilee.” It is rather surprising that Luke would mention the journey to Jerusalem at this point. It is also surprising that it includes Samaria. For decades scholars have asked why Luke 17:11 includes Samaria.⁶⁶ However, one should ask why the cleansing

⁶³ On Luke's interest in banquets see Dennis E Smith, “Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke,” *JBL* 106 (1987) 613-38; John Paul Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts: An Audience-Oriented Approach* (SBLMS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999).

⁶⁴ Erich Tiedtke and Hans-Georg Link (“δεῖ,” *NIDNTT* 2:665) note, “through his use of δεῖ Luke expresses in numerous ways the fact that Jesus’ way was not the result of chance or accident, but that the saving will of God has made history in the life of Jesus into salvation history.”

⁶⁵ F. Eluvathingal (“Jesus’ Travel Narrative According to Luke,” *BiBh* 24 [1998] 103-13) notes that Luke 9:51 and its wording suggest that Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem is presented as a divine necessity.

⁶⁶ The geographical data “between Samaria and Galilee” in 17:11 was interpreted in many different ways. For example, Hans Conzelmann (*The Theology of St. Luke* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982] 68-71) suggested that Luke thought of Samaria and Galilee as side by side. Grundmann (“Fragen der Komposition des lukanischen Reiseberichts,” 252-70) thought that “between Samaria and Galilee” serves to explain the presence of a Samaritan leper in 17:12-19.

of the ten lepers includes a Samaritan since the Samaritans refused to let Jesus pass through their territory (9:52-56). As is often the case, the ending of a story is crucial for understanding its meaning. The healing of the ten lepers ends with a Samaritan who returns glorifying God. Jesus praises the faith of the foreigner who comes back and he says to him, “stand up and go; your faith has saved you” (17:19). Thus, the travel notice is once again something more than a mere reminder of a journey. It highlights the universal character of salvation.

The third major travel notice, which includes Jerusalem as the final goal of the journey, appears in the context of the third passion prediction (18:31-34). The main difference between the third major travel notice (18:31) and the previous two (13:22; 17:11) is that here Jesus himself mentions his journey to Jerusalem. “Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem” (18:31).⁶⁷ Unlike the two previous passion predictions (9:22; 43-45), the third prediction (18:31-34) is more detailed. According to the first passion prediction (9:22), the Son of Man will be rejected by the elders, the chief priest and the scribes. The second passion prediction (9:44) has a broader vision inasmuch as the Son of Man will be handed over to men. Finally, the last passion prediction says that the Son of Man will be handed over to the Gentiles. The gradual development of the passion predictions suggests the involvement of all in the passion of Jesus, Jews and Gentiles alike.⁶⁸ If such is the case, the third passion prediction also implies the universal character of salvation. Since the travel notice opens with

⁶⁷ According to Davies (“The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke’s Gospel,” 168), ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ in 18:31 is an idiom for going to the Temple of Jerusalem for sacrifice.

⁶⁸ According to Green (*The Gospel of Luke*, 660), “Luke is gradually constructing a composite picture of Jesus’ passion; hence since 9:22 had established the central role of the Jewish leadership in Jerusalem in Jesus’ death, gentiles culpability may now be emphasized.”

the last passion prediction, it is possible that Luke intended the travel notices in 13:22 and 17:11 to prepare for the third passion prediction.

The first episodes after the third passion prediction portray Jesus healing a beggar (18:35-43) and dining in the house of Zaccheus (19:1-10). The healing of a blind beggar has its Synoptic parallels (Mark 10:46-52; Matt 20:29-34), but the story of Zacchaeus is exclusively Lukan. The healing of the beggar in Luke resembles the parallel healings in Mark and Matthew, but there are some elements that make the Lukan account unique. First, by omitting the Jewish name Barthimaeus, Luke makes the beggar an anonymous man calling for help. The beggar does not address Jesus with the Hebrew title “Rabbi” (ῥαββουνί). Instead, he uses a title more familiar to the Greek world (κύριος), which could imply that the beggar was not necessarily a Jew.⁶⁹ The faith of the beggar grants him salvation; “your faith saved you” (18:42). Similarly the story in the house of Zacchaeus ends with the proclamation: “today salvation has come to this house (19:9).” As the chief of tax collectors, Zacchaeus was considered to be a common sinner (19:7). As such he was excluded from the community of Israel and regarded as one of the Gentiles. Thus, the travel notice in 18:31 and its context highlight the universal dimension of salvation.

My analysis of these three travel notices (13:22; 17:11 and 18:31) suggests that their appearance in the journey section is not random. There is a logic to them. The three travel notices not only serve as reminders of the journey to Jerusalem, they highlight the universal aspect of the salvation that Jesus will accomplish through his ἀνάληψις. The presence of

⁶⁹ Luke and Paul are the two NT writers who most often use the title κύριος. Luke uses the title as a secular form of address (12:36; 16:3; 19:33) as well as a religious form (1:66; 10:21). The omission could be explained as an editorial choice to avoid the Hebrew vocabulary unfamiliar to the Gentile audience.

people from the four corners of the earth (13:29-30), the presence of the Samaritan leper (17:18), and the presence of the Gentiles (18:32-34) as well as of a blind beggar (18:35-43) and Zachaeus (19:1-10) point to the universal dimension of salvation.

2.3.2.2. An Outline of the Journey Section

Having presented the function of the major travel notices in the journey section it is time to outline the journey section. My outline is based on changes of place, time and audience. It consists of five parts divided on the bases of the five major travel notices. Luke 9:51–13:21 is the first part; 13:22–17:10 is the second; 17:11–18:30 is the third; 18:31–19:27 is the fourth; and 19:28-19:46 is the fifth. Each of the five parts is further divided into narrative sequences. Thus, the first part has eight narrative sequences, the second has four narrative sequences, the third has one narrative sequence, the fourth has four narrative sequences, and the fifth has three narrative sequences. Each of the narrative sequences is then divided into smaller units called scenes.

First Part: 9:51–13:21

First narrative sequence

- 9:51-56 “he resolutely determined to journey to Jerusalem”
- 9:57-62 “as they were proceeding on their way”

Second narrative sequence

- 10:1-12 “after this the Lord appointed seventy-two”
- 10:13-16 “woe to you, Chorazin! woe to you Bethsaida!”

Third narrative sequence

- 10:17-20 “the seventy-two returned”
- 17:21-22 “at the very moment he rejoiced in the Spirit”
- 10:23-24 “turning to the disciples in private”
- 10:25-37 “there was a scholar of the law who stood up to test him,”

Fourth narrative sequence

- 10:38-42 “as they continued their journey he entered a village”

Fifth narrative sequence

- 11:1-13 "he was praying in a certain place"
 11:14-26 "he was driving out a demon"
 11:27-28 "while he was speaking a woman in the crowd called out"
 11:29-36 "while still more people gathered"

Sixth narrative sequence

- 11:37-44 "after he had spoken, a Pharisee invited him to dine"
 11:45-54 "one of the scholars of the law said to him in reply"

Seventh narrative sequence

- 12:1-12 "meanwhile so many people were crowding"
 12:13-15 "someone in the crowd said to him"
 12:16-21 "he told them a parable"
 12:22-40 "he said to his disciples"
 12:41-53 "Peter said"
 12:54-59 "he said to the crowds"
 13:1-9 "at that time some people who were present"

Eighth narrative sequence

- 13:10-17 "he was teaching in a synagogue on the Sabbath"
 13:18-21 "then he said a parable"

Second Part: 13:22–17:10*First narrative sequence*

- 13:22-30 "he passed through towns and villages"
 13:31-33 "at that time some Pharisees came to him"
 13:34-35 "Jerusalem, Jerusalem"

Second narrative sequence

- 14:1-6 "on a Sabbath he went to dine at the home of a Pharisee"
 14:7-14 "he told a parable to those who had been invited"
 14:15-25 "one of his fellow guests on hearing this said to him"

Third narrative sequence

- 14:25-34 "great crowds were travelling with him, he addressed them"

Fourth narrative sequence

- 15:1-32 "the tax collectors and sinners were all drawing near to listen to him"
 16:1-13 "then he also said to his disciples"
 16:14-32 "the Pharisees heard all these and sneered at him. He said to them"
 17:1-4 "he said to his disciples"
 17:5-10 "and the apostles said to the Lord"

Third Part: 17:11–18:30*Narrative sequence*

- 17:11-19 “as he continued his journey”
- 17:20-21 “asked by the Pharisees he said in reply”
- 17:22-37 “then he said to his disciples”
- 18:1-8 “then he told them a parable”
- 18:9-14 “he then addressed this parable”
- 18:15-17 “people were bringing infants”
- 18:18-30 “an official asked”

Fourth Part: 18:31–19:27*First narrative sequence*

- 18:31-34 “he took the twelve aside and said, behold, we are going to Jerusalem”

Second narrative sequence

- 18:35-43 “now as he approached Jericho”

Third narrative sequence

- 19:1-10 “he came to Jericho”

Fourth narrative sequence

- 19:11-27 “he was near Jerusalem”

Fifth Part: 19:28–19:46*First narrative sequence*

- 19:28-40 “he preceded on his journey up to Jerusalem”

Second narrative sequence

- 19:41-44 “as he drew near, he saw the city”

Third narrative sequence

- 19:45-46 “Jesus entered the temple area and proceeded to drive out”

My outline follows the five major travel notices, which mention Jerusalem as the final goal of Jesus’ journey, and so divides the journey into five parts. These five travel notices could have been placed in any part of the narrative, but Luke placed them where they are for a purpose. My analysis suggests that the purpose of the travel notices is more than a simple reminder of the journey to Jerusalem. They serve to highlight the universal dimension of

salvation and the imminence of the events that will take place in Jerusalem. Therefore, the five travel notices (9:51; 13:22; 17:11; 18:31; 19:28) can be considered major turning points in the narrative.

The travel notices are not the only indicators of a shift in the narrative. Each part is further divided into narrative sequences. Each narrative sequence is a segment of text of variable length, which has a certain autonomy of content. The demarcation between one sequence and another is marked by a significant change in the development of the story. The demarcation can be a change of time or space. For the most part the shift is explicitly expressed. At times, however, it is only implied.

The first part of the journey section (9:51–13:21) is divided into eight narrative sequences. The first sequence starts with a change of place, “he resolutely determined to journey to Jerusalem” (9:51). The second starts with a change of time and place, “after this the Lord appointed seventy-two others whom he sent ahead of him” (10:1). The third starts with a change of time, “the seventy-two returned” (10:17). The fourth starts with the change of place, “as they continued their journey he entered a village” (10:38). The fifth starts with a change of place, “he was praying in a certain place” (11:1). The sixth starts with a change of place, “a Pharisee invited him to dine at his home” (11:37). The seventh starts with a change of time and place, “meanwhile so many people were crowding together” (12:1). The eighth starts with a change of place and time, “he was teaching in a synagogue on the Sabbath” (13:10).

The second part of the journey section (13:22–17:20) has four narrative sequences. The first sequence starts with a change of a place: “he passed through towns and villages”

(13:22). The second starts with a change of time and place: “on a Sabbath he went to dine at the home of one of the leading Pharisees” (14:1). The third narrative sequence starts with a change of place: “great crowds were travelling with him” (14:25). Finally, the fourth narrative sequence starts with the change of place, “the tax collectors and sinners were all drawing near to listen him” (15:1). There is no explicit change of place in the third and fourth sequence. However, in light of the previous sequences, which took place at the house of a Pharisee, the reference to a journey implies a change of place.

The third part of the journey section (17:11–18:30) has only one narrative sequence. Within the sequence there is no indication of a change of place or time. The events described in the sequence take place in a village where Jesus cures ten lepers and teaches the disciples and crowds.

The fourth part of the journey section (18:31–19:27) has four narrative sequences. Each of these sequences is discernible on the basis of a change of place. “He took the twelve aside and said to them. Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem” (18:31) opens the first narrative sequence. “As he approached Jericho” (18:35) begins the second narrative sequence. “He came to Jericho” begins the third narrative sequence (19:1), and “he was near Jerusalem” (19:11) begins the fourth and the last narrative sequence of the fourth part of the journey section.

The fifth part (19:28-46) has three narrative sequences. The beginning of each sequence is discernible on the basis of a change of place. “He proceeded on his journey up to Jerusalem” (19:28) opens the first, whereas “as he drew near, he saw the city” (19:41) opens the second, and “Jesus entered the temple area” (19:45) opens the third narrative sequence.

Each narrative sequence can be further subdivided into smaller units called scenes. The limits of the scene are marked by the arrival of a new character, the occurrence of a new event, the beginning of a dialogue, or a question. In other words, a change in the flow of the narrative indicates a change of scene. For example the third part of the journey section (17:11–18:30), which has only one narrative sequence, can be divided into seven scenes. The first scene presents Jesus meeting the ten lepers (17:11-19), whereas the question of the Pharisee about the coming of the kingdom of God (17:20-21) constitutes the second scene. The third scene presents Jesus turning to his disciples and teaching them on the day of the Son of Man (17:22-37). In the fourth (18:1-8) and fifth scenes (18:9-14) Jesus tells two parables. The two parables are discernible as two distinctive scenes because each one has a different audience. The parable of the Persistent Widow (18:1-8) is addressed to the disciples, whereas the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14) is addressed to “those who were convinced of their own righteousness and despised everyone else.”⁷⁰ The sixth scene opens with people who “were bringing even infants” (18:15) so that Jesus could bless them, whereas the seventh scene opens with a rich official who comes to Jesus asking “what must I do to inherit eternal life” (18:18).

The five major travel notices divide the journey section into five parts and remind the reader of the journey. At the same time they highlight the universal aspect of the salvation Jesus will accomplish through his ἀνάλημνις. The division into narrative sequences based on changes of place and time gives the impression of movement from one place to another.

⁷⁰ According to Luke 18:1, the parable of the Persistent Widow was addressed to them (αὐτοῖς). Taken out of context it is difficult to know who the audience of that parable is. The immediate context of the parable, which is the teaching on the day of the Son of Man, suggests that the audience of the parable is the disciples. A shift of audience comes only in 18:9. Prete, *Le parabole della preghiera nel Vangelo di Luca*, 84-85.

Finally, the change of audience within each narrative sequence emphasizes Jesus' teaching on the way and his progress toward Jerusalem.⁷¹

3. The Proximate Context of the Parable of the Good Samaritan

The proximate context of the parable of the Good Samaritan is the first part of the journey section. The first part begins with a firm decision to go to Jerusalem (9:51) and ends with a travel notice that Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem (13:22). The first part has seven narrative sequences each divided into scenes.

The parable of the Good Samaritan is found toward the beginning of the journey section. The scholar of the law approaches Jesus and asks him: "What must I do to inherit eternal life" (10:25). His question suggests that the scholar of the law comes to Jesus looking for instruction. Luke frequently presents Jesus as teaching. For example, after his first teaching in the synagogue in Nazareth, Jesus moves from one place to another to teach and cure the sick. The journey section is no different. Jesus teaches through several discourses, addressing the crowds, the disciples, and all who follow him.⁷²

Jesus does not immediately answer the scholar's question. Instead, he challenges the scholar to find the answer in the law. Consequently, the scholar quotes the commandment to love God and neighbor. The scholar understands the need to love God, but apparently the commandment to love the neighbor needs further explanation. He is not sure who should be considered a neighbor. In his reply Jesus tells the parable of the Good Samaritan. The parable

⁷¹ According to Matera ("Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem," 61), the changes of time and place "provide the narrative with a sense of movement and, however imperfectly, sustain the claim of 9:51 that Jesus is on a journey."

⁷² Ibid., 63-65.

illustrates that the concept of neighbor has a much wider dimension than the scholar initially thought. The concept of neighbor includes not only one's fellow countryman but foreigners as well. Thus, Jesus teaches that one can achieve salvation by following the love commandment and accepting others, even if they belong to different ethnic groups or nations.

The theme of salvation, which includes all, dominates the beginning of the journey section. In the first narrative sequence (9:51-62) Jesus sets his face to go to Jerusalem since the time of his ἀνάλημψις has drawn near. He intends to pass through a Samaritan village, but the inhabitants of that village, aware of the goal of the journey, do not let Jesus pass through their territory. Therefore, Jesus chooses an alternative route, and he does not allow his disciples to punish the inhospitable village. In the second scene (9:57-62) Jesus meets three men. Two of them volunteer to follow him (ἀκολουθήσω σοι), whereas the third is invited to join him (ἀκολούθει μοι). All three encounters present the requirements for proclaiming the kingdom of God. Whoever wishes to follow Jesus must leave behind everything, cannot look back, and must go forth and proclaim the kingdom of God (9:60-62). In the second narrative sequence (10:1-16) Jesus designates another seventy-two (ἐπείκοις ἑβδομήκοντα δύο).⁷³ The seventy-two are to go ahead of Jesus into the villages he intends to visit. Their mission is twofold. They are to cure the sick and to announce the kingdom of

⁷³ Some important manuscripts, among them Ⲙ, A, C, *f*¹, *f*¹³ read “seventy” whereas others read “seventy-two.” The latter reading is supported by ⲑ⁷⁵, B and D. According to Metzger (A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, 126), “The external evidence is almost evenly divided.” It has been proposed that the number may have a symbolic significance and alludes to the future proclamation of the gospel to all the world. In the Hebrew text of Genesis 11 the number of the nations of earth total seventy, whereas in the Greek Septuagint the enumeration is seventy-two. According to Green (*The Gospel of Luke*, 409), “in light of the widespread use of seventy in the biblical tradition, it is much easier to imagine that ὀδο was omitted than that it was added. Nolland (*Luke*, 2:546) explains this in the same way. See the discussion in Bruce M. Metzger, “Seventy or Seventy-Two Disciples?” *NTS* 5 (1958) 299-306; Sidney Jellicoe, “St. Luke and the Seventy (-Two),” *NTS* 8 (1960) 319-21.

God (10:9). Once again the territory of the mission is not mentioned. However, the instruction given by Jesus, “whatever town you enter” (καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε; 10:8; εἰς ἣν δ’ ἂν πόλιν εἰσέλθητε; 10:10) indicates that the territory of the mission is not restricted to any region or area.

After Jesus sends the seventy-two he recalls his previous activity in the region of Galilee and the unrepentant attitude of its inhabitants. Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum are contrasted with the pagan cities of Tyre and Sidon, and Jesus says that these pagan cities would have accepted his message if they had been given the same opportunity (10:13-16). The departure of the seventy-two for a mission, then, is the occasion for Jesus to reproach the towns of Galilee that did not heed his message.

The parable of the Good Samaritan presents Jesus interacting with a scholar of the law and discussing the law, love of God, and what one must do to inherit the eternal life (10:25-29). An echo of this encounter between Jesus and the scholar of the law is found in two other places in the first part of the journey section. First, in Luke 11:37 a Pharisee invites Jesus to dine with him. The dinner at the house of the Pharisee gives Jesus an opportunity to reproach the Pharisees for their love of the first seats in the synagogues and salutations at market places. Jesus chastises the Pharisees for following the minute prescriptions of the law while neglecting the more important things such as the justice and the love of God (11:38-44). He also reproaches the scholars of the law for putting heavy burdens upon others and for taking away the key of knowledge (11:45-52). The reproach of the Pharisees and the scholars of the law begins the hostility between Jesus and them. Consequently, from now on they try to interrogate Jesus in order to catch him in something that he might say (11:53-54).

Second, in Luke 13:10 Jesus teaches in a synagogue on the Sabbath. When Jesus cures a woman on the Sabbath day, the leader of the synagogue becomes indignant. The curing of the woman on the Sabbath leads to a further conflict between Jesus and his adversaries (13:17). This conflict gives Jesus an opportunity to continue his teaching on the function of the law and its prescriptions regarding the Sabbath (10:15-16). The two parables of the kingdom of God, the parable of a man who plants the mustard seed (13:18-19), and the parable of a woman who takes a measure of a yeast (13:20-21) end the first part of the journey section. In both parables the kingdom of God grows beyond measure.

The analysis of the proximate context of the parable of the Good Samaritan suggests that the mission of the seventy-two is not restricted to any region. The seventy-two are sent ahead to the towns Jesus intends to visit. For the most part their mission is successful. The religious leaders, however, oppose Jesus' message, and they are not able to see beyond their legalistic boundaries. Despite many obstacles and humble beginnings, the kingdom of God grows and will find a fertile soil.

4. The Immediate Context of the Parable of the Good Samaritan

The immediate context of the parable of the Good Samaritan is set within the third (10:17-24) and the fourth (10:38-42) narrative sequences. Both sequences either prepare or develop the theme treated in the parable of the Good Samaritan.

4.1. Return of the Seventy-Two (Luke 10:17-24)

The return of the seventy-two from their mission (10:17) marks the beginning of the third narrative sequence. There is no clear indication that the place or time has changed. However, the mission of the seventy-two and their return from that mission implies that a

certain amount of time has passed between their setting out on mission and their return from mission.

The sequence consists of three scenes. The seventy-two report the outcome of their mission. They note that even the demons were subject to their authority (10:17-20). Jesus tells the seventy-two that the success of their mission comes from the power he has given to them. The power given the seventy-two not only enabled them to accomplish what they have done, it also protected them from any harm. Jesus also warns them that the object of their joy should be that their names are written in heaven rather than the mighty deeds they were able to perform on their mission. The success of the mission leads Jesus to rejoice in the Spirit. He turns to the Father and praises him for having revealed the mysteries of heaven to the childlike (10:21-22). Since only the Son knows the Father, and only the Son reveals the Father to whom he wishes, the seventy-two are among those who have knowledge of the Father. Next, Jesus turns to his disciples in private (κατ' ἰδίαν).⁷⁴ He is not addressing the seventy-two but a group of his disciples and says that they have been privileged to see and hear what many prophets and kings wished to see and hear (10:23-24).

It may appear that there is no connection between the return of the seventy-two and the parable of the Good Samaritan. However, the reference to the wise (σοφός) and the learned (συνετός) from whom the mysteries of heaven have been hidden (10:21) anticipates the appearance of the scholar of the law (νομικός) who belongs to the wise and learned. Since the mysteries of heaven have been hidden from him, the scholar of the law turns to

⁷⁴ The travel narrative contains many discourses that have different audiences; the disciples, the crowd, the seventy-two, the religious leaders. There are some instances where Jesus initiates the teaching with a larger group and then turns to the disciples to continue his teaching or to explain what he had said.

Jesus and asks: “what must I do to inherit eternal life?” In other words, the scholar of the law asks what he must do to have his name written in heaven just as the names of the seventy-two have been written in heaven.

4.2. Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38-42)

The episode in the house of Martha and Mary constitutes the fifth narrative sequence. The sequence begins with a change of place. According to Luke 10:38 Jesus continues his journey and enters a certain village. The village is not identified, and there is no way to know where the episode takes place. The only indication Luke gives is that Martha and her sister Mary welcome him. Since the location of the village is not mentioned, it is a secondary issue that does not have any bearing on the message of the passage.⁷⁵ The most important elements of the story are the protagonists and their actions.

The discussion between Jesus and the scholar of the law (10:25-29) led to the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35). The parable ends with the Samaritan assisting the victim of the robbers, taking good care of him and paying for his recovery in the inn (10:33-35). The story of the two sisters who welcome Jesus complements the story of a Samaritan who cares for the victim on the road to Jericho. Thus, a certain woman (γυνή τις) complements a certain man (ἄνθρωπος τις).⁷⁶ The two episodes do not have many explicit linguistic

⁷⁵ In the Gospel of John, the two sisters and their brother Lazarus live in Bethany, near Jerusalem. According to John J. Kilgallen (“Martha and Mary: Why at Luke 10:38-42?,” *Bib* 84 [2003] 554), the setting of the story of Martha and Mary in the Gospel of Luke shows that Luke freely arranges the material at his disposal. In the present setting “the story highlights the saying of Jesus, that the ‘good portion’ is ‘hearing the word’ of the Lord.”

⁷⁶ Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 51-65; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 134-35.

connections. Nonetheless, there are motifs that connect the episode of Martha and Mary with the parable of the Good Samaritan.

First, Martha tells Jesus that her sister has left her alone (μόνην με κατέλιπεν). This reminds the audience that the robbers left their victim half dead (ἀφέντες ἡμιθανή), as well as the priest and the Levite who passed by (ἀντιπαρῆλθεν) and did not assist the victim. Second, the labors of Martha recall the labor of the Samaritan traveller. Martha was burdened with much serving (περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλήν διακονίαν), reminding the audience of the description of the Samaritan and his actions when he assisted the man in need (10:34-35). Thus the service (διακονία) offered by Martha recalls the series of actions performed by the Samaritan traveler.

The episode in the house of Martha and Mary continues the theme of what must be done in order to inherit eternal life. Answering the scholar's question, Jesus has shown that love of God and neighbor has neither ethnic nor religious boundaries. It cannot be limited. The actions of the Samaritan exemplified the love of neighbor that knows no boundaries. However, the love of God, its extension and practice remains unexplained. The story of Martha and Mary fills the lacuna.

The attitude of Mary who sits at the feet of Jesus resembles the attitude of an ancient disciple learning at the feet of a master.⁷⁷ Luke does not inform the audience of the content of Jesus' teaching. He only reports that Mary "sat beside the Lord at his feet listening to him speak" (10:39). Given the immediate context of the scene, it is possible that the teaching

⁷⁷ In Luke-Acts there is one more episode that portrays the disciple at the feet of a master. According to Acts 22:3, Paul was educated at the feet of Gamaliel. Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 134-35.

concerned the love of God and neighbor. If the larger context is taken into consideration, it is possible that the teaching also concerned the proclamation of the kingdom of God. Thus, the context suggests that the only thing necessary, of which Mary will not be deprived, is listening to God's message.

The scene in the house of Martha and Mary with its welcoming atmosphere continues the theme of the mission to proclaim the kingdom of God. The hospitality shown by two sisters exemplifies the hospitality that should be shown to those who embark on mission. Thus, the narrative sequence in the house of Martha and Mary recalls the return of the seventy-two (10:17-24) as well as the inhospitable attitude of the Samaritans who did not welcome Jesus into their village (9:52-56). Ultimately, the brief narrative sequence (only one scene) provides a break or hiatus in the narrative. The theme of the journey as well as haste and preoccupation in preparing what is necessary to welcome Jesus suggest a brief layover during the journey.

5. Conclusion

The larger context of the parable of the Good Samaritan is the Lukan journey section (9:51-19:46). According to Luke 9:51 Jesus embarks on a journey. Jesus' journey has two goals. The first is for Jesus to go to Jerusalem; the second is his *ἀνάλημψις*. In Luke 19:45-46 Jesus enters the temple of Jerusalem and fulfills the first goal of his journey. The fulfillment of the second goal depends on the interpretation of *ἀνάλημψις*. Since the exact meaning of *ἀνάλημψις* is disputed, it is not clear which event fulfills the second goal of the journey section. My analysis has shown that *ἀνάλημψις* in Luke 9:51 can connote the series of events that lead to Jesus' passion, death, and resurrection, as well as his ascension into

heaven. Thus, Jesus fulfills the second goal of the journey section at the end of the Gospel when he parts from the disciples and is taken into heaven (24:51). The beginning of the Acts of the Apostles recounts Jesus' ascension into heaven a second time in the context of the mission of the disciples (1:6-12). The repetition of Jesus' ascension serves as a link between the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles (the story of Jesus' life and mission and the story of the disciples' life and mission). The repetition also suggests that there is a clear connection between the fulfillment of the second goal of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and the beginning of the mission of the disciples. The way Luke introduces the mission of the disciples (ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν; 2:1) echoes the beginning of Jesus' journey (ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας; 9:51). The journey initiated by Jesus in Galilee, which led him through Samaria and Jerusalem, will have its continuation and further development in a journey continued by the disciples. The journey of the disciples, however, unfolds differently. First they will give testimony in Jerusalem (Acts 1:13-8:3), then in Samaria (8:4-9:43), and finally the mission of Paul will bring the Good News to Gentiles in Rome, the center of the then known world (28:17-31).

The universal mission to witness to Jesus' resurrection in the whole world (Acts 1:8; 2:1) has its confirmation in the internal structure of the journey section. The analysis of the major travel notices and their context has shown that they have at least two purposes. First, they remind the audience of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and prepare for its end. Second, they serve as a prelude to the universal mission of the disciples inasmuch as they highlight the universal destination of Jesus' mission and teaching. Thus, the travel notice in 13:22 points to the eschatological banquet attended by people from the four corners of the world (13:29). The second travel notice in 17:22 focuses the attention of the audience on the healing of the

Samaritan leper (17:19). Finally, the travel notice in the context of the third passion prediction in 18:31 highlights the involvement of all peoples in the death of Jesus and prepares for the meeting of Jesus and Zacchaeus, a leading tax collector, a sinner. The Lukan travel notices are not random. They remind the audience that the proclamation of the kingdom of God does not exclude anyone. The mission reaches all, even those who are considered outcasts and sinners.

Such a mission has its difficulties, challenges, and requirements. The proximate context (9:51–13:21) of the parable of the Good Samaritan reminds the audience that proclaiming the kingdom of God is not easy. Whoever wishes to undertake that mission will face difficulties and opposition. The messengers must be vigilant and faithful. The immediate context of the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:17-24; 38-42) shows that the mission of proclaiming the kingdom of God secures eternal salvation. The names of those who embark on the mission will be written in heaven. However, the messengers will not be able to conclude their mission until they first hear the one who sends them.

The leitmotif of the journey section and the context of the parable of the Good Samaritan is a universal salvation accomplished by Jesus. Salvation will take place in Jerusalem and initiate a worldwide mission of the disciples to be the witnesses of the risen Lord. Such a literary context affects the parable of the Good Samaritan and its interpretation in two ways. First, the context of the parable explains why the double commandment to love God and the neighbor should be combined and read alongside the commandment not to mistreat an alien who resides in the land. These two commandments should be read together because Jesus' mission has a universal dimension. Jesus' mission shows that no one can be

despised or rejected. All, even sinners and those who are considered outcasts because of their ethnic background, social status, or religious pedigree have been called to salvation and participation in the messianic banquet. People from the four corners of the earth (13:29-30), the Samaritan leper (17:18), the Gentiles (18:32-34), a blind beggar (18:35-43), Zachaeus (19:1-10), and a whole series of references to sinners coming to Jesus confirm the universal dimension of this salvation.

Second, the parable of the Good Samaritan ends with a call to follow the example of the Samaritan who crosses the ethnic and the religious boundaries in order to help the man in need (10:37). In light of the journey section the scholar of the law and the audience are invited to do the same. They are called to cross the boundaries that separate all people. The universal salvation preached by Jesus on his journey to Jerusalem neither knows nor allows for any boundaries. The crossing of boundaries enables the disciples to carry on their mission to be witnesses of Christ's resurrection to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8).

CHAPTER FOUR

A NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PARABLE OF THE GOOD SAMARITAN

1. Introduction

Thus far my study of the Lukan journey section has highlighted the goal and purpose of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. From a geographical point of view the journey section ends when Jesus enters the temple area (19:46). The purpose of his journey, however, will not be fulfilled until he is taken into heaven and sends his disciples to be his witnesses in Jerusalem, throughout Judea, Samaria, and to the end of the earth (Acts 1:8). When Jesus initiates his journey to Jerusalem, he is not accepted in a Samaritan village (9:51-56). Nevertheless, he continues his journey to Jerusalem.

In my study of the journey section and its structure I argued that the salvation Jesus will accomplish in Jerusalem is universal in scope, destined for all people regardless of ethnic, religious, or socio-cultural background. In this chapter I will present a narrative analysis of the parable of the Good Samaritan and demonstrate how Luke conveys the idea of crossing and disregarding socio-cultural boundaries in the parable of the Good Samaritan. To accomplish this, I will examine the plot of the parable of the Good Samaritan and the different narrative devices Luke uses in the course of the narrative. In my analysis I will pay close attention to how Luke introduces characters, how they enter the narrative, what he tells us about them, what they say about themselves, and what their actions tell us about them. I will also pay attention to the audience and its reaction. I will also consider what the narrator omits. Paying attention to what the narrator omits will help us to understand the choices the

narrator makes as well as the way the narrator presents the development of the narrative. At the end of my analysis I will determine which characters are flat and static, and which are round and dynamic.¹ The presentation of the characters will help us to understand their role in the narrative. I will also show how these elements of the narrative are related and how they help us to interpret the parable of the Good Samaritan. Lastly, I will indicate how the parable is related to other material in the journey section, thereby suggesting that the parable and the journey section help to interpret each other.

2. A Narrative Analysis

The parable of the Good Samaritan is generally restricted to Luke 10:29-37.² However, my study of the limits and structure of the parable, as well as my study of the larger and immediate context of the parable, has shown that the parable proper is closely related to 10:25-28. In the first part the scholar of the law asks Jesus, “What must I do to inherit eternal life” (10:25), whereas in the second part the scholar, who now wants to justify his first question, asks, “And who is my neighbor” (10:29). The two parts are closely related. This unity should not be overlooked or neglected since the introductory dialogue (10:25-28)

¹ A flat character is usually less important. He is a background character of the narrative who does not undergo a substantial change in the course of the story. According to James L. Resseguie (*Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005] 123), “a flat character lacks hidden complexity or depth.” By contrast, a round character is a major character of the narrative who encounters a conflict and undergoes a substantial change in the course of the narrative. Flat characters are usually static, whereas round characters are dynamic.

² Historical-critical studies restrict the parable of the Good Samaritan to Luke 10:29-37. For example, Evans, *Saint Luke*, 464-71; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:876-90; Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc*, 124-32; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, 440-50; Hans Binder, “Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter,” *TLZ* 15 (1959) 176-94; Helmut Gollwitzer, *Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962) 56-64; Werner Monselewski, *Der Barmherzige Samariter* (BGBE 5; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1967) 110-23; Kristján Búason, “The Good Samaritan, Luke 10:25-37: One Text, Three Methods,” in Petri Luomanen, *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 1-35;

and the parable proper (10:29-37) constitute a literary unit.³ For this reason I speak of the plot of this literary unit as a double controversy dialogue between Jesus and the scholar of the law that unfolds in the following way: the scholar of the law asks a question, and Jesus asks a counter-question (10:25-28). Then the scholar of the law answers Jesus' counter-question, and Jesus answers the scholar's original question (10:29-37).⁴

2.1. The First Part: "Teacher, What Must I Do to Inherit Eternal Life" (10:25-28)

2.1.1. The Scholar's Question (10:25)

The first part of the parable of the Good Samaritan opens with the interjection "behold" and the introduction of a new character, a scholar of the law. There is no indication of where this new character comes from. As a consequence, it is not certain if the scholar has been present already in the narrative, in the background. The lack of any change of place or audience, however, suggests that he was present in the previous scene. Thus, he may have played a marginal role as a silent auditor or bystander. For example, he may have been eavesdropping, standing behind and listening to what Jesus said to the seventy-two (10:17-20), or to the disciples (10:23-24). He may have heard Jesus saying that the names of the seventy-two are written in heaven (10:20), and this may have aroused his curiosity and encouraged him to step forward. Since there is no indication of a change of audience we

³ See my discussion on the structure of the passage in Chapter Two. Many authors recognize the two-part structure of the parable. Crossan, "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus," 290; idem., *In Parables*, 62-63; Nolland, *Luke*, 2:591-92; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 427; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 344; Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:81-82. According to Philip F. Esler ("Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of the Social Identity Theory," *BibInt* 8 [2000] 332), "to appreciate the force of the parable at 10:30-37, it is necessary to examine both parts of this unified composition."

⁴ Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 127.

assume that the scholar asks his question in the presence of the seventy-two, the disciples, and the crowd.

The narrator does not disclose the identity of the new character. His name remains unknown. However, a two-step presentation reveals much more about him than his name would have.⁵ In the first step the narrator informs us that the new character is a νομικός. This noun denotes someone, who in virtue of his profession, is learned in the law and trained to elucidate its nuances and disclose its meaning.⁶ In other words, he is a scholar of the law, that is, someone who is learned in the law in order to teach it. Since the law of Moses occupies a central position in the life of the Jews, the scholar of the law has an important position within the Jewish community of Second Temple Judaism.⁷ He is responsible for guiding people and teaching them the correct way of life.

In the second step the narrator says that the scholar of the law stands up to test Jesus. Nothing in the narrative implies that the scholar of the law acts as a spokesman for the leaders of the people or that he acts on behalf of a larger group. The way the omniscient

⁵ According to Resseguie (*Narrative Criticism of the New Testament*, 121), “characters reveal themselves in their speech (what they say and how they say it), in their actions (what they do), by their clothing (what they wear), in their gestures and posture (how they present themselves).”

⁶ The noun νομικός does not occur frequently in the NT. It occurs only nine times, six times in Luke (7:30; 10:25; 11:45; 11:46; 11:52; 14:3), once in Matthew (22:35), and once in the letter to Titus (3:13). Although the noun is not frequent, it refers to those who in other contexts are known as “scribes” (οἱ γραμματεῖς). In two instances (7:30; 14:3), Luke presents the scholars of the law together with the Pharisees. See Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus*, 93; Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ 175 B. C.–A. D. 135* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973) 2:25. According to Samuel Krauss (*Talmudische Archäologie* [Hildesheim: Olms, 1966] 169), the Greek noun νομικός was frequently used for Torah scholars to stress that the teachers of the law are comparable to the teachers of Roman public law.

⁷ Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period* (JSOTSup 291; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998) 121-23; Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 56-59.

narrator introduces the scholar of the law suggests that he stands up to test Jesus on his own.⁸ He is not the spokesperson of those who follow Jesus on his way to Jerusalem. Neither does he act as an envoy of the religious leaders of the people who, by the end of the journey section, become Jesus' major opponents and eventually decide to confront him and take him away.⁹

The omniscient narrator knows the inner thoughts of the characters, but he does not explain why the scholar of the law stands to test Jesus. If he was present in the previous scene, or if he had been following Jesus for some time, he would have heard Jesus' teaching.¹⁰ The content of his question echoes the questions of the crowds, the tax collectors, and the soldiers who came to John the Baptist asking *what they must do* (3:10-14), but his intention is different. According to the omniscient narrator, the scholar of the law approaches Jesus with a predetermined goal in mind.¹¹ He comes to test Jesus.¹² The verb (ἐκπειράζων)

⁸ Contrary to Scott F. Spencer (*The Gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles* [Nashville: Abingdon, 2008] 158-59), who hints that the scholar of the law in 10:25 represents the Jewish religious leaders. Although it is true that in Luke 11:45 another scholar of the Law makes himself a spokesman of the scholars saying to Jesus, "Teacher, by saying this you are insulting us too," nothing suggests that the scholar in 10:25 acts as a spokesman for a larger group.

⁹ The journey section shows that as Jesus approaches Jerusalem the conflict between him and the leaders of the people grows. They seek a way to trap Jesus and hand him over to the authorities. According to Jack D. Kingsbury (*Conflict in Luke* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991] 56-64), the authorities come into conflict with Jesus over the crucial issue of whom God has chosen to rule Israel.

¹⁰ Schottroff (*The Parables of Jesus*, 132) notes that "anti-Jewish reading has drawn the picture of the Torah scholar unjustly: as if he wanted to lay a trap for Jesus (*ekpeirazōn*, v. 25) and was being self-righteous (v. 29: "wanted to justify himself"). Only occasionally does someone recognize in vv. 25 and 29 the characteristics of discussion and learning that correspond to Jewish tradition." Robert F. Capon (*Kingdom, Grace, Judgment: Paradox, Outrage, and Vindication in the Parables of Jesus* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002] 211) reads the scholar's question as a sincere inquiry not as a threat.

¹¹ The narrator is omniscient because he knows the inner thoughts, desires, and feelings of the characters. He chooses to reveal some traits of the character and to conceal others. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament*, 127.

¹² According to Robert Alter (*The Art of Biblical Narrative* [New York: Basic Books, 1981] 116-17), the narrator's comments on the motives, feelings, intentions and desire of the character are at the top of the

leaves no doubt about the intentions of the scholar. He approaches Jesus with a desire to test him rather than look for instruction.¹³ Thus, at this point it cannot be excluded that the scholar wants to put into action a plan he had prepared beforehand. He wants Jesus to respond in a way that will offend the religious and political authorities. Based on the way the narrator introduces the scholar and what is known from the journey section, it is possible that the scholar of the law is not content with Jesus' teaching on the law, or with his association with outcasts and sinners. Therefore he stands up to test Jesus' allegiance to the law and to criticize his teaching. He does not enter into an argument, and he does not immediately attack Jesus. Rather, he chooses a more subtle way to expose Jesus' standpoint on the law so that he can discredit him in the eyes of those who follow him.¹⁴

Having introduced the scholar of the law, his purpose and his intentions, the narrator moves from the narrative level to the level of reported speech. In this way the narrator presents the scholar not only on the basis of his actions but also on basis of his words. The scholar of the law asks, "Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" It is noteworthy that the scholar addresses Jesus as "teacher" (διδάσκαλος). He does not use a generic and neutral

scale of means. With the comments of the omniscient narrator we enter the realm of certainty, we know what guides the character to act in such a way. These comments help to shape the reader's response to the narrative.

¹³ Luke 10:25 is the second and the last occurrence of the verb ἐκπειράζω in Luke-Acts. The first time this verb occurs in 4:12 when Jesus rebukes Satan for trying to tempt him. Apart from the form ἐκπειράζω, Luke twice uses the verb πειράζω. In 4:2 the narrator says that after his Baptism Jesus was led into the desert "to be tempted (πειραζόμενος) by the devil." In 11:16, "others to test him (πειράζοντες), asked him for a sign from heaven." Since there are only two occurrences of the verb ἐκπειράζω and two other forms of the verb πειράζω, it is difficult to determine in what sense Luke uses this verb. However, the use of the verb in the temptation scene suggests an unfavorable connotation. Forbes, *The God of Old*, 59. According to Nolland (*Luke*, 2:583), "as one who considers that he and his kind represents the true knowledge of God, the lawyer sets himself up to test the credentials of this one who claims to speak the mind of God." The prefix ἐκ strengthens the idea expressed by the verb πειράζω. Robert C. Tannehill (*Luke* [ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996] 181) calls the scholar suspicious and unreceptive.

¹⁴ Bailey, *Poet & Peasant*, 35.

title such as “lord” or “master” (κύριος), or a more specific Jewish form of address such as “rabbi” (ῥαββί).¹⁵ The scholar of the law chooses to address Jesus with a title that the crowds and the officials use to address him.¹⁶ There are three possibilities why the scholar of the law uses the title “teacher.” First, he addresses Jesus as teacher because the majority of his contemporaries have been addressing Jesus in this way. Second, he addresses Jesus as teacher because he has witnessed Jesus teaching the crowds.¹⁷ This usage would suggest that the scholar of the law has been following Jesus for some time and has heard the crowds address him in this way. Finally, the scholar of the law addresses Jesus as teacher because he recognizes Jesus as someone like himself, someone who teaches the law. In this way the scholar of the law establishes a more personal relation with Jesus.¹⁸

Having established a personal relation, the scholar reveals why he stands before Jesus and asks a question. The question he asks is not a trivial one, for it pertains to eternal life and how it can be inherited. The verb κληρονομήσω indicates that the scholar is looking for an answer to what he himself must do to inherit the eternal life. The scholar does not ask what a person in general must do, but what *he* must do to inherit eternal life. Thus, the question of

¹⁵ Most likely Luke avoids the title rabbi for the sake of the audience. He writes to Gentiles who would not know the meaning of this Jewish title. H. Shanks, “Origins of the Title Rabbi,” *JQR* 59 (1968-69) 153-54; J. Donaldson, “The Title Rabbi in the Gospels. Some Reflections on the Evidence of the Synoptics,” *JQR* 61 (1972-73) 287-91.

¹⁶ In Luke διδάσκαλος occurs seventeen times; twice as a noun (6:40), fifteen times as a title. Jesus uses this title only once for himself (22:11). The teachers in the temple of Jerusalem (2:46) and John the Baptist (3:12) are called “teachers.” Jesus is called “teacher” by the Pharisees (7:40; 19:39), someone from the synagogue official’s house (8:49), someone in the crowd (9:38; 12:13, 21:7), an official (18:18), the scribes and the chief priests (20:21.28.39), and by the scholars of the law (10:25; 11:45).

¹⁷ Madeleine I. Boucher (*The Parables* [Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1983] 119) commenting on why the scholar of the law addresses a layman as “teacher” and asks him what he must do to inherit eternal life notes, “perhaps the lawyer knew that Jesus preached the primacy of love repeatedly.”

¹⁸ Some authors note that the use of the title “teacher” is an affirmation that the scholar recognizes Jesus as someone at least equal to himself. See Bailey, *Poet & Peasant*, 35; Linnemann, *Gleichnisse Jesu*, 56.

the scholar has a personal dimension; it is not merely an academic inquiry. It pertains to his own life.¹⁹

The scholar of the law asks what he must do to inherit eternal life, in other words, how he can obtain salvation.²⁰ His question suggests that he belongs to, or closely follows, the group of the Pharisees who, unlike the Sadducees, believed in the resurrection of the dead.²¹ At the same time the question presupposes that in the scholar's view he can secure eternal life by practicing certain actions.

The study of the journey section has shown that Jesus frequently interacts with Pharisees, dines with them, and discusses the prescriptions of the law.²² Some of these encounters are helpful for understanding the dynamic of the encounter between Jesus and the scholar of the law in 10:25-37. For example, a Pharisee is amazed when Jesus fails to wash his hands before a meal as prescribed by the law and tradition (11:38). The scholars of the law and the Pharisees are insulted when Jesus criticizes their legalistic observance of the law

¹⁹ Schottroff (*The Parables of Jesus*, 132) notes, "at the beginning the learned man poses a question that is crucial to his own life: what must I do now, in my life situation? He sets this question before Jesus to test the man he has chosen to be his teacher."

²⁰ The phrase "eternal life" appears for the first time in Dan 12:2. According to Green (*The Gospel of Luke*, 428), the concept has been developed "in apocalyptic Judaism to refer to the life of the coming epoch." See, Rudolf Bultmann, "The Concept of Life in Judaism," *TDNT* 2:855-61; Str-B 1:808-9. According to Bailey (*Through Peasant Eyes*, 35), "after the Old Testament period the phrase 'inherit the earth/land' is applied to the salvation which God extends to His people. To possess the land is interpreted by the rabbis to mean participation in the salvation of the age to come."

²¹ The Gospels as well as the Acts of the Apostles note that the Pharisees believe in the resurrection of the dead, whereas the Sadducees do not. See the question about the resurrection (Matt 22:23; Mk 12:18; Luke 20:27) and Paul's use of the resurrection in his defense before the Sanhedrin (Acts 23:6-10). Josephus also states that these two groups differ on the subject of the resurrection (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:14; *idem.*, *J.W.* 2:163). See the discussion in Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees* (Leiden: Brill, 1991) 156-69; Anthony J. Saldarini, "Pharisees," *ABD* 5:289-303.

²² Anthony Le Donne, "The Jewish Leaders," in Chris Keith and Larry W. Hurtado (eds.), *Jesus among Friends and Enemies: A Historical and Literary Introduction to Jesus in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011) 199-217.

(11:45). The Pharisees criticize Jesus for associating with tax collectors and sinners (15:1-3).²³ All of these encounters offer Jesus a possibility to teach. The last encounter is especially significant because it becomes a springboard for a series of parables (15:4-32), which show that the legalistic prescriptions regulating the interactions between the people should not set boundaries that cannot be crossed since the salvation Jesus preaches has a universal dimension. The parables of the Lost Sheep (15:4-7), the Lost Coin (15:8-10), and the Prodigal Son (15:11-32) teach that there is more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents.

Jesus' harsh critique of the legalistic observance of the law practiced by the Pharisees and the scholars of the law has initiated their hostility toward him. Not all of the Pharisees and scholars of the law, however, have acted with hostility toward Jesus. According to 13:31 some of the Pharisees tried to warn him about Herod who wanted to kill him.

Thus far we have seen that the question of the scholar ("Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life") can be read as malicious inasmuch as he stands before Jesus to test him. However, in light of the journey section this question can also have a more neutral connotation. Toward the end of the journey section the narrator informs the audience that an official approaches Jesus to ask the same question, "Good teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" (18:18). There is an important difference, however, between the question of the scholar and the question of the official. Whereas the scholar addresses Jesus as "teacher" (διδάσκαλε), the official modifies "teacher" by adding the adjective "good" (διδάσκαλε

²³ Eckhard Rau, "Jesu Auseinandersetzung mit Pharisäern über seine Zuwendung zu Sünderinnen und Sündern. Lk 15,11-32 und 18,10-14a als Worte des historischen Jesu," *ZNW* 89 (1998) 19; Hans Joachim Eckstein, "Pharisäer und Zöllner. Jesu Zuwendung zu den Sündern nach Lukas 18,9-14," in idem., *Der aus Glauben Gerechte wird leben. Beiträge zur Theologie des Neues Testaments* (Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel 5; Münster: Lit, 2003) 143-51.

ἀγαθέ). The way the official addresses Jesus indicates that he approaches Jesus with a more positive disposition and hopes to find an answer to his question. This hope seems to be shattered when Jesus asks the official to sell his possessions and distribute them to the poor. The omniscient narrator informs the reader that the official becomes sad and walks away. His behavior, however, confirms that his question was sincere. He was not testing Jesus as was the scholar of the law.

2.1.2. Jesus' Counter-Question (10:26)

Contrary to what the scholar of the law may have expected, Jesus does not answer his question directly. Instead, he challenges the scholar to look for an answer in what he already knows, and so Jesus asks, "What is written in the law, how do you read it?" At first, the counter-question sounds dismissive or even sharp.²⁴ It appears as if Jesus dismisses the scholar by saying, "You are the scholar, you should know the law." But, if one examines the counter-question and its content this is not the case. In asking the counter-question Jesus does not turn away from the scholar. Rather, he provides the possibility for a fuller discussion. A short and laconic answer would have abruptly ended the dialogue. The counter-question not only requires an answer from the scholar, it requires a comment on the part of Jesus and possibly a further inquiry, questions or comments, on the part of the scholar. Thus, Jesus' counter-question should not be seen as dismissive.

The narrator does not specify why Jesus chooses to ask a counter-question. He may have been aware of the scholar's intentions. He may have been aware that the scholar was

²⁴ According to Esler ("Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict," 333), the tone of Jesus' reply is "quite sharp and rather dismissive."

testing him or trying to set him up. Or, Jesus may have wanted to use the scholar's question as an introduction to a lesson. The narrator does not give any clue as to whether or not Jesus knows the purpose of the scholar or his intentions. Nevertheless, the narrator has frequently noted that Jesus is aware of the intentions and thoughts of his interlocutors. According to Luke, Jesus knows the thoughts of the scribes and the Pharisees (5:22) and the intentions of the scribes and the Pharisees in the synagogue (6:8). Jesus knows what Simon thinks about him (7:40), and he knows the intentions of the heart of his own disciples (9:47). He also knows the thoughts of others (11:17) who are amazed when they see him cast out a demon. Given the previous occurrences of Jesus' awareness of the intentions of others it is possible that he is also aware of the true intentions of the scholar of the law.

Although the narrator does not specify why Jesus chooses to answer with a counter-question, the scholar of the law is most likely familiar with this technique.²⁵ Jesus tries to find a common ground with the lawyer for a much longer discussion. He enters the social space of his interlocutor, his mentality, and his educational upbringing.²⁶ He embraces a Jewish rhetoric and uses it to enter into dialogue with his opponent who comes to test him. The counter-question allows Jesus to examine the scholar and check his personal understanding of the law and what he must do to inherit eternal life. In this way Jesus verifies the true intentions of the scholar, and why he asks the question. The counter-question also

²⁵ Various authors suggest that at the time of Jesus it was customary for the teachers of the law and rabbis to respond with a counter-question. Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, 132; Rossé, *Il Vangelo di Luca*, 404; Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993) 34-37.

²⁶ Ibid.

unveils any misunderstandings and traps the scholar may have intended to set for Jesus.²⁷

Ultimately, the counter-question establishes the ground rules that will guide any additional inquiry. Jesus challenges the scholar of the law to look for an answer in the law: “What is written in the law?” By doing so, Jesus confirms the authority of the law, its ongoing validity and effectiveness.²⁸

The counter-question Jesus asks is in fact a double rhetorical question. First, Jesus asks what is written in the law. Then, he inquires about the scholar’s personal understanding of that law; that is, what is his interpretation of that law.²⁹ Jesus asks, “How do you read it?” In asking this question, Jesus does not want to know what other scholars of the law or what other scribes or Pharisees teach. Rather, he is interested in a personal answer from the scholar.³⁰ The shift from the third person perfect passive “written” (τί γέγραπται) to the second person active (ἀναγινώσκεις), as well as the shift from interrogative pronoun “what”

²⁷ Wilfrid J. Harrington, *A Key to the Parables* (Glen Rock: Paulist, 1964) 150; Michael Patella, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005) 75.

²⁸ According to Green (*The Gospel of Luke*, 428), “inquiring into the content of the law, Jesus assumes and endorses its ongoing normativity.” S. G. Wilson (*Luke and the Law* [SNTSMS 50; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983] 12-58) has studied the law in the Gospel of Luke. He notes that the theme of the law in the Gospel of Luke has rarely been discussed. Scholars have dedicated much attention to the law in Matthew, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Pauline letters. Jacob Jervell (“The Law in Luke-Acts,” *HTR* 64 [1971] 21-36) argues that Luke presents a consistent and conservative view of the law. Jewish-Christians are obliged to keep the whole of it, and Gentile Christians are to keep only parts that are relevant to them.

²⁹ Green (*The Gospel of Luke*, 428) notes, “what is at stake for him is not the law per se, but its construal. Hence he inquires into the nature of his antagonist’s legal interpretation.” See also Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:85.

³⁰ Joachim Jeremias (*Neutestamentliche Theologie* [Gütersloher: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1988] 182) suggests that the second part of Jesus’ counter-question corresponds to a rabbinic formula “what do you recite” and automatically implies the Shema. Simon J. Kistmaker (*The Parables of Jesus* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980] 166) reads the text in the same way. According to Rossé (*Il Vangelo di Luca*, 404), this question could have suggested to the scholar a correct answer. Some commentators suggest that Jesus may have been pointing to the scholar’s wrist and the phylacteries the Jews wore on their wrists. These phylacteries contained certain passages of scripture, such as Exodus 13:1-10, 11-16 and Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:13-20. Nolland (*Luke*, 2:443) and Duncan J. M. Derrett (“Law in the New Testament: Fresh Light on the Parable of the Good Samaritan,” *NTS* 11 [1964-65] 34) read, “how do you understand.”

(τί) to the interrogative “how” (πῶς) makes it clear that Jesus’ inquiry goes beyond a general and legalistic prescription and its mechanical repetition.³¹ Thus, the personal question of the scholar (“What must I do to inherit eternal life”) encounters a personal counter-question (“How do you read it?”).

In the course of the journey section, Jesus has frequently commented on the law and its interpretation. He has discussed the law and its prescriptions with the scholars of the law (11:46), the Pharisees (11:37; 14:3; 15:2), and the leaders of the synagogue (13:14). But in none of those discussions has he nullified or rejected the law. On the contrary, he indicates that the law remains valid and normative. He even says that it would be easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for the smallest letter of the law to lose its validity (17:17). Thus, Jesus shows that he does not oppose the prescriptions of the law and its practices. He proves that he obeys the prescriptions of the law when he sends the ten cured lepers to the priests so they can show themselves to the priest and present the offering prescribed by the law of Moses (Lev 14:2-9).

2.1.3. The Scholar’s Reply (10:27)

Jesus artfully turns the question back on the scholar. The one who stands before Jesus to test him becomes the object of the test. In other words, the scholar himself falls into the trap he sets for Jesus.³² The scholar himself must find the answer he is looking for. At this

³¹ Nolland (*Luke*, 2:583) notes, “Uniquely in the NT, ἀναγινώσκειν ‘to read,’ means here not the act of reading as such, but the perceiving of the sense of the text that has been read.” According to Bovon (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:85), the interrogation “what” corresponds to the text of the commandment, whereas the interrogation “how” corresponds to his interpretation.

³² Michael Mullins (*The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary* [Dublin: Columbia, 2010] 309) notes, “if the lawyer’s ploy was to show Jesus as uninformed, disobedient or disrespectful in regard to the Law, he failed

point in the narrative the audience (the seventy-two and the disciples) look at the scholar and wait for his answer. He is now under the scrutiny, and so, he is in the center of attention. He is the one who must defend himself and prove that he deserves the title he holds. Such a turnaround and reversal of roles is challenging. However, the narrator does not reveal whether the scholar is hesitant or reluctant to provide the answer. Neither does the narrator reveal if the scholar is looking for the help of anyone else, or if he is trying to avoid the question altogether. There is no interruption or pause in the flow of the narrative that would suggest any hesitation on the part of the scholar. The narrator does not pause to describe what the scholar thinks, what he feels, or what his first reaction is. Since the narrator does not provide this information, the audience assumes that the scholar immediately answers the counter-question. An immediate answer confirms what the reader already knows from the beginning: the scholar knows the answer to his own question, and he is able to recite that answer immediately. Nevertheless he asks the question to test Jesus.

It is important to look closely at the content of the answer the scholar provides. The scholar quotes two independent passages of the Torah. First he cites the commandment to love God (Deut 6:5). Then he cites the commandment to love one's neighbor (Lev 19:18). Jesus does not oppose the scholar's reply, which suggest that a combined reading was a common practice and the love of God and the love of one's neighbor played an important role in the life of every Jew and Jewish community.³³

miserably as he found himself to be the party under examination in the adversarial discussion he himself initiated."

³³ The two commandments are also closely related in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, *T. Iss.* 5:2, 7:6; *T. Dan* 5:3 as well as in manuscripts from the Dead Sea 1QS 1:1-3; 9-10.

The commandment to love God and the commandment to love neighbor come from different books of Torah but the scholar quotes them as one commandment. He does not pause between the two quotations. Neither does he introduce the commandments by saying that the commandment to love God is the first and the commandment to love one's neighbor is the second. For the scholar of the law both commandments constitute an intrinsic unity that cannot be separated; a single love commandment.³⁴ This love commandment, however, has two objects, God and neighbor, and the love of God cannot be separated from the love of neighbor.

In the commandment that the scholar quotes there are four nouns: heart, being, strength and mind, which are used as a measure of one's love of God. Love of one's neighbor, on the other hand, is measured by one's love toward himself.³⁵ The nouns used to measure one's love of God have a variety of meanings. All of them have a literary as well as a figurative meaning. Their meaning can change depending upon the context. Hence, it is difficult to draw a clear line and indicate with certainty what these nouns stand for in this context. Nevertheless it is possible to say something about each of them.

³⁴ Christoph Burchard, "Das doppelte Liebesgebot in der fruhen christlichen Überlieferung," in Eduard Lohse, Christoph Burchard and Berndt Schaller (eds.), *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 39-62; Serge Ruzer, "The Double Love Precept in the New Testament and the Community Rule," in Steven R. Motley, Marc Turnage and Brian Becker (eds.), *Jesus' Last Week: Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) 81-106. Contrary to Schottroff (*The Parables of Jesus*, 134) who writes, "the expression 'double commandment' of love in exegetical literature is misleading because it gives the impression that here something new (and Christian) is being added to the *Shema' Israel*."

³⁵ The commandment to love God, a fundamental part of the Jewish life, has been the subject of an extensive scholarly debate. See the discussion in H. L. Horowitz, "The Sh'ma Reconsidered," *Judaism* 24 (1975) 476-81; B. E. Willoughby, "A Heartfelt Love: An Exegesis of Deuteronomy 6:4-19," *ResQ* 20 (1977) 73-87; Michi Miyoshi, "Das jüdische Gebet Šema' und die Abfolge der Traditionsstücke in Luke 10-13," *AJBI* 7 (1981) 70-123; R. Walle, "Love Yahweh Your God with All Your Heart: The Deuteronomist's Understanding of Love," *Jeev* 13 (1983) 122-29; J. G. Janzen, "On the Most Important Word in the Shema (Deuteronomy VI 4-5)," *VT* 37 (1987) 280-300; F. Sedlmeier, "'Höre, Israel! JHWH: Unser Gorr (ist er) . . .' (Dtn 6, 4f.)," *TTZ* 108 (1999) 21-39.

“The heart” is the seat of the emotions such as joy (Deut 28:47) and excitement (Deut 19:6). It is also the seat of understanding, rational forces, and powers (1 Kgs 3:12); therefore, the heart is a place where intentions originate and where these intentions are put into actions (Exod 36:2).³⁶ Thus, loving God with “all one’s heart” denotes that love of God requires affectivity. There is no love of God if the emotions are not involved.

“Being” is the second noun used as a measure of one’s love for God. In classical Greek *ψυχή* refers to the inward part of man and his personality. In the LXX, *ψυχή* translates the Hebrew noun *נֶפֶשׁ*.³⁷ The waters teem with an abundance of living *נֶפֶשׁ* (Gen 1:20), and a dying mother gasps out her *נֶפֶשׁ* (Jer 15:9). Therefore, the noun “being” denotes the vitality of a living creature. Loving God with all one’s being requires loving God with all one’s life.

“Strength” is the third noun used as a measure of one’s love for God. In classical Greek *ἰσχύς* denotes the ability to do something, to be capable of working, to be strong and healthy. In the LXX *ἰσχύς* translates a variety of Hebrew words. All of them in one way or another refer to a manifestation of power or physical force.³⁸ Thus, loving God with all one’s strength implies that all one’s power and physical force must be put at the service of that love. One must love God and be able to do everything for that love. No part of one’s life can be excluded from that love.

³⁶ Theo Sorg, “καρδία,” *NIDNTT* 2:184.

³⁷ Collin Brown, “ψυχή,” *NIDTT* 3:682-83.

³⁸ Georg Bromine, “ἰσχύς,” *NIDTT* 3:713.

“Mind” is the last noun used as a measure of one’s love for God.³⁹ In classical Greek *διάνοια* denotes the ability to think, the faculty of knowledge and understanding.⁴⁰ It can also mean the disposition or the will. The use of *διάνοια* means that one must love God with understanding, intelligence, and thought. There is no true love of God if one does not understand why one loves God.

The four nouns used to measure one’s love of God— *καρδία*, *ψυχή*, *ισχύς*, and *διάνοια*—describe four different aspects of human life.⁴¹ They describe emotion, vitality, action, and understanding. The use of these four aspects does not mean that emotion is contrary to understanding, or that vitality is contrary to action. Rather, the four nouns underline the unity of man and the unity of all his actions. When the scholar quotes the commandment to love God as the requirement to inherit eternal life and uses the four nouns as the measure of that love, he confirms that the totality of one’s life must be engaged in loving God.⁴² No aspect of human life can be excluded when love of God is concerned. In order to inherit eternal life, one must engage all that one is, and all that one does, for the love of God.

Love of neighbor is the second part of the double love commandment. The union of love of God and love of one’s neighbor into a double love commandment affirms that love

³⁹ I noted in Chapter Two (footnote 11) that the Lukan quotation of Deut 6:5 differs from its Hebrew and Greek form. In Luke 10:27 there are four human capacities to love God, whereas in Deut 6:5 there are only three. According to Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:880), “where the fourth phrase comes from is not clear.” Rossé (*Il Vangelo di Luca*, 405) suggests that the heart and mind in Luke stand for the Hebrew *leb* (heart). It is possible that Luke added the fourth capacity to include all human activities.

⁴⁰ Günther Harder, “*νοῦς*,” *NIDTT* 3:126-29.

⁴¹ Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:86; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 428; Nolland, *Luke*, 2:584.

⁴² See also the discussion in Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus’ Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke’s Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994) 123-25.

for neighbor plays an important role in Second Temple Judaism. The importance of this commandment has its confirmation in the book of Jubilees.⁴³ Love of one's neighbor is defined by an enigmatic expression: "Love your neighbor as yourself."⁴⁴ Saying that one should love one's neighbor as oneself presupposes that one loves himself and does nothing to harm oneself. Thus, the commandment to love one's neighbor commands one to look for others and treat them with respect. In other words, one should care for another as one would liked to be cared for. The commandment to love one's neighbor commands the practice of the so-called golden rule. This rule can be read in two forms: "One should treat others as one would like be treated," or "One should not treat others as one would not like be treated." Both forms, the positive and negative, require one to respect others, to care for them and not to harm them in any way. We have already seen that both the OT and the Jewish tradition know and apply the golden rule. For example, when Tobiah prepares for a journey, Tobit instructs his son not to do what he himself hates (Tob 4:15). In a similar fashion Ben Sira repeats the same lesson in the context of table etiquette, "recognize that your neighbor feels as you do and keep in mind everything you dislike" (Sir 31:15). Finally, it is said that when Hillel the Elder was asked to summarize the entire Torah he said, "That which is hateful to

⁴³ The book of *Jubilees* prescribes, "And love one another, my sons, your brothers as a man who loves his own soul, and let each seek in what he may benefit his brother, and act together on the earth; and let them love each other as their own souls" (*Jub* 36:4-5).

⁴⁴ Nolland (*Luke*, 2:584) notes, "there has been some considerable debate about whether 'as yourself' reflects a need first to love oneself in order to be able to love others, or whether, rather, it proposes the replacement of self-love with love of neighbor." See the discussion in Duncan J. M. Derrett, "Love Thy Neighbor as a Man like Thyself?" *ExpTim* 83 (1971) 55-56; Andreas Nissen, *Gott und der Nächste im Antiken Judentum: Untersuchungen zum Doppelgebot der Liebe* (WUNT 15; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1974) 278-317.

you, do not do to your fellow. That is the whole Torah; the rest is the commentary; go and learn.”⁴⁵

When the scholar includes the commandment to love one’s neighbor as a requirement to inherit eternal life he recognizes that one cannot inherit eternal life unless one cares for one’s neighbor. Caring for one’s neighbor as one would care for oneself presupposes that a person recognizes the neighbor as equal and so wants what is the best for the neighbor.

2.1.4. Jesus’ Answer (10:28)

Jesus congratulates the scholar for his apt reply and endorses the correctness of his answer, “You have answered correctly.” At the same time he answers the original question of the scholar, “Do this and you will live.” If the true intention of the scholar was to discredit Jesus or to prove his lack of allegiance of Torah, the scholar fails. By endorsing the scholar’s reply Jesus proves to him and to all standing by that his message and ministry are not contrary to Torah or Jewish tradition. Jesus accepts the combined reading of the love commandment, but he also makes it clear that there is a flaw in the answer provided by the scholar. The answer is correct, but knowledge alone is not sufficient. One must put into action what Torah teaches. One must love God in such way that this love is translated into action. Thus, Jesus invites the scholar and the audience to see his teaching and ministry as the fulfillment of Torah.⁴⁶ This practice must be an ongoing process as the second person present active indicates (ποιεί).⁴⁷

⁴⁵ *b. Šabb.* 31a.

⁴⁶ See the discussions in Bauckham, “The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan,” 475-89; Robert W. Funk, “The Old Testament in Parable: The Good Samaritan,” *Enc* 26 (1965) 251-67; Bastiaan Van Elderen, “Another Look at the Parable of the Good Samaritan,” in James I. Cook, *Saved by Hope* (Grand Rapids:

In the course of the journey section, Jesus does not criticize Torah but an interpretation of Torah that disregards and excludes others. For example, he criticizes the scholars of the law for overburdening people with practices that no one, including themselves, is ready to carry out (11:46). When Jesus cures a crippled woman on a Sabbath (13:10-17), the leader of the synagogue becomes indignant. In reply, Jesus notes that the leader of the synagogue would not see anything wrong in rescuing an animal on the Sabbath. Thus, Jesus criticizes a legalistic observance of the Sabbath that does not allow one to help those in need. He denounces an interpretation of the law that focuses on literal observance of a prescription but does not allow one to cure a man suffering from dropsy on the Sabbath (14:1-6).

Jesus' critique of the way the religious leaders practice Torah is not the only element of the journey section that illumines the present discussion between him and the scholar. In the course of the journey, Jesus repeatedly stresses the importance of obeying the word of God, which requires deeds and compassion for the needy, the oppressed, and the outcasts. He has also shown the need to cross the boundaries that separate people.

We have seen that Jesus' teaching on the narrow gate as the way to salvation is crucial for understanding the structure of the journey section. In this teaching Jesus stresses the universal aspect of salvation. People from the four corners of the earth will recline at

Eerdmans, 1978) 109-10; William Richard Stegner, "The Parable of the Good Samaritan and Leviticus 18:5," in Dennis E. Groh and Robert Jewett, *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1985) 27-38; Craig A. Evans, "Do This and You Will Live: Tragic Coherence in Luke 10:25-28," in Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans, *Jesus in Context* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 377-80; Eduard Verhoef, "Eternal Life and Following the Commandments: Lev 18,5 and Luke 10,28," in Christopher M. Tuckett, *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (BETL 131; Leuven: Peeters, 1997) 571-77.

⁴⁷ Rossé, *Il Vangelo di Luca*, 403.

table in the kingdom of God (13:29). In the same teaching Jesus indicates that not all who follow him or eat in his company will enter through the narrow gate. That gate remains closed to evildoers, that is, those who hear the word of God but do not put it into practice (10:27).

Jesus delivers a similar message in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. The parable recounts the story of a rich and a poor man named Lazarus. Lazarus was lying at the door of the rich man, which implies that the rich man could have helped him. But he chose not to do anything. The rich man's lack of compassion for Lazarus, his refusal to cross the boundaries that separated him from Lazarus and his lack of visible and tangible signs of following the word of God spoken through Moses and the prophets exclude the rich man from enjoying the company of Abraham when he dies.⁴⁸

This refusal to cross the boundaries that separate people is also present in the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14). The Pharisee obediently follows the law in fasting and paying tithes.⁴⁹ Despite all the prescriptions of Torah that the Pharisee fulfills in his love for God, he is unable to see the tax collector as his equal. Instead, he separates

⁴⁸ Otto Glombitza, "Der reiche Mann und der arme Lazarus," *NovT* 12 (1970) 174; Keith Pearce, "The Lucan Origins of the Raising of Lazarus," *ExpTim* 96 (1985) 359-61; Richard J. Bauckham, "The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and The Parallels," *NTS* 37 (1991) 236-37; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1996) 2:45-47; idem., "The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus and the Ethics of Jesus," *SwJT* 40 (1997) 68-70; Ernest Van Eck, "When Patrons are not Patrons: A Social-Scientific Reading of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-26)," *HTS* 65 (2009) 350-52.

⁴⁹ The Pharisee goes beyond the law for he fasts twice a week and pays tithes on all he acquires. Fasting twice a week is a surplus because the Torah does not prescribe such practice. The Torah prescribes public fasting on Yom Kippur or the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29.31; Num 29:7). This fasting is known in Luke-Acts (Acts 27:9). The biblical tradition knows many other fasts practiced on various occasions (Zech 8:19, Esth 9:31; Neh 9:1), but none of these corresponds to the fasting practice mentioned by the Pharisee. So, for example, there is a fast as a sign of pain (2 Sam 12:21), fasting for penance (1 Kgs 21:27; Ezra 10:6), or fasting for prayer (Neh 1:4, Dan 9:3). Some fasts are short and last one day (1 Sam 7:6; 2 Sam 1:12), and others are longer, three days (Exod 4:16), or even one week (1 Sam 31:13; 2 Sam 12:15-23). The practice of fasting twice a week is known only from Luke 18:12 and *Didaché* 8:1.

himself from the tax collector. He separates himself both in the way he stands in the temple and in the content of his prayer.⁵⁰ On the other hand, the tax collector, who unlike the Pharisee recognizes his sinfulness, asks for God's mercy. At the end of the story, it is the tax collector who goes home justified rather than the Pharisee who fulfills the prescriptions of the law but fails to cross the boundaries separating him from the tax collector, a public sinner.⁵¹

The last passage of the journey section that stresses the importance of obeying the law is the encounter between Jesus and the rich official (18:18-23). We have already seen that this encounter illumines the meaning of the scholar's question. The same passage, however, makes it clear that in order to inherit eternal life and have a treasure in heaven certain conditions must be met. One must follow the prescriptions of Torah (18:20). If one wants to follow Jesus, one must also be ready to give up everything for the poor and needy (18:22). Knowledge of the law must be accompanied by practice.

To summarize, I have noted that Jesus has frequently pointed to the necessity of obeying the law and loving God above all things. At the same time he points out that observance of the law and love of God must be followed by visible and tangible signs of love for one's neighbor. The love of neighbor must cross the boundaries that separate people. In other words, what Jesus teaches throughout the journey section is in agreement with the best teaching of Judaism; the love God and neighbor leads to eternal life. However, love of God

⁵⁰ Franz Schnider, "Ausschliessen und ausgeschlossen werden. Beobachtungen zur Struktur des Gleichnisses vom Pharisäer und Zöllner," *BZ* 24 (1980) 42-56; Betty O. S. Tan, "The Parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector in Luke 18:9-14: A Study on the Practice of Prayer," *AJT* 14 (2000) 286-303.

⁵¹ Hyam Maccoby, "How Unclean Were Tax-Collectors?," *BTB* 31 (2002) 60-63.

and neighbor is neither a theory to be espoused nor a lesson to be learnt by heart. It is a practice to be adopted.

2.2. *The Second Part: “And Who Is My Neighbor?” (10:29-37)*

2.2.1. The Scholar’s Question (10:29)

Jesus answers the scholar’s question by saying, “Do this and you will live.” This answer closes the first round of the double controversy dialogue between Jesus and the scholar of the law. The imperative “do this” (ποιέει) recalls the scholar’s question, what must he “do” (ποιήσας) to inherit eternal life. Similarly, the promise “to live” (ζήσῃ) echoes the “eternal life” (ζωὴν αἰώνιον) for which the scholar of the law looks. The first part of the dialogue comes to an end but the narrator does not inform the audience how the scholar of the law reacted when he heard Jesus’ answer. Neither does the narrator tell the audience whether or not the scholar accepted Jesus’ answer.

The scholar found an answer to his question, but apparently he felt the need to continue to question Jesus. He felt that his inquiry into the matter of what he must do to inherit eternal life needed a continuation. The scholar does not disclose the reasons why he asks the second question. Neither does he explain why he wants to continue his conversation with Jesus. The narrator who comments on the scholar’s motives fills that lacuna. According to the omniscient narrator, the scholar asks the second question in order “to justify himself.” Before we look into the content of the question it is worthwhile to examine the scholar’s wish to justify himself. The wish to justify himself can be interpreted in various ways. The plurality of interpretations, however, does not necessarily mean that one excludes the other. These interpretations can be treated as complementary and as illuminating each other.

First, the scholar's wish to justify himself can be understood as an attempt to regain lost honor.⁵² Hearing Jesus' answer, "Do this and you will live," the scholar of the law must have felt embarrassed. At the beginning of the scene the narrator informed the audience that the scholar of the law approached Jesus to test him. The scholar tried to put Jesus on the spot and challenge his teaching. Jesus accepted the challenge and asked a counter-question, which revealed the true intentions of the scholar. The scholar realized that he lost the initiative and was under scrutiny.

Second, the scholar's wish to justify himself can be understood as a defense of his original question.⁵³ Jesus accepted and endorsed the answer provided by the scholar; one can live if one loves God and one's neighbor. Endorsing that answer Jesus stressed that knowing what one must do is not sufficient. Knowledge must be translated into action. Asking the second question to justify himself, the scholar of the law wants to defend the legitimacy of his inquiry. He admits that he knows what the law of Moses prescribes, but he does not know exactly how to apply that prescription or what its limits are. He wants to involve Jesus in a further discussion on the meaning of the love commandment. This may be the reason why the scholar of the law approaches Jesus and asks the question in the first place. He wants to prove to Jesus and the audience that his first question ("What must I do to inherit eternal life") is more complicated than it sounds. The question merits a more profound and extensive answer.

⁵² Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World," in Jerome H. Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991) 51.

⁵³ Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 152; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 469; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:886; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 202; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 447; Schmid, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 191.

Finally, the scholar's wish to justify himself can be interpreted as a sign of pride or a further attempt to test Jesus.⁵⁴ The scholar realizes that he lost the first part of the controversy dialogue with Jesus, but he wants the last word of the discussion. He wants to test Jesus at all cost. To achieve this, he continues his inquiry by asking a second question to test Jesus. The scholar is trying to regain the initiative in his dialogue with Jesus.

The scholar's wish to justify himself is a collage of motivations. He is driven by a wish to regain his lost honor, he wants to save face and win the controversy with Jesus that he himself initiated, and he wants to test Jesus and show what he believes is an unorthodox teaching. Later, in the course of the journey section, Jesus will rebuke the Pharisees because they justify themselves before people (16:15). The Pharisees will hear Jesus' teaching on the use of money and sneer. According to the narrator, the Pharisees sneer because they loved money (φιλόργυροι). The Pharisees disliked Jesus' teaching on the proper use of wealth, and apparently it was not the only teaching they disliked. That the scholar of the law is interested in Jesus' teaching and wants to expose it as unorthodox becomes evident when the content of that second question is examined.

The answer Jesus provided to the first question of the scholar, "Do this and you will live," was perfectly in line with Jewish teaching. The law of Moses was fundamental in one's life. Obedience to the law could lead to eternal life. Such an answer did not satisfy the scholar inasmuch as it did not expose what he believed to be Jesus' unorthodox teaching. The scholar of the law, however, does not want to give up. He wants to discredit Jesus, and that is why he asks the second question, "And who is my neighbor?"

⁵⁴ Rossé, *Il Vangelo di Luca*, 404.

At first it seems that this question, “And who is my neighbor?” does not have anything to do with the first one, “What must I do to inherit eternal life.” However, since both the scholar of the law and Jesus recognize that love of God and love of one’s neighbor are means to inherit eternal life, there is a strict connection between inheriting eternal life and loving one’s neighbor.

The scholar’s second question, “And who is my neighbor?” implies that there is a group of people who are not classified as neighbors. The scholar assumes that there is a limit. Some people can be defined as neighbors and treated as such, while others are not to be treated as neighbors. If the scholar followed Jesus and heard his teaching he was aware of Jesus’ frequent encounters with sinners, outcasts, and those who lived on the margins of society. The scholar of the law who challenges Jesus to define his view of neighbor continues to test Jesus and tries to expose his teaching.⁵⁵ If Jesus gives an extended interpretation of neighbor that includes sinners, outcasts, and those living on the margins of society, as well as Gentiles, then the lawyer will succeed in unmasking Jesus’ teaching as unorthodox inasmuch as an extended definition of neighbor was not accepted by most Jews.⁵⁶

2.2.2. The Proper Parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30-35)

Hearing the second question of the scholar, “And who is my neighbor?” Jesus changes his tactic. He neither replies nor immediately asks a counter-question. Instead he

⁵⁵ In Chapter Two I argued that in Second Temple Judaism there was an ongoing discussion about who was to be considered a neighbor and who was to be excluded from the group. The scholar of the law apparently wants to bring Jesus into this discussion and force him to take a stand on the matter.

⁵⁶ According to John J. Kilgallen (“The Plan of the ‘NOMIKOS’ [Luke 10:25-37],” *NTS* 42 [1996] 615-19), the question about eternal life and what one must do to inherit it is a strategic setup for the real test which comes in the second question, the boundaries that determine who is neighbor.

chooses to tell a story. The narrator does not inform the audience why Jesus chooses to postpone his counter-question. The change of tactic suggests that Jesus is trying to prepare the scholar for the counter-question and that he is going to suggest to the scholar the correct answer. The only information the narrator provides is that Jesus understands the scholar's question. Jesus comprehends the dilemma the concept of neighbor causes.⁵⁷

At this point in the narrative Jesus himself takes the role of the narrator and tells a story about a man who fell victim to robbers. The man is in dire need of assistance. A series of different characters enter the scene, but they refuse to assist the man in need. At the end of the story a Samaritan traveler assists the man and takes care of him. Thus, the parable proper of the Good Samaritan has seven scenes: (1) a man fell into the hands of the brigands, (2) the arrival of the priest, (3) the arrival of the Levite, (4) the arrival of the Samaritan traveler, (5) the aid provided by the Samaritan, (6) taking the wounded man into the inn, and (7) final matters.

2.2.2.1. A Certain Man Fell into the Hands of Robbers (10:30)

The story Jesus chooses to tell opens with a simple yet significant introduction of character, setting, and circumstances. The audience is told, "A certain man fell victim to robbers as he went down from Jerusalem to Jericho." Jesus, speaking now in the role of the narrator, does not tell the audience who the man was. The audience knows neither the ethnic background nor the profession, nor even the origin of the man. The audience does not know

⁵⁷ Nolland (*Luke*, 2:592) notes that the participle ὑπολαβών is to be taken in the sense of to take up a conversation and so to answer a question. Such usage of the participle is found in the LXX as well as in Classical Greek (BDAG, 845). Bovon (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:81-82) argues that Jesus accepts the scholar's question inasmuch as he understands it well. Burghard Siede ("λαμβάνω," *NIDNTT* 5:747) notes, "when extended to mental processes *hypolambanō* approximates to the English to pick up someone's words."

whether the man was a rich merchant or a poor peasant. The identity of the man, as we shall see, remains concealed throughout the whole story.⁵⁸

At first it seems logical to assume that the man who fell victim to robbers was a Jew.⁵⁹ There are a few indices that suggest such an assumption. First, the immediate audience of the parable was Jewish. Jesus told the story to the scholar of the law and possibly also to the seventy-two and the disciples. Therefore, the audience assumes that the main character of the story was also a Jew. Second, according to biblical tradition Jews were to go to Jerusalem three times a year to celebrate the major feasts of Passover, Shavuot, and Sukkot. The audience assumes that the man was a Jew returning home after one of these feasts. Some members of the audience may have made the same journey so they are able to imagine the scene. They picture themselves falling into the hands of robbers on the road to Jericho. Third, Jericho was a city in Judea. In first century Palestine many priest and Levites, therefore Jews, lived in Jericho.⁶⁰ Finally, the man was traveling from Jerusalem (a Jewish city) to Jericho (another Jewish city).

The man of the story could be a Jew. But he could be a Samaritan, a Greek, or even a Roman soldier. First century Palestine was inhabited by peoples from many regions of the

⁵⁸ Some commentators ignore the identity of the man saying that it is insignificant for the story. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 123-25; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 203. Crossan, *In Parables*, 57-66. Others like B. T. D. Smith (*The Parables in the Synoptic Gospels* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937] 180) note that the popular stories omit the elements that are insignificant.

⁵⁹ Bailey (*Through Peasant Eyes*, 42), Bernard Brandon Scott (*Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989] 194), Funk ("The Good Samaritan as Metaphor," 32) and Ramaroson ("Comme le bon samaritan," 535) assume that the man was a Jew.

⁶⁰ Bailey (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes*, 292) notes that "many of the priests in the first century lived in Jericho. They would go up to Jerusalem for a two-week assignments and then return to their homes in Jericho." See also Str-B 2:66.

Middle East.⁶¹ They spoke different languages, had different customs, and wore different clothing. Even if they spoke the same language, there was a possibility that they spoke a different dialect.⁶² Each ethnic group that lived in Palestine in the first century was divided into groups and fractions. For example, according to Josephus, Second Temple Judaism had three sects: the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Essenes.⁶³

It is possible that the man who fell into the hands of the robbers was a Jew, but he may not have been. He could have been anyone. The narrator does not disclose his identity. He simply notes that there was “a certain man.” Since there is no direct identification, the anonymity of the man is crucial for the rest of the narrative, and this anonymity should be preserved.⁶⁴ Any attempt to identify the wounded man as a Jew is tendentious.

The man was traveling alone from Jerusalem to Jericho. The distance between the two cities is neither long nor time-consuming. It is approximately seventeen miles from Jerusalem to Jericho, and the distance could be covered in several hours. The time needed to reach Jericho depends on the condition of the traveler. A seasoned traveler could reach Jericho in a few hours, whereas a novice needed extra time. In either case the distance between the two cities could be covered in one day.

⁶¹ David Flusser, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 123-25.

⁶² Chaim Rabin, “Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century,” in Shemuel Safrai and Menahem Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 2:1007-39.

⁶³ Josephus, *Ant.* 18:11-15.

⁶⁴ In the course of the narrative Jesus identifies the other characters as the priest (10:31), the Levite (10:32), and a Samaritan (10:33). If he does not identify the man, there must be a reason for this.

The man was traveling alone on a road that was notorious for its danger. The road from Jerusalem to Jericho is dangerous for two reasons. First, the terrain descends rapidly. Jerusalem is located about 2500 feet above sea level, whereas Jericho is located in the Jordan valley about 800 feet below sea level. There is a significant difference in level that causes discomfort. The difference of level and the discomfort it causes are not the only dangers to which the traveler was exposed. The road from Jerusalem to Jericho leads through the Judean desert. In ancient times it was one of the most dangerous routes in Palestine. The rocky desert provided a hiding place for thieves, robbers, and all kinds of outlaws.⁶⁵ According to Strabo, the ancient Roman historiographer, this road was a notorious place for bands of robbers who lived there waiting for their victims.⁶⁶ The dangers of the road were known to Josephus who notes that travelers carried weapons to protect themselves.⁶⁷ Because of all the blood that had been shed there by robbers, the road from Jerusalem to Jericho was sometimes called the “way of blood.”⁶⁸

The narrative opens full of possibilities. A man is traveling from Jerusalem to Jericho. His journey may have a pleasant end inasmuch Jericho was considered to be one of the best oasis in the Judean desert renown for its riches and splendor.⁶⁹ The goal of the journey is to

⁶⁵ R. Beauvery, “La route romaine de Jerusalem à Jericho,” *RB* (1957) 72-101; E. F. F. Bishop, “Down from Jerusalem to Jericho,” *EvQ* 35 (1963) 97-102; S. J. Kistemaker, *The Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980) 168.

⁶⁶ Strabo (*Geography*, 16.2.4.) mentions the road from Jerusalem to Jericho recalling how Pompey smashed the brigands lurking there.

⁶⁷ Josephus (*War* 2:125) mentions that the Essenes “carry nothing with them when they travel into remote parts, though still they take their weapons with them, for fear of thieves.”

⁶⁸ John Wilkinson, “The Way from Jerusalem to Jericho,” *BA* 38 (1975) 10-12.

⁶⁹ In biblical tradition Jericho is called “city of palm trees” (Deut 34:3; Judg 1:16; 3:13; 2 Chr 28:15). In the first century Jericho became famous due to the extensive renovations made by Herod the Great. He built a winter palace, a hippodrome-theatre to entertain his guests, and aqueducts to irrigate the area. See Jerome

reach one of the best places of the Judean desert, but the journey of the anonymous man comes to a sudden end. What began as a tranquil and pleasant journey turns out to be a life-threatening situation. The anonymous traveler falls into the hands of robbers who “stripped and beat him and went off leaving him half-dead.”⁷⁰ Here the narrator provides three important pieces of information that create tension and intensify the drama of the story: beating, stripping of clothing, and leaving the man half-dead. The beating may suggest that the man tried to resist assault or tried to defend himself.⁷¹ However, self-defense or lack thereof does not have any bearing on the narrative. The beating intensifies what the next two pieces of information convey. The beating explains why the man was in dire need for help and why he was lying half-dead. What does have a bearing on the flow of the story is the stripping of, and leaving, the man half-dead. The relative pronoun followed by the conjunction and participle (οἱ καὶ ἐκδύσαντες) emphasizes that there was something unusual in stripping the man’s of his clothing.⁷² The stripping of clothes serves two goals. First, it

Murphy-O'Connor, *The Holy Land an Oxford Archaeological Guide from Earliest Times to 1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 289-91.

⁷⁰ The man falls into the hands of λησταις. Since Josephus uses the same noun for Zealots there have been attempts to identify the robbers with Zealots. See Daniel Constantin, “Les Esséniens et l’arrière-fond historique de la parabole du Bon Samaritain,” *NovT* 11 (1969) 71-104. Apart from the same noun there is nothing that would justify such an identification. In Luke 10:30 the man falls into the hands of robbers. According to Sharon H. Ringe (*Luke* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995] 158), “in first century Palestine they would probably not have been simply muggers or highwayman, but rather some of the roving terrorists staging their own form of protest against various types of official and unofficial exploitations of the poor. They would assault well-to-do travelers in the countryside, relieving them of their wealth and often leaving them with a persuasive reminder not to collaborate with the exploiters.”

⁷¹ K. H. Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955) 140. According to Bailey (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes*, 291), “robbers in the Middle East are known to beat their victims only if they resist.” Constantin (“Les Esséniens et l’arrière-fond historique de la parabole du Bon Samaritain,” 71-104) suggests that the man who fell into the brigands’ hands was an Essene. He was attacked by a Zealot and tried to defend himself using a weapon he was carrying.

⁷² Contrary to Nolland (*Luke*, 2:593) who notes that “the οἱ καὶ (lit. ‘who also’) may be rendered ‘who went so far as to,’ but need have no special force at all.”

secures the man's anonymity. The audience may have tried to identify the man as a Jew who was coming home from Jerusalem. If clothing and speech could have betrayed one's ethnic and social status, then, the man was devoid of all signs that would reveal his identity.⁷³ The audience imagines the man lying beside the road devoid of his clothing unable to identify him or tell what village, region, or city he comes from. Likewise the audience is unable to tell whether he was rich or poor, or whether he was Jewish, Greek, or Roman. In other words, the audience knows nothing about the man except his urgent need for help.

The narrator tells the audience that the robbers stripped, beat, and went off leaving the man half-dead, but there is no mention that they actually robbed the man.⁷⁴ Of course there is the possibility that the expression, "they stripped the man," suggests that the man is devoid of everything he was carrying.⁷⁵ However, it is also possible that the narrator purposely omits any reference to robbery. Saying that the man was robbed of all he was carrying entails specifying what the robbers took from the man. The mention of booty can help identify the man, or at least his social status. Once again, the narrator carefully omits any information that would help identify the man. In this way he secures the man's anonymity.

⁷³ According to Bailey (*Through Peasant Eyes*, 42), "the traveler is able to identify strangers in two ways. He can talk to the unknown man on the road and identify him from speech, or, even before that, he can identify him by his manner of dress."

⁷⁴ According to James Breech (*The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983] 166), "even if the listener makes the assumption that the robbers' stripping the man includes taking his money and goods, he must nevertheless notice that the description pictures not robbing, specifically, but stripping." In a response to Breech, Charles W. Hedrick (*Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994] 104) notes, "falling among the robbers could scarcely mean anything other than being robbed. The stripping and beating are vicious acts above and beyond the robbing, and hence mentioned apart from the robbery."

⁷⁵ Luke 10:30 is the only place where Luke makes use of the verb ἐκδύω. The literary meaning of the verb in the sense of stripping Jesus of his clothes is found in Matt 27:28.31 and Mark 15:20. The meaning of the verb in the sense of undressing oneself, losing the garment of the body, is found in 2 Cor 5:3-4. In all instances it refers to the stripping off of garments. See Horst Weigelt, "δύω," *NIDNTT* 1:315-16.

The robbers left the man half-dead. Since the adjective ἡμιθανῆ can be translated as “almost dead” or “about to die,” the audience understands that the fate of the man depends on whether help will come or not, and whether help will come soon enough to save the man. The suspense is growing, and the audience waits to see whether the man’s life will be saved or not.

At this point in the narrative one cannot help but wonder why Luke inserted the parable of the Good Samaritan at this point of the journey section and not somewhere else. At the beginning of the journey section in 9:51, Luke presented Jesus on his way to Jerusalem. The inhabitants of the Samaritan village who did not want Jesus to pass through their village did not change this plan; Jesus continued to journey to Jerusalem. If Luke insists so much on presenting Jesus as going to Jerusalem, one can ask why he places towards the beginning of Jesus’ journey a parable with a journey *from* Jerusalem rather than *to* Jerusalem. Given the travel notices that point to Jesus’ journey *to* Jerusalem (9:51; 13:22; 17:11; 18:31), one wonders what is the function of a parable of an unnamed man who goes *from* Jerusalem and not *to* Jerusalem. It would seem that the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector who went up into the temple to pray (presumably the temple of Jerusalem) would be more appropriate for the beginning of the journey to Jerusalem. The narrator does not answer this question. However, the narrative itself justifies the current position of the parable. Luke 10:30 opens with ἄνθρωπός τις. This introduction appears only in Luke, and for the most part in the journey section.⁷⁶ Luke 10:30 is the first instance where this form is used in the

⁷⁶ In Luke there are two more cases where the form ἄνθρωπός τις occurs (14:12; 20:9). Both cases are not without textual difficulties. Some manuscripts (D f¹) omit ἄνθρωπός τις in 14:12. If the pronoun is part of the original text, it may be to balance γυνή in 13:11. ἄνθρωπός [τις] in 20:9 appears in the context of the parable of the tenants. Since neither Matthew nor Mark have the pronoun τις, it may have been added in Luke to resemble the other parables of the journey section.

Gospel. The form will return in several other parables.⁷⁷ It has been noted that such introductions resemble fables and their way of introducing a character in a story.⁷⁸ It has also been noted that the introduction ἄνθρωπός τις is a mark of Lukan style.⁷⁹ If ἄνθρωπός τις is in fact a Lukan stylistic technique perhaps Luke writes in such a way as to highlight the universal dimension of salvation.

2.2.2.2. The Priest (10:31)

Having introduced an anonymous traveler and presented him as somebody in need of urgent assistance, the narrator introduces a series of characters who will serve as potential helpers. At this point the audience does not know how many characters will enter the scene. All the characters enter the narrative gradually, one by one. However, given that many parables and popular stories have more than one character the audience assumes that there will be more than one character.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ In 12:16 there was a rich man (ἀνθρώπου τινός) whose land produced a bountiful harvest. In 14:16 there was a man (ἄνθρωπός τις) who gave a great dinner. In 15:11 there was a man (ἄνθρωπός τις) who had two sons. In 16:1 there was a rich man (ἄνθρωπός τις) who had a steward. In 16:19 there was a rich man (ἄνθρωπός τις). In 18:9 two men went up to the temple (ἄνθρωποι δύο). Finally in 19:12 there was a certain nobleman (ἄνθρωπός τις) who went off to a distant country. Some characters of these parables can be identified, for example, Lazarus, the Pharisee and the tax collector. Nevertheless all of these parables begin in the same way, ἄνθρωπός τις.

⁷⁸ Wolter (*Das Lukasevangelium*, 395) notes that many fables of Aesop begin in this way.

⁷⁹ Jeremias (*Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*, 191) argues that *antrōpos tis* comes from one of the Lukan sources, whereas *anēr tis* comes from Luke. According to Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:886), “*antrōpos/anēr* with indef. *tis* is exclusive to Luke among the evangelists; both should be reckoned as part of his own style.”

⁸⁰ Robert L. Brawley (*Centering on God: Method and Message in Luke-Acts* [Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990] 219) notes that it is a common narrative device to introduce a series of three characters. The last character in the narrative is either the strongest form of the pattern established by the first two, or acts in a different way than the previous two.

Unlike the first character who was introduced as an anonymous “certain man,” the narrator identifies the second character of the story as a priest. The audience is aware that priests officiated in the temple of Jerusalem. The priests were held in high esteem. They held a position of prestige in the Jewish community and were considered leaders of the people. Given the position of the priests in Second Temple Judaism and their duties towards the people, the audience expects that the priest will help the half-dead man. The audience expects that the priest, who was set to preside in the temple according to the ordinances of the law, will obey the law and put into action the commandment to love one’s neighbor.⁸¹ The audience also expects that the priest will assist the man because his survival depends on immediate assistance.

The narrator tells the audience that the priest traveled the same road “κατὰ συγκυρίαν.” The expression “by chance” seems to be a minor and insignificant detail, but it plays an important role in the narrative. The emphatic position of “by chance” suggests that closer attention should be paid to it.⁸² “By chance” serves several purposes. First, it stresses the remoteness of the place. The narrator does not tell the audience exactly where the man fell into the hands of the robbers. He could have fallen into their hands either in a place where many travelers were passing by or in a remote and isolated place. The expression “by chance” suggests the latter. The place where the man fell victim was a lonely place, and it

⁸¹ Commenting on the status of priests and Levites in Second Temple Judaism, Scott (*Hear Then the Parable*, 195) notes, “as part of the religious and cultural codes of first-century Palestine, these characters conjure up specific values for the audience.”

⁸² Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:887. Evans (*Saint Luke*, 470) notes that half of the twenty-four courses of the priests used to live in Jericho. Such a number would rather reduce the force of “by chance.” Plummer (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 287) and William Oscar Emil Osterley (*The Gospel Parables in the Light of Their Jewish Background* [London: SPCK, 1936] 161-62) read “by chance” as a sign of divine providence.

was only by chance, or by mere coincidence, that the priest happened to travel the same road. In other words, it was only by chance that the priest spotted the man. Second, the expression “by chance” emphasizes the exalted status of the passerby as a priest.⁸³ The man who fell into the hands of the robbers could feel fortunate because the priest happened to travel the same road at the proper time. Third, the expression “by chance” serves to build up expectation. The audience understands that the place was remote. It also understands that if the priest does not help the man in need nobody else may happen to travel the same road. If the priest does not take care of the man nobody else may come on the scene soon enough to save him. The half-dead man may soon die.

The narrator tells the audience that the priest was traveling the same road. He does not specify how the priest was traveling. The audience does not know whether the priest was walking or riding. Since the distance between Jerusalem and Jericho is not very long, the audience can assume that the priest was walking. However, given his social status it is possible that the priest was riding. If the priest was riding he could have taken the wounded man to the nearest inn.⁸⁴

The narrator does not disclose what the final destination of the priest’s journey was. It could be Jerusalem or Jericho. Although the narrator does not explicitly say what direction the priest was traveling, the verb καταβαίνω suggests that the priest was descending from Jerusalem to Jericho. The direction the priest was traveling is important information because it has implications for the narrative. At the time of Jesus, Jericho was a popular residence for

⁸³ Marshal, *The Gospel of Luke*, 448.

⁸⁴ Bailey (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes*, 292) notes, “as a person of means, the priest would not be hiking seventeen miles down the hill when he could easily afford to ride.”

priests. The audience assumes, then, that the priest was returning to his residence after his course of service in the temple of Jerusalem.⁸⁵

The priest was descending from Jerusalem when he saw the half-dead man in need of help. The audience has been told that the man was still alive. He was half-dead but still alive. No information is given as to whether the priest was aware of the actual state of the man. All the narrator tells the audience is that the priest saw the man. Since the priest saw *him* (αὐτόν) and not a corpse (ἡ πτώσις) or a body (τὸ σῶμα), the audience assumes that the priest was aware that the man was still alive.⁸⁶ Contrary to what the audience expects, the priest did not stop to help the man in need. He chose to pass by, or pass by on the opposite side. No explanation is given why the priest chose not to help. The only information the audience hears is that “when he saw him he passed by on the other side.”

Whereas the narrative does not clearly state why the priest chose not to assist the man, the audience fills in the gap and imagines the reasons why the priest chose not to help.⁸⁷

There are several possible explanations. First, the priest did not assist the man because he

⁸⁵ M. Stern, “Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and Other Classes,” in Shemuel Safrai and Menahem Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 2:584. According to Jeremias (*Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 147), at the time of Jesus there were about 7200 priests who periodically served in the temple of Jerusalem. They were divided into classes. See also Josephus, *Ant.* 7:365; Str-B 2:66.

⁸⁶ Technically speaking the pronoun αὐτόν could also stand for the masculine noun, ὁ νεκρός. This possibility, however, is highly improbable. Since αὐτόν refers to what has been previously mentioned, its antecedent is ἄνθρωπός τις.

⁸⁷ Scott (*Hear Then the Parable*, 195) notes, “the parable does not speculate about their motives—a huge gap that tempts a hearer.” I believe that the speculation on the part of the hearer is an intrinsic part of the narrative. If that speculation was unnecessary, if the audience did not have to fill the gap, or if the audience did not have to form an opinion, the characters could have been introduced as unknown. Since they are introduced as priest and Levite, the audience recalls the offices and the duties of the two characters toward God and the people. Nolland (*Luke*, 2:593) is correct when says, “the story’s focus is on the priest’s failure to help rather than on the reasons that he failed to help.” Nevertheless, the reasons why the priest failed help to build up the suspense and drama of the narrative.

was afraid of the robbers. The priest traveled alone and he was fearful of becoming the next victim of the robbers. The audience was told that the robbers departed and left their victim lying there, but no one could guarantee that they would not come back and assault him again.⁸⁸ The road from Jerusalem to Jericho was notorious as a hideout for robbers, therefore, the priest may have been fearful of falling into the hands of the robbers. He may have even feared that the man lying on the road was pretending to be dead, or that the man was part of the band of robbers. Another possible explanation why the priest chose not to help the man in need is that the priest was in a hurry or tired. Although the journey from Jerusalem to Jericho is not time-consuming it can be tiresome. It is possible that the priest did not stop because he was tired or aware that he would not be able to assist the man in need.

All of the above reasons could apply to any traveler. Since Jesus introduces the first potential helper as a priest, his failure to assist the man in need requires a different explanation.

In the past it has been suggested that the priest chose to pass by and not help the man in need for the fear of ritual defilement.⁸⁹ If the priest became defiled because he touched a corpse he would be unclean for seven days and would be required to undergo purification (Num 19:11-22). There was only one case when the prescription did not apply. The priest could touch the corpse of a close relative or family member (Lev 21:1-4; 22:4-7; Ezek 44:25-27). Neither the high priest (Lev 21:11) nor a nazirite (Num 6:6-12) were exempt from

⁸⁸ Marshal, *The Gospel of Luke*, 448.

⁸⁹ Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 43-46; Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 232; Boucher, *The Parables*, 120; W. Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke* (New Testament Commentaries; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978) 594; Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus*, 97; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 203; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 448-49; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 195-97.

this prescription. They could not touch any corpse. However, according to the Mishnah, both the high priest and the nazirite were allowed to attend to a neglected corpse. The burial of a neglected corpse had priority over the study of even Torah.⁹⁰

In light of the above, the explanation on the basis of ritual purity does not take into account the data of the narrative. The narrator told his audience that the priest was *descending*, therefore, he was traveling from Jerusalem, not to Jerusalem. If he was descending from Jerusalem he had finished his duties in the temple. Therefore there was no danger that burying a neglected corpse would prohibit him from performing his priestly duties. He may have to go back to Jerusalem for purification, but the turn of his service was finished. Nothing prevented him from burying a neglected corpse. According to the narrative the priest did not even stop to check whether the man was dead or alive. The narrative suggests that the priest may have been aware that the man was still alive, but there is no explicit information that he actually checked the vitals. If the man was alive there was no threat or danger of defilement or ritual impurity caused by contact with a corpse.

Another possibility why the priest did not stop to care for the man was fear of legal responsibilities. If the priest had helped the man he could become responsible for any or all expenses of the treatment. Since the man in need had been stripped of all he had, a travel bag and clothing included, the priest was unable to identify the half-dead man. The priest did not know whether the man was a Jew, a Samaritan, a Greek, or a Roman. In the eyes of the priest

⁹⁰ Some commentators assume that the priest in the parable belongs to the Sadducees who kept only the Torah and did not accept the tradition codified later in the Mishnah. J. Mann, "Jesus and the Sadducean Priests: Luke 10:25-27," *JQR* 6 (1914) 417-19; Duncan J. M. Derrett, "Law in the New Testament: Fresh Light on the Parable of the Good Samaritan," *NTS* 11 (1964) 22-37; idem., *Law in the New Testament* (London: Longman & Todd, 1970) 212-14; E. Feldman, *Biblical and Post-Biblical Defilement and Mourning: Law as Theology* (New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1977) 60-62.

the man lying on the road was nobody. Therefore, it is possible that the priest did not stop to assist the man or take responsibility for him because he did not know whether the man was Jewish or not. He did not want to take responsibility for a stranger, or for somebody who might belong to a different nation, a different culture, or even a different social class. Fearing to cross the boundaries that separated them, the priest chose not to take the risk. He saw the man, but he “passed by on the opposite side.” Although he saw the man in need he chose to become blind to his plight and not to see the other human being in need.⁹¹ To describe the action of the priest the narrator employs a rare compound verb (ἀντιπαρῆλθεν).⁹² The meaning of this verb becomes clearer in light of the previous scene. The audience has been told that after the robbers stripped and beat the man they went off (ἀπῆλθον) leaving him half-dead. The priest not only went off leaving the man, he also passed on the opposite side as if he was trying to avoid any contact with the man.⁹³

Apart from 10:31 the journey section has only one more instance where a priest is mentioned. In 17:14 Jesus sends the ten lepers to go to the priests, show themselves and be declared free of leprosy. Sending the lepers to the priests in accordance with the prescription

⁹¹ F. J. Leenhardt, “La parabole du Samaritain (schéma d’une exégèse existentialiste),” in F. S. M. Goguel (ed.), *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne* (Paris: Neuchâtel, 1950) 133.

⁹² There are only two occurrences of this form in the NT (Luke 10:30,31) and one in the OT (Wis 16:10).

⁹³ Bovon (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:90) notes that the exact sense of the verb is not entirely clear inasmuch as ἀντί implies passing over, whereas παρὰ suggests walking before or against. According to Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:887), “the implication of his passing by is to avoid contamination by contact with or proximity to a dead body.”

of the law shows that Jesus obeys the law and its prescriptions. He sends the lepers to the priests because they are the guardians of the law and tradition.⁹⁴

2.2.2.3. The Levite (10:32)

The audience is aware that the appearance of the priest, one of the leaders of the people, did not change the precarious state of the man in need. The priest saw the man, but he passed on the other side without assisting him or even stopping to check his vitals. Having presented how the priest failed to assist the man, the narrator continues the story and introduces the next character. The next potential helper who enters the scene is a Levite.⁹⁵ Hearing that the Levite enters the scene, the audience recalls that Levites were members of the tribe of Levi. The Levites along with the priests were in charge of the sacrifices in the temple of Jerusalem. They were temple functionaries although lesser in rank and responsibility than priests.⁹⁶ Before the Levite enters the scene and takes any action the narrator already anticipates the course of the narrative. From the very beginning the audience is informed that the Levite will leave the man without helping him.

The narrator introduces the Levite saying, “likewise the Levite.” The adverb “ὁμοίως” suggests that the Levite was also descending from Jerusalem to Jericho. It was

⁹⁴ Talbert (*Reading Luke*, 130) notes, “when, therefore, Jesus’ hearers were told the priest and Levite avoided any contact with the man who was half-dead (v. 30), they would know these religious figures did exactly as they were instructed to do by the Scripture.”

⁹⁵ Levites and their functions are mentioned several times in the Bible. They were helpers of the priests in various functions. See Numbers 3–4; 1 Chronicles 23. According to Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:887), “their status varied in the course of the OT times, especially as priestly clans became more numerous.”

⁹⁶ Jeremias (*Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 147) notes that at the time of Jesus there were about 9600 Levites engaged in the temple service. Some of them lived in Jericho and occasionally traveled to Jerusalem to perform their service. According to Henry Leopold Ellison (“Λευίτης,” *NIDNTT* 2:467), in the time of Jesus the role of the Levites was diminished. Moreover the lower ranks of temple servants gradually obtained the right to call themselves Levites.

likewise, by chance or by mere coincidence, that he happened to travel the same road. The Levite was likewise descending from Jerusalem, and he likewise came across the place where the half-dead man was lying. The adverb “likewise” emphasizes the second fortuitous discovery of the half-dead man. At the same time this adverb prepares the audience to hear that the Levite will also pass by without assisting the man. Just as the priest passed by, so the Levite will pass by without helping.

The narrator presents the actions of the Levite in the same way that he described the actions of the priest. In both cases the same pattern and verbs are used. Just as the priest “saw the man and passed by on the opposite side,” so the Levite “when he saw him, he passed by on the opposite side.” The same grammatical construction and the same verbal forms emphasize that the Levite did exactly the same as the priest did. The Levite saw the man in need, but he did nothing to help him. Since the narrator does not provide any explanation why the Levite chose not to help the man, the audience once more fills in the gap. The Levite may have chosen not to help for all the same reasons the priest chose not to stop and assist the man in need. Additionally, the Levite may have felt exonerated from helping the man if he saw that the priest had chosen not to do anything.⁹⁷

Since the Levite was of a lesser rank than the priest, it may seem that the intensity of the drama is less. However, there are some factors that intensify the culpability of the Levite and increase the drama.⁹⁸ The Levites were required to observe ritual purity, but only when

⁹⁷ Bailey (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes*, 293) notes, “this particular Levite probably knew that a priest was ahead of him on the road and may have been an assistant to the same priest. Since the priest set a precedent, the Levite could pass by with an easy conscience.”

⁹⁸ Contrary to Nolland (*Luke*, 2:594) who notes, “the doubling heightens the effect, but the hearer is less surprised the second time round. This slight lessening in the intensity of the drama is reflected by the

they were performing their duties in the temple. Since the Levite in the narrative was *likewise* descending from Jerusalem, presumably coming home after his temple service, nothing prohibited him from taking care of the half-dead man in need. The Levites were engaged in the temple of Jerusalem, and their role was to assist and help the priests. When the audience hears that the Levite was traveling the same road and saw the man in need, it assumes that the one whose primary task was to help the priests and teach the people the law will assist the man in need. Contrary to the expectation of the audience, the Levite did not stop to help the man.

The priest and the Levite acted in the same way. Both came, saw, and passed by on the opposite side of the road. Apparently there is no change in the way the priest and the Levite acted except for a small detail, easily overlooked. The narrator informs the audience that the Levite came to the place where the half-dead man was lying. If the priest only saw the man, it seems that the Levite takes a step forward and comes closer to see the man.⁹⁹ Although the Levite does something different than the priest, he acts in essentially the same way. He does not assist the man. The half-dead man still awaits rescue as the expectation of the audience grows.

2.2.2.4. The Samaritan (10:33)

Hearing that the priest and the Levite passed by on the other side and did not stop to assist the wounded man, the audience expects the arrival of a third character who will either

sequence “priest” then “Levite,” since the Levites were second-ranking figures to the priests in Jewish religious life, from whom one might expect a little bit less.”

⁹⁹ In Chapter Two I argued that the reading *γενόμενος κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐλθών*, although problematic, is the preferred reading. Such a reading suggests that the Levite not only came to the place where the man was lying, he also came closer.

intensify the pattern set by the previous two characters or contrast that pattern and act in a completely different fashion.¹⁰⁰

After the priest and the Levite, representatives of the cult, pass by on the opposite side of the road, the audience expects the third character to be a layman who will either follow the example set by the officials and pass by causing the man's death or break the pattern and rescue the man.¹⁰¹ Given that the two previous characters were Jewish, the audience may anticipate the third character will also be Jewish. Contrary to the audience's expectation the narrator introduces the third character as a Samaritan.¹⁰² The Samaritan was traveling the same road.¹⁰³ He came to the place where the half-dead man was lying. The appearance of the Samaritan is totally unexpected.¹⁰⁴ The emphatic position of Σαμαρίτης guarantees the shock of the audience.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ Brawley, *Centering on God*, 219.

¹⁰¹ Some commentaries note that the audience would expect the third character be a Jewish layman. Thus the story would have an anti-clerical twist. See Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 47; D. Gewalt, "Der Barmherzige Samariter: Zu Lukas 10,25-37," *EvT* 38 (1978) 415-17; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 204; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to Saint Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 189.

¹⁰² According to Gerhardsson (*The Good Samaritan, the Good Shepherd*, 9-22), there is a wordplay between *rēa* ' (neighbor) and *ro'eh* (shepherd). If this is the case, the parable would be comprehensible only to a Jewish audience that knew Hebrew and was able to make the connection between the two nouns.

¹⁰³ It is not certain whether the Samaritan was going to Jerusalem or to Jericho. The narrator does not specify the final destination of his journey. In the case of the priest, the verb κατέβαινεν suggests that he was descending from Jerusalem. The audience assumes the Levite travels in the same direction inasmuch as he "likewise" comes to the place. In the case of the Samaritan the narrator employs the verb ὁδεύω, which can be translated as "to travel," or "to journey." D. Patte ("An Analysis of Narrative Structure of the Good Samaritan," *Semeia* 2 [1974] 1-26; idem., *Structural Exegesis for New Testament Critics* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990] 109) suggests that the use of a different verb (ὁδεύω instead of καταβαίνω) implies that the Samaritan was traveling nowhere. Since the Samaritan's journey did not have a specific goal, he could interrupt his journey and take care of the half-dead man. The usage of a different verb may suggest that the Samaritan was traveling in the opposite direction or that he was simply on a journey, possibly a journey much longer than the decent from Jerusalem to Jericho.

¹⁰⁴ A. J. Mattill ("The Good Samaritan and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," *Enc* 33 [1972] 367) argues that Luke replaced a Jewish layman with a Samaritan. The presence of the Samaritan is necessary for the unexpected twist of the story. See Breech, *The Silence of Jesus*, 163-65; M. S. Enslin, "The Samaritan Ministry and

Hearing that a Samaritan enters the scene the audience does not anticipate that he will save the man. In the eyes of the audience the half-dead man is already dead. The gospel tradition (John 4:9) as well as my study of the historical background point out that in the time of Jesus, Jews had no dealings with Samaritans. The Jews considered the Samaritans to be spiritually defiled. The misunderstandings between them and their mutual hatred occasionally escalated into serious incidents on both sides.¹⁰⁶ Given the centuries of animosity between Jews and Samaritans, the audience cannot comprehend how the Samaritan would assist the man in need since, in the eyes of the audience, the half-dead man is a Jew. The audience reasons in this way, if the priest and the Levite who were experts in the law of Moses passed by, then a Samaritan schismatic and sworn enemy of Israel will certainly not help the man in need. The audience imagines that the Samaritan will pass by on the other side just as the previous two have done. The audience might even expect the Samaritan to kill the man rather than assist him.¹⁰⁷

The narrator tells the audience that the Samaritan “came upon the man.” Unlike the priest and the Levite who saw and passed by on the other side of the road (ἀντιπαρῆλθεν), the Samaritan came upon the man (ἦλθεν κατ’ αὐτόν). The narrator does not stop to tell the

Mission,” *HUCA* 51 (1980) 34-36; Claude Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1909) 2:467; Scott, *Here Then The Parable*, 198.

¹⁰⁵ Evans, *Saint Luke*, 470; Forbes, *The God of Old*, 64; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 449.

¹⁰⁶ Josephus (*Ant.* 18:29-30; 20:118-36) provides a few examples of how the Samaritans treated the Jews, and how the Jews treated the Samaritans. See N. Heutger, “Die lukanischen Samaritanerzählung in religionspädagogischer Sicht,” in W. Haubeck and M. Backmann (eds.), *Wort der Zeit* (Leiden: Brill, 1980) 276-80.

¹⁰⁷ PHEME PERKINS (*Hearing the Parables of Jesus* [New York: Paulist, 1981] 119) notes, “the best they might hope for is that the Samaritan will not see him—but the priest and the Levite did so. It looks as though the man’s life is in dire jeopardy. Perhaps, the Samaritan will look to see if he is alive, and if so, kill him. Perhaps, he will just pass by like the others, and the man will die after all, an unfortunate victim of the travelers who happened to be on the road that day.”

audience whether the Samaritan gave any thought to the man's religion or political background. Neither does the narrator tell the audience whether the Samaritan pondered what to do next. All the audience knows is that the sight of the half-dead man profoundly moved the Samaritan.¹⁰⁸ The Samaritan is moved because he sees a man who needs help. He sees the need for his wounds to be bound. He sees the need to cloth him. He sees the need for the man to rest and recover. He sees a man unable to walk.

The Samaritan who approaches the man, sees his needs, and is moved with a compassion interrupts the previous chain of events. So far the audience has heard that the priest and the Levite came, saw, and passed by the opposite side. They were unable to see what the Samaritan saw: a man in need. They were unable to cross the boundaries of ethnicity, religion, and fear. Whatever boundaries separated the priest, the Levite and the half-dead man in need, these boundaries were unsurpassable for them. Now the audience hears that the Samaritan, unlike the priest and the Levite, is willing to cross those boundaries since he sees a man in need. The sight of that man moves the Samaritan. The Greek word ἐσπλαγχνίσθη is, therefore, a turning point in the story. It breaks the pattern of seeing and passing by on the other side established by the first two potential helpers.¹⁰⁹ The Samaritan was moved at the sight of the man. He responded to the half-dead man's need with

¹⁰⁸ Since the noun σπλάγχνα refers to inward parts, entrails, and by extension to the seat of emotion, the heart, the verb σπλαγχνίζομαι can be translated as have pity, show mercy, and feel sympathy. The verb σπλαγχνίζομαι occurs twelve times in the NT; five in Matthew (9:36; 14:14; 15:32; 18:27; 20:34), four in Mark (1:41; 6:34; 8:2; 9:22) and three in Luke (7:13; 10:33; 15:20). In the majority of cases the verb describes the attitude of Jesus at the sight of the people. In three parables (Matt 18:27; Luke 10:33; 15:20) the verb expresses a strong feeling of merciful or loving reaction that is the turning point of the story.

¹⁰⁹ According to Hans Helmut Esser ("σπλάγχνα", *NIDNTT* 2:599-601), σπλαγχνίζομαι in Luke 10:33 "expresses the attitude of complete willingness to use all means, time, strength, and life, for saving at the crucial moment." Thus, σπλαγχνίζομαι is a turning point of the parable. According to Menken ("Position of σπλαγχνίζεσθαι and σπάγχνα in the Gospel of Luke," 111), ἐσπλαγχνίσθη in Luke 10:33 is preceded by 68 words and followed by 67, thus, making it the center of the unit.

compassion, not with a sense of duty.¹¹⁰ Since the Samaritans also accepted the Pentateuch, they were also bound by the Torah and the prescriptions regarding contact with a dead body. Despite the prescriptions prohibiting contact with the dead body, the Samaritan approached the anonymous half-dead man. The Samaritan could have passed by on the other side of the road just as the priest and the Levite had done. Instead, he risked becoming a target of the same robbers who had attacked the man. The Samaritan chose to act differently. He did not act differently because he could identify the man (there is no information suggesting that the Samaritan identified the man) but because he saw a man in need.¹¹¹

2.2.2.5. Dressing the Man's Wounds (10:34a)

Having broken the pattern of seeing and passing by on the opposite side, the narrator slows the pace of the narrative and describes the action of the Samaritan in detail. Unlike the priest and the Levite who passed by on the other side of the road (ἀντιπαρῆλθεν), the Samaritan comes closer and approaches (προσελθών) the half-dead man. The narrator does not tell the audience what the first reaction of the Samaritan was. Neither does he say whether the Samaritan was pondering what to do next or whether he also considered passing by on the other side as the others did.¹¹² Since the Samaritan approaches the man with compassion, the audience assumes that he will break the impasse and help the man in need.

¹¹⁰ Forbes, *The God of Old*, 65.

¹¹¹ Jean Cantinat, "Les Parables de la Miséricorde," *TD* 4 (1956) 120-23; Francis H. Agnew, "The Parables of Divine Compassion," *TBT* 27 (1989) 37.

¹¹² Bailey (*Through Peasant Eyes*, 49-50) notes that if the Samaritan was going uphill he might have previously met the priest and the Levite. If the Samaritan was going downhill he was following the priest and the Levite. In either case the Samaritan noticed that they did not assist the man in need. The Samaritan could have felt excused from helping the man. If two law-abiding Jews chose not to help, nothing compelled the Samaritan to get involved. The Samaritan could have passed by on the other side of the road.

The audience assumes that the Samaritan will decide to act and save the life of the wounded man.¹¹³

The narrator informs the audience that the first thing the Samaritan did for the half-dead man was to administer assistance.¹¹⁴ He bound up the man's wounds and poured oil and wine on them to lessen the pain and disinfect the wounds.¹¹⁵ The narrator does not tell the audience whether the fear of ritual defilement was of any concern to the Samaritan. The detailed description of the actions performed by the Samaritan suggests that he did not perform them in haste or in fear of being attacked or robbed. On the contrary, he takes his time and uses all means at his disposal to succor the man in need and ease his pain. All of these actions make the Samaritan vulnerable. He exposes himself and all he carries to a potential attack from the robbers. However, the detailed description of actions suggests that the Samaritan was neither concerned about spiritual defilement nor potential danger. All he cared for at the moment was the man in need, and so he fully accepted the risk he incurred.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ Spencer ("2 Chronicles 28:5-15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan," 317-49) notes that the aid the Samaritan gives parallels the story of the Samaritans who take their Judean captives back to their land at Jericho in 2 Chr. 28:8-15. Bailey (*Through Peasant Eyes*, 49-50) lists no less than twelve links between the Samaritan story and Hos 6:6.

¹¹⁴ Lagrange (*Évangile selon Saint Luc*, 313), Bailey (*Through Peasant Eyes*, 49-50) and Bovon (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:91) note that the order of action is, at least, surprising. The logic would suggest that the Samaritan first pour wine and then bind the wounds. Such considerations may be out of place. First, the parable of the Good Samaritan is neither a Gray's *Anatomy of the Human Body* manual nor any kind of first aid guide. The order of the actions performed by the Samaritan is not the most important factor. What is important is that the Samaritan uses all he has at his disposal to assist the man and alleviate his pain. Second, the participle present ἐπιχέων, which follows the aorist κατέδησεν, suggests contemporaneous action. The Samaritan binds the wounds while pouring wine and oil. See Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:91.

¹¹⁵ The use of oil and wine for medical purpose is well attested in the Bible and extra biblical sources. See Isa 1:6; *m. Šab.* 19.2; Theophrastus, *Hist. Plant.* 9.11.1; Str-B, 1:428. Lagrange (*Évangile selon Saint Luc*, 313) quotes a text from Hippocrates that prescribes that one immerses certain leaves first in vine and oil and then apply these leaves on a wound.

¹¹⁶ Ruben Zimmermann, "Un amore toccante," in idem., *Compendio delle parabole di Gesù* (Brescia: Queriniana, 2011) 850.

The narrator does not say whether there was any dialog between the Samaritan and the wounded man.¹¹⁷ Neither does he provide any explanations of the Samaritan's actions other than compassion. All the narrator wants the audience to know are the actions of the Samaritan.¹¹⁸ The narrator pays close attention to the actions of the Samaritan because they went beyond what was required to secure the welfare of the wounded man. The length of the description offers the audience time to reflect on the attitude of all three characters and form an initial judgment. The Samaritan finally saves the man in need.

Although the order of the actions (first pouring wine and oil or first bounding the wounds) is not of concern, the audience grasps the irony of the situation. Wine and oil were commonly used in the temple service and the priest and the Levite had officiated in the temple. Wine and oil were the two most common items any traveler would take on a journey. The priest and the Levite would have had some wine and oil with them.¹¹⁹ The audience understands, therefore, that the priest and the Levite had all the means necessary to assist the man in need. Although both had what was necessary to take care of the man in need, they chose to pass by rather than involve themselves. Instead, a foreigner who was traveling through a foreign land stops and makes use of the two most common and accessible medicinals. The audience notes that of the three potential helpers only the Samaritan steps

¹¹⁷ Robert W. Funk (*Parables and Presence* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982] 33) insists on the man's inability to resist being helped by a Samaritan. The narrator does not give any clue whether the man resists or not. Nolland (*Luke*, 2:595) is correct when he says "the audience of the parable is, while perhaps embarrassed, finally glad of the Samaritan's rescue of the needy man."

¹¹⁸ Commentators note that verses 34-35, which describe the actions of the Samaritan, contain many *hapax*, or constructions typically Lucan. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:887-88; Nolland, *Luke*, 2:595; Rossé, *Il Vangelo di Luca*, 409.

¹¹⁹ Derrett, "Law in the New Testament," 22; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 132; Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus*, 99.

forward, approaches the half-dead man, and helps him. Of the three characters only the one, who in the eyes of Jews, is least expected to obey the law and practice the love of God and neighbor actually obeys the law.¹²⁰

2.2.2.6 Taking the Man into the Inn (10:34b)

The Samaritan assisted the man and bound his wounds. Since the life of the half-dead man is saved, the audience assumes that the story ends here. Contrary to what the audience expects, however, the narrator continues the story and informs the audience that the concern and compassion of the Samaritan for the wounded man did not end on the road. The narrator informs the audience that after having assisted and aided the man, the Samaritan wanted to secure the future of the wounded man and his complete recovery. The Samaritan lifted the man, put him on his own beast, and took him to an inn.¹²¹ The narrator does not tell the audience where the inn was located. However, since the narrator does not mention Jericho, the audience assumes that the inn is somewhere on the road between Jerusalem and Jericho. In either case the inn is located in Jewish territory. The audience understands that by taking the wounded man to an inn in Judean territory the Samaritan risks his life. In light of the animosity between Jews and Samaritans, the audience may wonder if the Jewish innkeeper will refuse to welcome the Samaritan.

Taking the man into the inn is not the final goal of the Samaritan. The narrator informs the audience that the Samaritan takes the wounded man into the inn in order to take

¹²⁰ Bauckham, "The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan," 487-88; Forbes, *The God of Old*, 65.

¹²¹ According to the Greek text, the Samaritan "leads him into the inn." Nolland (*Luke*, 2:595) notes that "the Greek could also support an image of the two men sharing the mount, but this is a less likely use of ἄγειν." See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of *Agein* and *Pherein* in the Synoptic Gospels," in E. H. Barth and R. E. Cocroft (eds.), *Festschrift to Honor F. Wilbur Gingrich* (Leiden: Brill, 1972) 147-60.

care of him. The welfare of the wounded man is secured, but the same cannot be said about the security of the Samaritan. The audience realizes that the Samaritan takes the wounded man into an inn in a Judean territory. The Jewish innkeeper as well as all other travelers at the inn may accuse the Samaritan of having attacked, beaten, and stripped the anonymous man.¹²² The audience, aware of the socio-cultural situation between Samaritans and Jews, shifts its primary concern. The audience no longer fears whether the man will live or not. The audience fears for the life of the Samaritan who went above and beyond what was necessary to save an anonymous man. The expectation grows once again, and the audience waits for the end of the story.

2.2.2.7. Final Matters (10:35)

Taking the wounded man into the inn and thereby securing his protection and recovery does not end the narrative. The narrator tells the audience that the Samaritan stayed with the anonymous man overnight. The next morning the Samaritan leaves the wounded man in the inn. The narrator does not tell why the Samaritan leaves the inn. In light of the previous information, the audience assumes that the Samaritan was on a trip and had an important matter to attend to that could not be postponed. However, before the Samaritan leaves the inn, he does something unusual and beyond the expectations of the audience. He gives the innkeeper two denarii so that he can take care of the wounded man until he returns.

¹²² Bailey (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes*, 295) notes, “A Samaritan would not be safe in a Jewish town with a wounded Jew over the back of his riding animal. Community vengeance may be enacted against the Samaritan, even if he has saved the life of the Jew.”

Since a denarius was a man's daily wage, the audience assumes that two denarii would cover all the necessary costs.¹²³

If a Samaritan traveler assisting an anonymous wounded man on a road shocked and surprised the audience, his actions the next morning shock and surprise the audience even more. The Samaritan goes above and beyond what is necessary and pays generously for the recovery of an anonymous man. The narrator does not say if the innkeeper asked for the money, so the audience assumes that the Samaritan pays freely, of his own will, and without regret.¹²⁴

At this point the narrator moves from the level of the narrative to the level of reported speech. There is no apparent reason why the narrator would prefer reported speech to the narrative level. The change is uncalled for. The narrator could continue to narrate as he has done so far. Since he does not, he must do it for an important reason. The narrator now employs reported speech in order to inform the audience of the decision taken by the Samaritan. At the level of reported speech the Samaritan asks the innkeeper to take good care of the wounded man (ἐπιμελήθητι v. 35). The audience notes that the Samaritan asks the innkeeper to take the same care that he himself has already offered (ἐπεμελήθη v. 34). The

¹²³ Commentators note that two denarii was the cost of lodging at an inn for at least twenty four days; less if food and lodging were to be paid. A day's lodging, at that time, was worth approximately one-twelfth of a denarius. See Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 205; N. Heutger, "Münzen im Lukasevangelium," *BZ* (1983) 98; Douglas E. Oakman, "The Buying Power of Two Denarii: A Comment on Luke 10:35," *Forum* 3 (1987) 33-38. For the value of two denarii in first century Palestine, see Augustus Spijkerman, "Coins Mentioned in the New Testament," *SBFLA* 6 (1955/56) 279-98; Roland de Vaux, *Le istituzioni dell'Antico Testamento* (Torino: Marietti, 1964) 213-15; John W. Betlyon, "Coinage," *ABD* 1:1086; Kenneth W. Harl, *Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 B.C to A.D. 700* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996) 278-79; Cesare Colombo, *Trenta monete d'argento* (Milano: Docete, 2003) 56-63.

¹²⁴ Donahue (*The Gospel in Parable*, 133) notes that the Samaritan secures the wounded man's recovery and freedom. If the wounded man had not paid the bill, he would have been arrested for his debt. See also Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*, 218.

Samaritan also promises the innkeeper that he will pay any extra expenses the innkeeper may incur in caring for the wounded man. By doing this, the Samaritan enters into an open-ended contract with the innkeeper. At the very beginning of the story the narrator told the audience that the man was beaten, stripped, and left half-dead (v. 30). If he was left half-dead, his condition was rather critical and no one could predict the rate of recovery. No one could even predict if the wounded man would recover at all. Nonetheless, hoping for the best but fearing the worse, the audience assumes that recovery will be long and expensive. Apparently the Samaritan does not care what the future costs of taking care of the man will be. He pledges to cover the cost and repay the innkeeper everything he may need in addition. The Samaritan risks be taken advantage of. The innkeeper may not take care for the wounded man at all, or exaggerate the expenses he incurs.¹²⁵

The narrator does not inform the audience of any discussion between the Samaritan and the innkeeper. Neither does he say whether the innkeeper willingly accepted to take care of the wounded man, or if he was reluctant to do so. This silence suggests that the innkeeper trusted the Samaritan, knew him well, or had met him previously. The Samaritan may have been a frequent traveler and may have occasionally lodged at the inn.¹²⁶ There are many possibilities, and the audience may feel a need to fill the gap. However, the narrative does not mention whether the innkeeper knew the Samaritan traveler or not. Neither does it mention

¹²⁵ Douglas E. Oakman ("Was Jesus a Peasant? Implications for Reading the Samaritan Story [Luke 10:30-35]," *BTB* 22 [1992] 122-23) notes that lodging in an inn was a risky matter. The Samaritan had to take into consideration the risk of being robbed and taken advantage of. See also Douglas E. Oakman, "The Countryside in Luke-Acts," in Jerome H. Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991) 151-79.

¹²⁶ Nolland (*Luke*, 2:597) notes "we are probably to understand that the Samaritan's business brought him regularly past this point and that he was known to the innkeeper."

whether he traveled that road frequently. Had he traveled that road frequently he may have said that he was going to repay all the expenses on *one* of the next visits, or *on another occasion*. The narrative only mentions that the Samaritan promises to return and repay all extra expenses when he comes back. Thus the audience understands that the Samaritan takes full responsibility for the wounded man's recovery. He takes responsibility for him not only in the present situation but also in the future for as long as he needs his assistance.¹²⁷

Why the narrator chooses to report the words spoken by the Samaritan to the innkeeper remains a question. It is possible that the change from the narrative level to the level of reported speech emphasizes the words spoken by the Samaritan. If this is the case, the audience understands that the attitude of the Samaritan who promises to come back stands in strong contrast to the attitude of the priest and Levite who did not even stop but chose to pass on the other side of the road.

The appearance of the Samaritan traveler who saw, approached the man in need, and did everything to assist him comes as a surprise to all listeners of the story.¹²⁸ The Jewish audience is shocked to hear that the Samaritan (a member of a despised community that frequently showed their animosity towards Jews) chose to act with mercy toward an anonymous man. The way the story is told and the setting of the story guarantee that the non-Jewish component of the audience will be shocked as much as the Jewish component.

¹²⁷ Contrary to Bovon (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 2:82) who notes that the Samaritan's promise to come back and repay all extra expenses is a way of limiting the dependence of the wounded man on the Samaritan.

¹²⁸ Glanville Downey ("Who is my Neighbor? The Greek and Roman Answer," *ATHR* 47 [1965] 3-15) notes that the parable would not have been entirely understood in the Greco-Roman world. First, a non-Jewish audience would not be aware of the animosities between the Jews and Samaritans. Second, in the Greco-Roman world various philanthropic rules were at stake.

Although non-Jews may not be aware of the centuries-old animosity between Jews and Samaritans, the beginning of the journey section provides a backdrop that illuminates the drama of the story. In 9:53 Luke states that when Jesus sets on his journey, the inhabitants of a Samaritan village did not welcome him because he was traveling to Jerusalem.

The Samaritan traveler reached out and helped a man who was in need. He helped the man in need despite all prejudices that may have prevented him from assisting an anonymous man. The Samaritan, unlike the priest and the Levite, crossed the boundaries that separated the people. He was not concerned whether the half-dead man was a Jew, a Samaritan, a Greek or a Roman. The Samaritan was simply moved with compassion at the sight of the man. Only life seemed to matter to him.

Luke 10:33 is the second episode of the journey section where a Samaritan plays an important role. However, the parable of the Good Samaritan is not the last episode of the journey section where a Samaritan is the center of the attention. In the previous chapter I argued that the cleansing of ten lepers (17:11-19) provides a key to understanding one of the travel notices. Jesus cleanses ten lepers but only one, a Samaritan, returns to thank him. Hearing that a Samaritan traveler acts with mercy and compassion towards an anonymous half-dead man on the road to Jericho, the audience changes its initial attitude towards the Samaritans and is now ready to accept the Samaritan leper among those who are saved by faith (17:19).

2.2.3. Jesus' Counter-Question (10:36)

Having secured the well-being of the wounded man the narrator ends the story. The audience does not know whether the wounded man recovered or not. Neither does it know

whether the man's recovery was a long and time-consuming process or a swift and serene healing. The narrator does not say whether the Samaritan traveler returned to pay all of the extra costs he had promised to take care of. What the narrator does say, however, is that the Samaritan did everything he could to rescue the man and secure his well-being. Since the story is open-ended the audience wants to ask a series of questions and imagine various scenarios and endings to the story.¹²⁹ Despite the suspense and the audience's wish for the story to continue and to see the wounded man healed and recovered, the narrator ends the story with the Samaritan's promise to return and settle accounts.

Having ended the story of the wounded man who fell victim to the robbers, Jesus turns back to the scholar of the law and asks a counter-question, "Which of these three, in your opinion, was neighbor to the robbers' victim?" The audience realizes that when Jesus asks his counter-question he picks up the scholar's original question concerning the neighbor (v. 29). The noun "neighbor" in Jesus' counter-question (πλησίον v. 36) is a catch word that reminds the audience of "neighbor" in the scholar's question (πλησίον v. 29). However, the audience notes that there is a shift in concern.¹³⁰ The counter-question Jesus asks is not exactly the counter-question the audience expects. When the scholar of the law asked his first question, "Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" (v. 25), Jesus employed that question to challenge the scholar of the law to look for the answer in what he already knew,

¹²⁹ Simon J. Kistmaker ("Jesus as Story Teller: Literary Perspectives on the Parables," *MSJ* 16 [2005] 52) notes, "some of Jesus' parables seem to have a conclusion that is open-ended (...) but these omissions reveal the express purpose of the parables, namely, to confront the reader with hidden sins that must be uncovered to bring him or her to repentance."

¹³⁰ Bovon (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 83) notes that the change of meaning of the noun πλησίον cannot escape the attention of anyone. The concept of "neighbor," which could become the object of love, becomes the subject of love.

“What is written in the law? How do you read it?” (v. 26). Hearing the second question, “And who is my neighbor?” the audience expected Jesus to ask, “Who is your neighbor? What is written in the law?” Instead, Jesus chose a different tactic and told the story about a man who fell victim to the robbers. Once the story is ended and Jesus turns to the scholar, the audience expects Jesus to ask a counter-question that will resemble the original question of the scholar. Since the scholar of the law asks Jesus to set limits and define who is his neighbor and who is not, the audience expects Jesus to ask a question such as, “What in your opinion are the limits of being someone’s neighbor?”

Contrary to the expectation of the audience Jesus’ counter-question does not resemble the question of the scholar. Jesus does not ask who is your neighbor. Instead, he asks who of the three characters *acted* as a neighbor. Despite the shift of concern, the counter-question Jesus asks maintains a personal dimension. The scholar of the law asked, “Who is my (μου) neighbor,” whereas Jesus asks, “Which of these three, in your opinion (δοκεῖ σοι), was neighbor to the robbers’ victim?” Jesus asks the scholar to form his own judgment and answer which of the three proved to be neighbor. Jesus’ counter-question forestalls any kind of limits the scholar’s question implied or tried to impose.¹³¹ Moreover, the counter-question shifts the primary concern because it does not pertain to the object of love but to the subject of love. In other words, if love of neighbor is one of the conditions to inherit eternal life, the question one should ask is how one expresses that love rather than defines the limits of love,

¹³¹ Forbes, *The God of Old*, 66; Robert W. Funk, “The Old Testament in Parable: The Good Samaritan,” *Enc* 26 (1965) 221; Herman Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986) 89; Peter Rhea Jones, *Studying the Parables of Jesus* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 1999) 306-37; Nolland, *Luke*, 2:596.

or restricts the love of neighbor to one group.¹³² Furthermore, the counter-question, “Which of these three, in your opinion, was neighbor to the robbers’ victim?” invites the scholar to look at “neighbor” from the perspective of someone who needs help and removes any kind of prejudice.¹³³

In the past there has been much discussion why there is a discrepancy between the scholar’s question and Jesus’ counter-question and what that discrepancy means.¹³⁴ The content of Jesus’ counter-question sheds light on why Jesus did not answer the scholar’s question immediately but chose to tell the parable proper of the Good Samaritan instead. The first counter-question of Jesus, “What is written in the law? How do you read it?” encouraged the scholar to look for a prescription of the law as well as his personal interpretation of that law. In reply, the scholar quoted two commandments of Torah; the commandment to love God and the commandment to love one’s neighbor. The second counter-question of Jesus is different. Jesus does not ask how the law defines neighbor nor who, according to that law, should be considered one’s neighbor. What Jesus asks is, “Which of these three, in your

¹³² Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus*, 99.

¹³³ Nolland (*Luke*, 2:596) notes that the scholar “is invited by the story to look at the neighbor question from the point of view of the potential recipient of neighbor-love in a situation of extremity.” Jeremias (*The Parables of Jesus*, 205) notes that Jesus is inviting the scholar or put himself in the shoes of the victim. “Think of the sufferer, put yourself in his place, consider, who needs help from me.”

¹³⁴ There has been much scholarly debate on whether the parable answers the scholar’s original question or not and whether the difference between the scholar’s question and Jesus’ counter-question is due to Luke’s inattentiveness, lack of inner logic, or redaction of two different sources. See the discussion in M. S. Ensiln, “Luke and the Samaritans,” *HTR* 36 (1943) 287; J. Lambrecht, “The Message of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-37),” *LS* 5 (1974) 133; Mike Graves, “Luke 10:25-37: The Moral of the ‘Good Samaritan’ Story?” *RevExp* 94 (1997) 269-75; Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisse*, 2:596. According to Heinrich Kahlefeld (*Paraboles et leçons dans l’évangile* [Paris: Cerf, 1969] 90), the different use of the noun neighbor in vv. 27-29 and 36, is due to the use of different sources. Bovon (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 83) is probably right when he notes that if there is a tension between vv. 27-29 and 36 Luke maintains that tension on purpose. John M. Creed (*The Gospel according to Saint Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* [London: Macmillan, 1960] 151) notes that the scholar’s question is answered indirectly inasmuch as “your neighbor is anyone in need with whom you are thrown into contact.”

opinion, was neighbor to the robbers' victim?" The content of the counter-question suggests that Jesus is not interested in official prescriptions. He is interested in the scholar's own opinion. He does not ask the scholar what the law says about neighbor or what other scholars of the law teach about neighbor. He does not ask whom, according to the law, the scholar should consider as his neighbor. Jesus does not ask whom the scholar was taught to treat as a neighbor or whom he treated as such. In other words, Jesus does not ask the scholar to repeat a formula he learned as a child and recites every day. Moreover, Jesus does not want the scholar to define the limits of neighbor in an abstract or imaginary way. The scholar must form his own opinion based on a concrete case. The way Jesus forms his counter-question leaves no doubt. The scholar must keep in mind the story he just heard, "Which of these three, in your opinion, was neighbor to the robbers' victim?" The case the scholar must keep in mind in forming his opinion is the story of the wounded man who fell victim to the robbers on the road to Jericho. The answer to that counter-question is not simple for two reasons. First, my study of the historical background has shown that the commandment to love one's neighbor (Lev 19:18) concerned the members of one's own people. Second, the scholar of the law did not consider Samaritans to be member of his own people.

2.2.4. The Scholar's Reply (10:37a)

The omniscient narrator does not inform the audience what the scholar was thinking when he heard the question. The audience does not know whether the scholar was reluctant to give an answer, or whether he was trying to recast his original question to remind Jesus that his question was different, or change the subject and avoid the difficult counter-question

altogether. Since there is no information of any reluctance on the part of the scholar, one must assume that he accepted Jesus' challenge.

Answering Jesus' counter-question must have been a challenge for the scholar. It was a challenge because of the three potential helpers only the Samaritan, the one least expected to help, was moved with compassion and stopped to assist the man in need.¹³⁵ The ethnical, religious and cultural barriers did not allow the scholar of the law to admit that the Samaritan could be a positive character of the story. However, the way the story was told, leaves the scholar no choice. He must admit that the Samaritan played a crucial role. He must admit that the Samaritan proved to be a neighbor. The answer of the scholar is, "The one who treated him with mercy." The scholar does not explicitly identify the rescuer and does not say that it was the Samaritan who proved to be a neighbor. In light of the previous information such an answer raises questions because the narrator clearly identified all the potential helpers. The narrator did not identify the robbers or the man who fell victim, but he clearly identified the first potential helper as a priest (v. 31), the second as a Levite (v. 32), and the third as a Samaritan (v. 33). Moreover, in the course of the narrative the narrator showed that it was only the Samaritan who approached the victim and helped him. The detailed description of the actions performed by the Samaritan stood in clear contrast to the passiveness of the priest and the Levite who came, saw, and passed by on the other side of the road. Only the Samaritan stopped to help the man. Only the Samaritan took him to the inn and promised to pay all the costs needed for the recovery of the wounded man. The detailed description of the

¹³⁵ Tannehill (*Luke*, 184) notes, "although the lawyer and other members of Jesus' Jewish audience might have expected to identify with the hero of this story, the appearance of the Samaritan makes this very difficult."

Samaritan's actions offered the audience the possibility to form an initial judgment: the Samaritan's actions were praiseworthy. In light of this information one must admit that the scholar of the law had all the necessary information to identify the one who proved to be a neighbor to the robbers' victim as the Samaritan.

Despite this information, the scholar gives a laconic answer. Given all the information at his disposal, the scholar could have answered that it was *the Samaritan* who proved to be neighbor. The scholar had all the necessary data to identify the one who proved to be neighbor as the Samaritan. Instead, he says, "the one who treated him with mercy." Such an answer seems to conceal the identity of the Samaritan. It seems that the scholar of the law is trying to avoid the name Samaritan, or that he does not want to admit that the member of a hated community could be the best character of the story.¹³⁶ It is possible that the scholar of the law avoided referring to the Samaritan explicitly because of ethnic barriers. These barriers separated Jews and Samaritans and did not allow the scholar of the law to admit that the Samaritan acted better than the priest and the Levite.¹³⁷ However, I suggest that such assumptions miss the point of the scholar's answer. The scholar's answer, "the one who treated him with mercy," is intentional and says more than the expected answer, "the Samaritan proved to be neighbor."¹³⁸

¹³⁶ Some commentators note that the scholar does not want to use the hateful name Samaritan. He tries to avoid it at all cost. See Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 205; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 450; Mullins, *The Gospel of Luke*, 311. Although there is no doubt that the scholar avoids the name Samaritan, I believe that he does so for different reasons than just a desire to avoid pronouncing a hateful name.

¹³⁷ Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus*, 99; Rossé, *Il Vangelo di Luca*, 410.

¹³⁸ Harrington (*A Key to the Parables*, 153) notes, "a frequent suggestion that he deliberately avoided pronouncing the hated name 'Samaritan' is doubtless unfair to him; in fact his answer does underline the message of the Savior—he who performed the work of mercy on him."

The audience was told that when the Samaritan came to the place where the victim was lying, he saw the man, and he was moved with compassion at his sight. Since the narrator did not tell the audience why the Samaritan chose to help the man, the audience assumed that the Samaritan's actions were guided by compassion. It was compassion that enkindled in the Samaritan a desire to help the wounded man. It was compassion that moved the Samaritan to do whatever was necessary to secure the welfare of the wounded man. Therefore, since compassion was the only factor that interrupted the chain of coming, seeing, and passing by the other side of the road, it is appropriate for the scholar of the law to identify compassion as the key concept of the story. Saying that the one who treated the half-dead man with mercy proved to be a neighbor, the scholar acknowledges that he understands the lesson Jesus has taught. One cannot define who neighbor is; one can only become a neighbor. Being a neighbor requires not only seeing those in need. It requires acting with mercy. When the scholar of the law says, "the one who treated him with mercy," he emphasizes that seeing somebody in need is not enough. One must act and become a neighbor.¹³⁹ To summarize, by not explicitly mentioning the Samaritan, the scholar admits that being a neighbor requires crossing the barriers that separate people from each other. If one wants to be a neighbor, one cannot look at others as members of different ethnic groups, nations, or cultures. One cannot be a neighbor unless one looks at others with compassion, sees their needs, and acts towards them with mercy. Therefore, the answer provided by the scholar does not intend to conceal the identity of the man. Rather, it proves that the scholar of

¹³⁹ Bovon (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 83) notes that the answer of the scholar unites the exterior with the interior inasmuch as it unites compassion (τὸ ἔλεος) with action (ὁ ποιήσας).

the law understands the need to cross the barriers that separate him as a Jew from the Samaritans.

The sight of a Samaritan who approaches and helps the wounded man must have shocked the scholar of the law and the audience. They had to rethink their prior judgments and conclude that the least expected character turns out to be the most positive figure of the story. In the course of the journey section there are several parables that portray a reversal of fortunes and warn the audience not to form premature judgments.¹⁴⁰ There are several parables in which a character who initially seems to be positive turns out to be negative, and vice versa. For example, when the audience hears that a rich man had land which produced a bountiful harvest, it assumes that the man can finally live in peace, prosperity, and enjoy the fortune he has accumulated. It assumes that nothing can take a man's wealth away. However, at the end of the parable the audience must conclude that the man was foolish. He rejoiced in his wealth but did not consider the possibility of losing everything he had earned (12:16-21). In another place the audience hears of a certain man who had two sons. The younger one asked his father to divide the property and give him his share, whereas the older son remained with the father. The audience imagines the younger son as cruel, heartless, and devoid of any emotion, whereas the older son who remained with his father did not ask for his share as an obedient and loving son.¹⁴¹ Toward the end of the story, however, the

¹⁴⁰ Two of these parables (the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus 16:19-31 and the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector 18:9-14) have already been discussed in the previous context, so I limit myself to the parables that have not been examined.

¹⁴¹ Kenneth E. Bailey, *Jacob and the Prodigal: A Study of the Parable of the Prodigal Son in the Light of the Saga of Jacob* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003) 45-47; John Nolland, "The Role of Money and Possessions in the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32)," in Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green and Anthony C. Thiselton (eds.), *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005) 187-89.

audience must reformulate its judgment. The younger son acknowledges his mistakes, repents, and returns to ask his father's forgiveness. The older son, whom the audience viewed as a positive figure of the story, becomes angry and is unable to accept the return of his brother (15:12-31).

2.2.5. Jesus' Answer (10:37b)

The scholar answered Jesus' counter-question. He came to understand that seeing someone with mercy is a key concept when it comes to defining the neighbor. Seeing someone with mercy requires taking action, therefore, and creates the bond of neighborliness the scholar was looking for. In this way, the scholar of the law understands that the concept of neighbor is not limited to friends, acquaintances, or those who belong to the same group, be it ethnic, national, or social. The neighbor includes those people who are deprived of essential needs, including food and clothing. In a word, the neighbor can be anyone in need. Setting the boundaries leads to death.

Although the scholar of the law does not explicitly identify the one who treated the victim with mercy, Jesus accepts the answer and orders the scholar to do likewise. Jesus says, "Go and do likewise." Since neither Jesus nor the omniscient narrator provide any further explanation of what "do likewise" means, the audience understands that Jesus orders the scholar of the law to follow the example of the one who in the scholar's opinion proved to be a neighbor. Literally it means to help all those in need. Figuratively it means to set aside any barriers that separate people and regard others without prejudice. All the future actions of the scholar must be based on the lesson he has just learnt.

Unlike in v. 29, when Jesus admits that the scholar of the law answered correctly, in v. 37 Jesus does not say that the scholar's answer was correct. There is no judgment only the order to do likewise. Such a judgment would probably be superfluous inasmuch as Jesus orders the scholar to do likewise, which already implies that the answer of the scholar was correct. The lack of judgment on the part of Jesus is not the only difference between verses 28 and 37b. In verse 28 Jesus says, "Do this and you will live," whereas in verse 37b the order to do likewise is preceded by a dismissal. Jesus says, "Go and do likewise." The dismissal of the scholar suggests that Jesus finally gives the scholar the answer he is looking for. Jesus answers the scholar's questions and, at the same time, emphasizes the need for the scholar's personal involvement. The emphatic position of the personal pronoun *you* (σὺ ποίει) is another element that distinguishes the answer in verse 28 from the answer in verse 37b.¹⁴² Whereas in the first case Jesus simply asked the scholar of the law to do what the law prescribed, in verse 37b he emphasizes that the scholar himself (σὺ) must put into action the lesson he has learnt. No one else can do it for him.

Jesus orders the scholar of the law to go and follow the example of the one who acted with mercy, but this invitation goes beyond a mere imitation of the Samaritan's actions. The imperative "do" (ποίη) in v. 37b echoes the scholar's question, "Teacher, what must I do (ποιήσας) to inherit eternal life" in v. 25, as well as Jesus' first invitation to do what the law prescribes, "do (ποίη) this and you will live" (v. 28). Since, the verb "to do" (ποιέω) frames the whole passage, Jesus' invitation to *do* cannot be seen as a mere invitation to follow the example of the Samaritan. It certainly does imply that the scholar of the law should follow

¹⁴² Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:888; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 205; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 450.

the example of the one who showed mercy. Following that example, however, is not a goal in itself. The scholar of the law is invited to follow that example in order to do what is required by the law—love one’s neighbor as oneself—and ultimately to inherit eternal life. Therefore, the final purpose of the parable of the Good Samaritan goes beyond following the example of the Samaritan.¹⁴³ Reading the parable proper of the Good Samaritan (10:29-37) within its literary setting (10:25-28) allows us to see that the Samaritan’s example not only concretizes love for one’s neighbor, it also concretizes how one must love one’s neighbor in order to inherit eternal life—set aside the boundaries that separate people. One cannot inherit eternal life unless one accepts others despite their differences.

Jesus orders the scholar of the law to go and do likewise; thereby instructing him what he must do to inherit eternal life. In the course of the journey section Jesus frequently addresses the crowds, the seventy-two, and the disciples in order to teach them.¹⁴⁴ For example, Jesus teaches the disciples how to pray (11:2-13) and what the effects of prayer are (18:1-14). He denounces the hypocrisy of the Pharisees as well as the hypocrisy of the scholars of the law (11:39-52). He criticizes the Pharisees who choose the first places (14:8-

¹⁴³ Jülicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 1:112-15) notes that all parables have a didactic purpose. Although all the parables have a didactic purpose, not all are the same. The parables can be divided into three groups: similitudes, parables, and example stories. According to Jülicher the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37), the parable of the Rich Fool (12:16-20), the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19-31), and the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:9-14) are the example stories inasmuch as they offer a clear and straightforward lesson. No further exposition is required, only application. The thesis of Adolf Jülicher began a long research for the classification of these four parables. There are studies which defend the classification offered by Jülicher and studies oppose to calling these parables example stories. See the discussion in Heinrich Zimmermann, *Jesus Christus: Geschichte und Verkündigung* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973) 108; Jacques Dupont, *Il metodo parabolico di Gesù* (Brescia: Paideia, 1978) 19-20; Ernst Baasland, “Zum Beispiel der Beispielerzählungen zur Formenlehre der Gleichnisse und zum Methodik der Gleichnisauslegung,” *NovT* 28 (1986) 193-219; W. Eckey, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004) 2:760. Tucker (*Example Stories*, 417) notes that scholars should feel free to interpret the four ‘example stories’ as parables, either as parables of Jesus or as parables of the Gospel of Luke.

¹⁴⁴ Matera, “Jesus’ Journey to Jerusalem,” 65-74.

14) as well as their inability to accept the sinners and outcasts (15:3-31). He also warns the crowd and the disciples to be watchful and expect the coming of the Son of Man (12:1–13:9) and the coming of the kingdom of God (17:22-35). Jesus' journey to Jerusalem is an occasion to call the crowd to repentance and teach people that in order to be saved they need to enter through the narrow door (13:23-30).¹⁴⁵ He teaches the cost of discipleship (14:26-35) and reminds his disciples for the third time of his imminent passion. Jesus tells the twelve that he will be delivered to the Gentiles (18:31-34). When Jesus teaches during his journey to Jerusalem, he continues to carry out the mission he initiated in the synagogue in Nazareth (4:16-30). He comes into contact with various persons, and he reveals the different points of view of those who follow him. Doing so, he prepares the audience for his death and resurrection as well as for his ἀνάληψις and the universal dimension of the salvation it will bring.

3. Conclusion

Luke 10:25-37 presents a dialogue between Jesus and a scholar of the law. The scholar of the law approaches Jesus to ask him, “Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?” The scholar of the law tests Jesus, but eventually he himself becomes the object of scrutiny. He must defend himself and ask Jesus for instruction. Thus, the question of the scholar, “What must I do to inherit eternal life,” becomes a springboard to ask a more delicate question, “And who is my neighbor.” In order to answer this second question, Jesus tells the parable of the Good Samaritan. My study has shown that the scholar's encounter

¹⁴⁵ Frank J. Matera (*New Testament Theology* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007] 51) notes, “In 9:51–19:44 Luke describes this fateful journey as a period when Jesus teaches his disciples, calls the crowds to repentance, and finds himself in conflict with Israel's religious leaders.”

with Jesus, and especially the story of the Good Samaritan, turns the world of the scholar upside down. From now on he must consider anyone in need a neighbor and do as the man in the story did.

The two questions of the scholar are separated and each receives its own answer. “Do this and you will live” (v. 28) answers the first question, whereas, “Go and do likewise” (v. 37b) answers the second question. My analysis has shown that these questions, although distinct, are related. They can only be understood in relation to each other. The verb “to do” frames the whole story, and the encounter between Jesus and the scholar of the law (v. 25) ends only when Jesus dismisses the scholar with an order to imitate the actions of the Samaritan (v. 37).

In this chapter I have analyzed how the characters are introduced, what they say, what they do, and what their intentions are. I have also paid attention to the expectations of the audience and considered what the narrator omits. Doing this has allowed me to emphasize suspense and surprise as two narrative devices the narrator employs to tell the story of the Good Samaritan. This technique has also helped me to appreciate what the narrator actually says and how he says it.

My analysis has shown that the narrative has two dynamic characters that undergo a substantial change; the Samaritan and the scholar of the law. The Samaritan is a dynamic character for two reasons. First, he sees the wounded man, he is moved with compassion, and he decides to do whatever he can to assist the man in need. Second, the Samaritan is a dynamic character because his actions cause surprise. The audience does not picture the Samaritan as someone able to do a good work. Contrary to the expectation of the audience

the Samaritan proves to be a character of hidden complexity and depths. The scholar of the law also proves to be a dynamic character. He approaches Jesus with a firm decision to test him and expose his teaching. He has certain ideas about eternal life and the meaning of neighbor. He knows that in order to inherit eternal life he must obey Torah, and he sets limits when it comes to who is his neighbor; only certain people are his neighbors. As the story develops, the scholar of the law has to admit that the Samaritan proved to be a neighbor to the man in need. A character who, according to the scholar, should not be and act as neighbor proved to be neighbor. The world of the scholar turns upside down, and he undergoes a substantial change. He acknowledges this change by admitting that the one who treated the victim with mercy proved to be a neighbor. The other major characters of the story, the priest and the Levite, are static characters. Both saw the wounded man, but did nothing to assist him. They did not even stop to consider options. Their actions surprise the audience but not in the way that the Samaritan's actions and the scholar's final answer do.

My analysis has shown that in several cases the course of the events has been contrary to the expectations of the audience. First, Jesus does not immediately answer the scholar's question about what he must do to inherit eternal life. Instead, he challenges the scholar to answer the question himself (v. 26). Second, Jesus tells the scholar to obey the law and practice what it prescribes. By this response, Jesus acknowledges the validity of Torah, and he thwarts the scholar's attempt to show that his teaching deviates from the law (v. 28). Third, when the scholar of the law asks Jesus to define "neighbor," the audience expects Jesus to challenge the scholar to define who the neighbor is according to Torah. Contrary to the expectation of the audience, Jesus does not immediately ask a counter-question. Instead, he tells the parable proper of the Good Samaritan (vv. 30-35). Fourth, the audience expects

the priest and the Levite to assist the man who fell victim to the robbers. The audience is surprised and shocked when it hears that both came, saw, and passed by on the other side of the road. Fifth, when the audience hears the Samaritan came and saw the wounded man, it expects that the Samaritan will not assist the wounded man. Contrary to what the audience expects, the Samaritan helps the man and does whatever is necessary to secure his recovery.

Paying attention to the expectations of the audience as well as to the omissions of the narrator has shown that the narrator deliberately omits information that would betray and disclose the identity of the man who fell victim to the robbers. Although the narrator identifies nearly all the main protagonists of the story, he does not disclose the identity of the wounded man. Thus, the identity of the only character who is present from the beginning of the narrative to the end remains unknown. It is true that the narrator identifies neither the robbers nor the innkeeper, but they are not the main characters of the story. The setting of the story in the Judean desert as well as the presentation of two of the main protagonists (the priest and the Levite) could suggest that the victim was a Jew. However, the narrator does not explicitly say that the wounded man was of Jewish descent. Furthermore, the narrator does not say that the robbers stole the property of the victim, a detail that could betray the social or economical status of the victim. Therefore, I suggest that this lack of identification is a deliberate device of the narrator to secure the anonymity of the victim and this anonymity is a crucial and indispensable part of the narrative.

My analysis has shown that the parable of the Good Samaritan challenges the audience in two ways. First, it challenges the audience to look at the teaching of Jesus as a teaching that fully conforms to Jewish tradition. Jesus bases his teaching on Torah and does

not expect anything beyond what has already been asked for in Torah: one should love God and one's neighbor. What Jesus asks for is that knowledge of Torah become a way of life. He asks that knowledge of Torah be put in practice in order to lead a person to eternal life. Second, Jesus challenges the audience to look at neighbor by setting aside all boundaries, prejudices, and biases that separate people. Since the scholar of the law is interested in life, Jesus teaches him that his quest for eternal life must be a quest that does not lead others to death. If the scholar of the law wants to inherit eternal life, he must consider the possibility that other people, nations, and social classes are in search of the same life.

The parable of the Good Samaritan becomes a key to interpreting and understanding the rest of Jesus' activity on the way to Jerusalem. His frequent encounters with sinners and the outcast shock and surprise the audience. But, from now on, the audience must look at Jesus' teaching in a new light. The parable of the Good Samaritan reminds the audience of the reversal of fortune the Kingdom of God is bringing and it warns the audience not to judge prematurely. The socio-cultural background of others should not become an obstacle to treat others as neighbors since salvation is universal in scope.

CHAPTER FIVE

GENERAL CONCLUSION

In this dissertation I have studied the parable of the Good Samaritan in order to determine its function and purpose within the Lukan journey section. In this last chapter I will summarize the results of the previous chapters and then draw a general conclusion from my research. This conclusion will explain the function and purpose of the parable of the Good Samaritan. In doing so, I will show how the journey section helps us to understand the parable and how the parable illuminates the journey section.

1. History of Research

My history of research showed that the parable of the Good Samaritan has been the subject of numerous monographs and articles. Different methods and approaches have been applied to interpret the parable. Initially the parable was subjected to an allegorical interpretation in which every element of the parable was given a symbolic meaning. The allegorical interpretation was not uniform and often led to opposing conclusions. The Reformers as well as some Fathers of the Church criticized the allegorical interpretation of the parable. Nonetheless, the allegorical interpretation of the parable continued until the end of the nineteenth century. The studies of Adolf Jülicher, however, initiated a new era of historical-critical and literary exploration of the parable that emphasized the historical and cultural aspects of the parable.

From this history of research, I drew the following conclusions. The allegorical interpretation explored the richness of the parable and its possibility for various interpretations, whereas historical-critical studies explored the origin of the parable. Historical-critical studies limited the parable of the Good Samaritan to 10:30-37 and often disregarded the initial dialogue between the scholar of the law and Jesus (10:25-28). Scholars who did consider the dialogue between Jesus and the scholar of the law studied this dialogue in relation to other Synoptic passages (Matt 22:35-40; Mark 12:28-31) but rarely in relation to the parable of the Good Samaritan. Thus, the literary context of the parable was not treated in great detail in the past. My dissertation has fulfilled a lacuna inasmuch as it takes into consideration the preliminary dialogue and it studies the larger context of the parable, which is the Lukan journey section. To do so I applied a narrative-critical method.

2. Text and Historical Background of the Parable of the Good Samaritan

My study of the text of the parable has shown that the text does not present serious textual problems. The two most noteworthy variants (found in vv. 30 and 36) tend to harmonize the reading and improve the syntax and grammar of the text. I argued that γενομενος κατα τον τοπον ελθων (v. 32), although a more difficult reading that appears redundant should be preferred. Apart from the external and internal evidence (manuscript witnesses and Lukan syntax), I have shown that the reading with two participles (γενομενος and ελθων), which describe the coming of the Levite, is an important element of the narrative. It serves to stress the culpability of the Levite who saw the man in need, came closer, but did nothing to assist him. The second noteworthy variant (τινα ουν δοκεις

πλησιον; v. 36) tends to remove the discrepancy between the original question of the scholar of the law and the counter-question of Jesus.

In my study I considered the parable of the Good Samaritan as a unit composed of two closely related parts (10:25-28 and 10:29-37). In the first part, the scholar of the law asks Jesus, “What must I do to inherit eternal life?” (10:25). In the second part the scholar, who now wants to justify himself, asks, “And who is my neighbor?” (10:29). For this reason I proposed a structure that presents the unit as a double controversy dialogue between Jesus and the scholar of the law. The double controversy dialogue unfolds in the following way: the scholar of the law asks a question, and Jesus asks a counter-question (10:25-28). Then the scholar of the law answers Jesus’ counter-question, and Jesus answers the scholar’s original question (10:29-37). The second counter-question of Jesus is preceded by the parable proper of the Good Samaritan.

Since the concepts of “neighbor” and “Samaritan” play an important role in the parable of the Good Samaritan, I studied these two concepts. My study led to the following conclusions. It seems that Jewish interpretation of the Torah did not consider love of neighbor, interpreted as love for the members of one’s own people, the same as love for aliens and foreigners who resided in the land of Israel. Thus, the commandment to love one’s neighbor as oneself was restricted to members of one’s own people. In the course of history, however, Israel was exposed to other nations, cultures, and peoples. Entering into contact with them may have initiated a more favorable consideration of foreigners who resided in the land of Israel. What remained constant throughout the centuries was a negative perception of

the Samaritans. The double commandment to love God and neighbor should be combined and read alongside the commandment not to mistreat the alien who resides in the land.

3. The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Lukan Journey Section

Since the literary setting of the parable has not been sufficiently explored, I began by establishing the limits of the journey section. I concluded that the journey section begins when Jesus makes a firm decision to go to Jerusalem (9:51) and ends when he enters the temple of Jerusalem (19:45-46). In my study of the journey section I argued that the goal of the journey is Jerusalem, and the purpose of the journey is Jesus' ἀνάλημψις. Although the exact meaning of ἀνάλημψις is disputed, my analysis has shown that it refers to Jesus' passion, death, resurrection, and ascension. Thus, Jesus fulfills the purpose of his journey when he parts from the disciples and is taken into heaven (24:51).

The Acts of the Apostles recounts Jesus' ascension into heaven a second time in the context of the mission of the disciples. The beginning of the mission of the disciples (ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν; Acts 2:1) echoes the beginning of Jesus' journey (ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας; Luke 9:51). Thus, the journey initiated by Jesus in Galilee, which led him through Samaria and Jerusalem, has its continuation and further development in a journey continued by the disciples. The journey of the disciples, however, proceeds in reverse order from Jesus' journey. The disciples first give their testimony in Jerusalem (Acts 1:13–8:3), then in Samaria (8:4–9:43), and finally the mission of Paul brings the good news to Rome, the center of the then known world (28:17-31).

The mission to witness to Jesus' resurrection in the whole world (Acts 1:8; 2:1) has its confirmation in the internal structure of the journey section. The analysis of the major

travel notices and their context has shown that they have at least two purposes. First, they remind the audience of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and prepare for its end. Second, they serve as a prelude to the universal mission of the disciples inasmuch as they highlight the universal goal of Jesus' mission and teaching.

My study distinguished between the geographical end of Jesus' journey (Jerusalem) and the purpose of that journey (Jesus' ἀνάλημψις). Jesus reaches the geographical end of his journey when he enters the temple of Jerusalem. However, since according to Luke, Jesus enters the temple of Jerusalem rather than Jerusalem itself, I suggested that his journey will have its fulfillment when he parts from the disciples, returns to his Father in heaven, and sends his disciples on a new journey.

I have also shown that the travel notices (9:51; 13:22; 17:11; 18:31) remind the audience of the final goal of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem as well as highlight the passages that remind the reader of the universal scope of salvation. Therefore, the placement of the travel notices within the journey section is not random but has a purpose.

4. A Narrative Analysis of the Parable of the Good Samaritan

In my analysis of the parable I paid attention to the way the characters are introduced, what they say, and what they do. I also noted what the expectations of the audience are and what the narrator omits from the story. The use of this technique allowed me to point out an important element of the narrative that has not been sufficiently explored. For example, the narrator purposely does not identify the man who fell victim to the robbers in order to maintain the man's anonymity. Thus, the Samaritan does not know whom he is helping. My

analysis showed that the parable of the Good Samaritan challenges the audience in two ways. First, the audience is challenged to look at Jesus' teaching in a different way. Jesus' teaching does not oppose what Torah teaches. Rather, it has its roots in Jewish tradition, and it does not expect anything beyond what Torah already requires. Jesus asks for a complete fulfillment of what is found in Torah. By observing Torah, a person can inherit eternal life. The audience is challenged, then, to look at the neighbor by setting aside all boundaries, prejudices, and biases that separate people. Since the scholar of the law seeks to inherit eternal life, Jesus teaches him that he must be open-minded inasmuch as other people, nations, and social classes are in search of life as well.

5. The Significance of the Journey Section for Interpreting the Parable

I suggest that the journey section illuminates the parable of the Good Samaritan in three ways: (a) it presents Jesus' activity as a mission destined for all regardless of their pedigree, national origin, or socio-economical status, (b) it further illumines Jesus' position on the law of Moses, (c) it helps to understand why the scholar of the law approaches Jesus to test him.

(a) The journey section presents the salvation Jesus brings as universal in scope. In the journey section Jesus continues to heal, restore sight to the blind, and casts out demons as a sign that the kingdom of God is making its appearance. He drives out a demon from a mute man (11:14-23), cures a crippled woman (13:10-17), and heals a man with dropsy (14:1-6). He also heals ten lepers (17:11-19) and a blind beggar sitting by the roadside at Jericho (18:35-43). Healing all those who are held in the bonds of Satan and sickness, Jesus continues to do what he did during the Galilean ministry. He carries out the mission he began

in the synagogue in Nazareth when he proclaimed “a year acceptable to the Lord” (4:19).

However, in the journey section he also cures a Samaritan leper, thereby expanding his ministry to non-Jews.¹

Journeying to Jerusalem, Jesus continues to teach people and call them to repentance. He reproaches Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, the three unrepentant towns of Galilee (10:13-16) that did not accept his message. He warns the crowds to repent lest they perish (13:1-5; 6-9), and he calls them to prepare for the coming of the Son of Man (17:22-37). The theme of welcoming and rejecting Jesus’ message occurs again toward the end of the journey section when he predicts the fall of Jerusalem because the city did not recognize the time of its visitation (19:41-44). This severe judgment upon the Galilean cities stands in contrast to a more lenient attitude towards the Samaritan village and the Gentile cities of Tyre and Sidon. Jesus neither reproaches the unwelcoming village of Samaria (9:55), nor does he allow the disciples to harm the habitants of the Samaritan village. Moreover, he even predicts that the Gentile towns of Tyre and Sidon, which did not have the opportunity to hear his message, will be judged less severely than the towns of Galilee that did not accept his message (10:14). Thus, from the beginning of the journey section, Jesus notes that his teaching will eventually reach non-Jewish territory.

In the journey section Jesus’ activity begins to reach non-Jews, but Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem is also a time when he meets with sinners who are drawn to him (15:1-2). The

¹ During the Galilean ministry Jesus heals mostly Jews. There are only two episodes that depict non-Jews as beneficiaries of Jesus’ healing power; the healing of the centurion’s slave (7:1-10) and the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (8:19-39). However, the healing of the centurion’s slave does not explicitly state that the centurion’s slave was a Gentile. He could have been a Jew at the service of a Roman soldier. Therefore, the healing of the Gerasene demoniac is the only healing in the Galilean ministry of a non-Jew. The healing occurs in a place where there is a herd of swine suggesting that the land is unclean, therefore, in Gentile territory. The demoniac is said to be a man from the town, namely, he is from a town in Gerasene territory.

sinner and tax collectors do whatever is possible to get a glimpse of Jesus (19:1-10).

Although the Lukan journey section only preserves a few episodes that explicitly tell about Jesus' encounters with tax collectors, sinners, and outcasts, these encounters must have been rather frequent, for the Pharisees and scribes complain that Jesus meets and eats with sinners (15:1-2).

Much of Jesus' teaching takes place during meals. It is noteworthy that he not only dines with his friends (10:38-42), he also dines with sinners (15:1-2), a chief tax collector in Jericho (19:1-10), and he is a frequent guest in the houses of Pharisees (11:37; 14:1). He never refuses anyone; rather, he accepts all who come to him and does not want anyone to be deprived of the better part (10:38-42). Even when the disciples try to stop the children from approaching him, he finds time to welcome them, and he presents them as an example of how to receive the kingdom of God (18:15-17). Jesus' encounter with Zacchaeus in Jericho is one of the best examples of how Jesus accepts those who seek him. Despite the grumbling and murmuring of the crowd ("He has gone to stay at the house of a sinner;" 19:7), Jesus enters the house of Zacchaeus who, because of his profession, was considered to be a sinner. It is during his meals with others that Jesus delivers some of his most important teachings on God's grace and forgiveness, as well as God's love towards sinners. None of the Synoptic Gospels records so many meal scenes as does Luke. These meals, however, are important for what they signify. In Luke, the motive of a banquet becomes an important theme inasmuch as Jesus predicts that people from the east and the west, as well as from the north and the south, will recline at table in the kingdom of God (13:29). The common meal becomes a sign of the salvation that an individual accepts (19:9). Thus, Luke continues to present the salvation

accomplished in Jerusalem as universal in scope. Salvation is not limited to Israel or to those who follow all the prescriptions of the law. The salvation that Jesus proclaims has a much wider scope and includes all who repent and accept his message. He comes to save all those who are far from God and unable to find their way back. Jesus calls all to repentance. He calls people to accept his message and to sit at table in the banquet of the kingdom of God. The end of the journey section shows that only some will accept the invitation and follow Jesus.

(b) The journey section illumines the parable of the Good Samaritan because it further explains Jesus' position on the law of Moses. Luke notes that in the course of the journey section Jews observe and challenge Jesus to test his allegiance to Torah (10:25; 11:38; 13:14; 14:1; 18:18). Despite frequent challenges, Jesus neither rejects Torah nor what it teaches. In a dialogue with a scholar of the law and a rich official Jesus shows that fulfilling the double love commandment (10:28) and fulfilling the Decalogue (18:20) lead to eternal life. Furthermore, Jesus calls all those who follow the law to put it into practice and not to misinterpret the law (17:18). Thus, he shows that his ministry does not nullify the law. He does not reject the law, but he does criticize a rigid and intransigent interpretation of Torah that makes people insensitive to the needs of others. Jesus shows that his ministry inaugurates a new era.

The journey section portrays Jesus as one who teaches and cures in the synagogue (13:10-17). He orders the ten cleansed lepers to go and show themselves to the priests (17:14), thereby showing that he recognizes the function of the priest. He also recognizes the function of the scholars and the leaders of the people as those charged to interpret the law

and teach the people. He recognizes their role, but he also denounces their shortcomings inasmuch they overburden people with practices that no one (themselves included) is ready to carry out (11:46). Finally, Jesus travels to Jerusalem and enters the temple area (19:46). All of this confirms that Jesus does not reject the institutions of the OT. He accepts them, but he also wants to restore their original purpose. The restoration of the original purpose reaches its climax when Jesus cleanses the temple of Jerusalem so that it may be “a house of prayer” (19:46).

(c) The journey section illumines the parable of the Good Samaritan because it helps to understand why the scholar of the law approaches Jesus to test him. The omniscient narrator does not specify why the scholar of the law steps forward to test Jesus. The narrator only says that he stands before Jesus to test him. It is the larger context of the journey section that provides an explanation for the motives of the scholar. He stands before Jesus to test him because he opposes Jesus’ teaching, he does not accept it, and he does not understand why Jesus eats with sinners and tax collectors. He tests Jesus in order to show that his teaching is contrary to the law.

Jesus’ activity meets various reactions from those who follow him. Sinners, tax collectors, and even a Samaritan leper welcome him and accept his message, whereas the leaders of the people reject his message. Thus, Jesus’ activity during the journey section (healing on the Sabbath, eating with sinners and tax collectors) causes a conflict. Toward the end of the journey section the conflict escalates into open hostility on the part of the chief priests, the scribes, and the leaders of the people who will conspire to put Jesus to death. The leaders of the people accept neither Jesus nor his teaching. They even criticize him and those

who follow him. Paradoxically, those who were supposed to teach the people the law and prepare them for the coming of the Messiah do not receive him when finally he comes. The leaders of the people and the scholars of the law criticize Jesus because sinners, tax collectors, and outcasts are the primary beneficiaries of his work. Not able to accept Jesus' activity, and failing to understand why he comes to call sinners, the religious leaders question Jesus' activity and do whatever they can to discredit him in the eyes of those who follow him. Despite this criticism, Jesus changes neither the goal of his mission nor the way he carries out his mission.

6. The Significance of the Parable for Interpreting the Journey Section

The parable of the Good Samaritan picks up the major themes of the journey section (a) Jesus comes to fulfill the law not to abolish it, (b) universal salvation destined to all regardless of their status, (c) the growing conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders of the people, and develops them further.

(a) The parable of the Good Samaritan picks up the theme of fulfilling the law and living according to it. The scholar of the law asks what he must do to inherit eternal life. He admits that, according to his understanding of Torah, one must love God and neighbor. The scholar quotes the two love commandments side-by-side as if they came from the same book. Although it is not certain who combined the two love commandments for the first time (Lev 19:18; Deut 6:5), it is possible that an early tradition did so. The two commandments may have been combined because both begin with an imperative, "you shall love," and both begin with the same verbal form (ואהבת). The double love commandment is, for the scholar, the

requirement without which one cannot inherit eternal life. Jesus agrees with the scholar, and therefore, he orders him to follow the law and practice it. In doing so, Jesus confirms that the double love commandment plays an important role in the life of those who follow him. At the same time, he completes the scholar's understanding of the law and turns his attention to the necessity of living according to the commandment, "Do this and you will live."

Knowledge of the law is not sufficient. One must put that knowledge into practice.

(b) The parable of the Good Samaritan not only confirms the validity of the law, it also shows what it means to obey the law. Apart from the necessity of putting into action what the double love commandment prescribes, Jesus completes the answer provided by the scholar with an important detail; eternal life cannot be inherited unless one loves God, one's fellow countryman, and all people. The presence of an anonymous man whose national, religious, and social status are unknown, makes the scholar realize that one cannot pass by and disregard the needs of anyone. If love for one's neighbor is eclectic, or, if love for one's neighbor is restricted to the members of one's own nation, it is not sufficient. The story of the man who fell victim to the robbers shows that a limited interpretation of the law may lead to misfortune and death. Thus, the parable proper of the Good Samaritan (10:30-37) serves, as a further development and correction of the answer provided by the scholar. According to the various rules of conduct (Lev 19:1-37), one should love the neighbor as one loves oneself (19:18), and one should love the foreigner who resides within his land (19:34). The scholar of the law was rather eclectic in his understanding and application of the law. He combined the commandment to love God (Deut 6:5) with the commandment to love his neighbor (Lev 19:18), but he did not consider the possibility that the commandment to love a foreigner

should also be taken into consideration. Despite the fact that all these commandments begin with the same imperative, “you shall love,” and the same verbal form (ואהבת), the scholar limited his understanding of love of God and neighbor. The scholar chose only the commandment that suited his concept of neighbor. Thus, according to the scholar of the law, there was a group of people whom he did not consider his neighbor.

By telling the parable of the Good Samaritan in which an unknown man needs assistance Jesus corrects the scholar and shows him what it means to obey and practice the law so that not even the smallest part of a letter of the law becomes invalid (17:17). It is the fulfillment of the law that Jesus requires of the rich official who approaches him to ask almost the same question the scholar of the law did, “Good teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?” (18:18). When the official admits that he had already done everything the law prescribed, Jesus invites him to follow him. The official declines the invitation, but this does not mean that Jesus required anything more from him to inherit eternal life. It was following Jesus as his disciple that required a complete renunciation of possessions and distribution of the proceeds to the poor. The renunciation of possessions was not the prerequisite to inheriting eternal life the rich official was looking for.

Fulfilling the double love commandment that does not exclude anyone from the circle of neighbor serves as an introduction of the salvation that is universal in scope. The presence of the Samaritan traveler, who becomes a leading character of the story and whose actions become an example to be followed by the scholar of the law, shocked and surprised the audience. However, the presence of the Samaritan, a member of a despised and hostile group, is no more shocking than the presence of the sinners and tax collectors who followed Jesus

on his way to Jerusalem and accepted his message. Luke does not provide any information indicating that the presence of a Samaritan leper in the group of lepers shocked or surprised anyone. Similarly, neither does he provide any information that the Jews took offense at Jesus for healing a Samaritan (17:11-19). But Luke does say that some of the religious leaders took offense when Jesus dined with sinners (15:1-2) and entered the house of Zacchaeus (19:7). Since the parable of the Good Samaritan makes use of a character who does not belong to the establishment of Second Temple Judaism, it invites the audience to reconsider the position of Samaritans, sinners, and Gentiles in the Kingdom of God. The parable invites the audience to reflect on how the conversion of sinners becomes an obstacle for them to accept Jesus' message, whereas the presence of the Samaritan does not disturb the leaders of the people at all. Hearing that a Samaritan traveler, a character who in the common opinion of Jews was viewed negatively, assisted the man in need, the audience was forced to look at Jesus' teaching in a new light. The audience must now look more favorably on those who follow Jesus' teaching despite their national and socio-economical status.

(c) Lastly, the Lukan journey section highlights a growing conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders of the people who do not want to accept Jesus' message. The first part of the parable of the Good Samaritan, the initial dialogue between Jesus and the scholar of the law who comes to test Jesus, is only one example of how the religious leaders tried to discredit Jesus in the eyes of those who followed him. Jesus' dialogue with the scholar of the law (10:25-37) shows that he neither looked for confrontation nor tried to excuse himself. He accepted the challenge, and he responded in order to correct certain misconceptions. Thus, Jesus tells the parable of the Good Samaritan to lead the scholar to accept his message and

recognize that his teaching is not contrary to the law. His teaching is fully conformed to what Torah teaches.

To summarize, the present study suggests that the purpose of the parable of the Good Samaritan is to remind the audience of the validity of the law as well as the necessity of putting it into action. The parable emphasizes what Jesus teaches throughout the journey section: obedience of the law should not be eclectic. One cannot choose the commandments one wants to follow and neglect the others. Furthermore, the parable completes the interpretation of Torah inasmuch it shows that one cannot restrict the love commandment. A limited interpretation is not what the law requires. An interpretation of Torah that sets boundaries, limits, and restrictions is not authentic. The presence of the Samaritan warns the audience not to judge prematurely. The socio-cultural background of others should not become an obstacle to treating others as neighbors since salvation is universal in scope. The parable functions as a key to interpret Jesus' activity on his way to Jerusalem. Everything Jesus does during the journey section serves as reminder that he came to save all. There is no restriction to his mission; he extends his mission to all and invites all to accept it.

7. Further Research

My study suggests that Jesus' ascension recorded at the end of the Gospel (24:50-53) and at the beginning of Acts (1:6-12) fulfills the scope of the journey section. Once Jesus' journey ends, the journey of the disciples begins. This conclusion hints that a study of Luke's Gospel is incomplete without a study of the Acts of the Apostles. In my study I argued that the journey section depicts the universal scope of the salvation. It is the Acts of the Apostles, however, that tells the reader how various people came to know the message about the

universal salvation accomplished by Jesus. The journey section frequently informs the audience of an ongoing conflict between Jesus and Jewish authorities. He is confronted by the leaders of the people and tested by them in order to discredit his teaching in the eyes of those who follow him. The Acts of the Apostles continues to present a conflict with the Jewish leaders. This time, however, the parties are the disciples and the Jewish leaders.

I argued that the parable of the Good Samaritan is a key episode that illuminates Jesus' ministry as he journeys to Jerusalem. The audience is challenged to put aside all prejudice and bias, and it is told not to judge people on the basis of their origin. The journey of the disciples in Acts contains a series of episodes that continue to portray the Samaritans in a good light. They accept the preaching of the apostles and contribute to spreading the good news (8:14; 9:31; 15:3). Despite the universalistic approach of the disciples, their mission stumbles. The disciples do not know what to do with Gentiles who want to accept the good news. The episodes of Peter and Cornelius in Caesarea (10:1–11:8) and the council of Jerusalem (15:1–29) are key episodes that bring the proclamation of the good news to the Gentiles.

In my research I employed a narrative approach. I chose this method because Lukan studies have frequently approached the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles as a unity. What was needed, however, was a study of how individual narratives are an integral part of the overall structure. The study of the individual narratives within the Gospel, especially within the Lukan journey section, shows that the arrangement of the material has its internal logic. Certain episodes, sentences and statements serve as a guide or key that help the reader to rediscover that logic.

I have studied the parable of the Good Samaritan and illustrated how the parable illumines the Lukan journey section. My research has also shown that the study of the parables should not neglect their literary contexts. The study of the parables in the journey section, however, does not end here. The journey section contains several other parables, many of them exclusively Lukan. I suggest that reading these parables in light of the journey section can further illumine the parables as well as the journey section. The method used in this dissertation, therefore, presents a template for further research into the parables of the journey section.

The parable of the Good Samaritan is one of the best-known parables of Jesus. The parable has been at the center of attention since the beginning of the proclamation of the good news. The early Fathers of the Church retold the parable applying allegory. They emphasized the drama of the wounded man and the fortuitous appearance of the Good Samaritan who spared neither time nor money to assist the man in need. The parable inspires poets and charitable organizations that dedicate their time and effort to assist those in need. Despite the continuous study of the parable in our day, it still remains fresh and can inspire people to listen to Jesus' message today. It is my hope that my study contributes to the centuries of research and inspires others to look at the parable of the Good Samaritan as a guiding passage for reading the Lukan journey section.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agnew, Francis H. "The Parables of Divine Compassion." *TBT* 27 (1989) 35-40.
- Aland Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Aletti, Jean-Noël. *L'art de raconter Jésus Christ*. Paris: Seuil, 1989.
- . *Il racconto come teologia*. Bologna: Dehoniane, 1996.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
- Anderson, Robert T. "Samaritans." *ABD* 5:940-48.
- Augustine. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Doctrina Christiana, De Vera Religione*. CChr.SL 32. Turnhout: Brepols, 1962.
- . *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Quaestiones Evangeliorum*. CCh.SL 30. Turnhout: Brepols, 1980.
- Aus, David R. *Weihnachtsgeschichte, Barmherziger Samariter, Verlorener Sohn: Studien zum ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund*. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1988.
- Baarlink, H. "Die zyklische Struktur von Lukas 9.43b–19.28." *NTS* 38 (1992) 481-506.
- Baasland, Ernst. "Zum Beispiel der Beispielerzählungen zur Formenlehre der Gleichnisse und zum Methodik der Gleichnisauslegung." *NovT* 28 (1986) 193-219.
- Bachmann, Michael. *Jerusalem und der Tempel*. BWANT 109. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980.
- Bailey, Kenneth E. *Poet & Peasant. A Literary Approach to the Parables in Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- . *Through Peasant Eyes. More Lukan Parables, Their Culture and Style*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

- . *Jacob and the Prodigal: A Study of the Parable of the Prodigal Son in the Light of the Saga of Jacob*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003.
- . *Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes: Cultural Studies in the Gospels*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2008.
- Barclay, William. *The Parables of Jesus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.
- Bauckham, Richard J. “The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and The Parallels.” *NTS* 37 (1991) 225-46.
- . “The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan: Jesus’ Parabolic Interpretation of the Law of Moses.” *NTS* 44 (1998) 475-89.
- Baum, A. D. *Lukas als Historiker der letzten Jesusreise*. Zurich: Brockhaus, 1993.
- Beaubeof, Stéphane. *La Monté à Jérusalem: Le dernier voyage de Jésus selon Luc (9,51–19,48)*. Lire la Bible 161. Paris: Cerf, 2010.
- Beauvery, R. “La route romaine de Jerusalem à Jericho.” *RB* (1957) 72-101.
- Betlyon, John W. “Coinage.” *ABD* 1:1086-89.
- Binder, Hans. “Das Gleichnis vom barmherziger Samariter.” *TLZ* 15 (1959) 176-94.
- Bishop, E. F. F. “Down from Jerusalem to Jericho.” *EvQ* 35 (1963) 97-102.
- Blomberg, Craig L. “Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke’s Central Section.” In *Gospel Perspectives III: Studies in Midrash and Historiography*. Ed. R. T. France and D. Wenham. 217-61. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- . *Interpreting the Parables*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990.
- . “Interpreting the Parables of Jesus: Where Are We and Where Do We Go from Here?” *CBQ* 53 (1991) 50-78.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. BECNT. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994-96.
- . “The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus and the Ethics of Jesus.” *SwJT* 40 (1997) 63-72.

- . *Studying the Historical Jesus: A Guide to Sources and Methods*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Bond, Helen K. “Political Authorities.” In *Jesus among Friends and Enemies*. Ed. Chris Keith and Larry W. Hurtado. 219-47. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Bösen, Willibald. *Der letzte Tag des Jesus von Nazaret. Was wirklich geschah*. Freiburg: Herder, 1999.
- Bottini, Giovanni Claudio. *Introduzione all’opera di Luca*. Analecta 35. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 1992.
- Bovon, François. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. EKKNT III. 4 vols. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989-2009.
- . *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950-2005)*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- . *The Last Days of Jesus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Boucher, Madeleine I. *The Parables*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1983.
- Breech, James. *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Centering on God: Method and Message in Luke-Acts. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990.
- Bromine, Georg. “ισχύς.” *NIDTT* 3:713.
- Brown, Collin. “ψυχή.” *NIDTT* 3:682-83.
- Búason, Kristján. “The Good Samaritan, Luke 10:25-37: One Text, Three Methods.” In *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*. Ed. Petri Luomanen. 1-35. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. New York: Harper, 1968.
- . “The Concept of Life in Judaism.” *TDNT* 2:855-61.

- Burchard, Christoph. "Das doppelte Liebesgebot in der fruhen christlichen Überlieferung." In *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde*. Ed. Eduard Lohse, Christoph Burchard and Berndt Schaller. 39-62. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Busch, K. A. "Das Evangelium im sogenannten Reisebericht des Lukas (9,51–18,14)." *Sächsisches Kirchen und Schulblatt* 85 (1935) 430-38.
- Busse, Ulrich. "A Study of Luke 10 in Context." *HTS* 61 (2005) 81-91.
- Cadman, William Healey. *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem: Its Purpose in the Light of the Synoptic Gospels*. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.
- Cadoux, Cecil J. "The Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem." *Expositor* 9 (1925) 175-92.
- Capon, Robert F. *Kingdom, Grace, Judgment: Paradox, Outrage, and Vindication in the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Carlston, Charles E. "Parable and Allegory Revisited. An Interpretive Review." *CBQ* 43 (1981) 228-42.
- Cantinat, Jean. "Les Parables de la Miséricorde." *TD* 4 (1956) 120-23.
- Chrupcala, Daniel L. *Il regno opera della Trinità nel vangelo di Luca*. Analecta 45. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 1998.
- . *The Kingdom of God*. Analecta 45. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 2007.
- Chrysostom, John. *Discourses against Judaizing Christians*. FC 68. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1979.
- . *Homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew*. NPNF 10. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Coggins, Richard J. *Samaritans and Jews*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1975.
- Colombo, Cesare. *Trenta monete d'argento*. Milano: Docete, 2003.
- Constantin, Daniel. "Les Esséniens et l'arrière-fond historique de la parabole du Bon Samaritain." *NovT* 11 (1969) 71-104.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Mitte der Zeit*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1954.

———. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Cook, E. J. "Synoptic Indications of the Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem." *ExpTim* 41 (1929-30) 121-23.

Creed, John M. *The Gospel according to Saint Luke: the Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: Macmillan, 1960.

Crispy, Georges. "The Parable of the Good Samaritan: An Essay in Structural Research." *Semeia* 2 (1980) 27-50.

Crossan, John Dominic. "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus." *NTS* 18 (1971-72) 285-307.

———. *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973. "

———. "Structuralist Analysis and the Parables of Jesus." *Semeia* 1 (1974) 192-221.

———. "The Good Samaritan: Towards a Generic Definition of Parable." *Semeia* 2 (1974) 82-112.

———. *Ciffs of Fall: Paradox and Polyvalence in the Parables of Jesus*. New York: Seabury, 1980.

———. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.

———. "Parable." *ABD* 5:148-49.

Crown, Alan David. *The Samaritans*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.

Davies, J. H. "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." In *Studia Evangelica III*. Ed F. L. Cross. TU 87. 164-69. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1963.

Davies, John. G. *He Ascended into Heaven*. New York: Association, 1958.

Dawsey, James M. "Jesus' Pilgrimage to Jerusalem." *PRSt* 14 (1978) 217-32.

De Meeûs, X. *La composition de Lc. 9,51-18,14*. Diss.doct.Théol. Leuven, 1954.

Denaux, Adelbert. "The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Luke." In *The Synoptic Gospels. Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Ed. Camille Focant. BETL 110. 359-92. Leuven: Peeters, 1993.

———. and Rita Corstjens, in collaboration with Hellen Mardaga, *The Vocabulary of Luke. An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel*. Biblical Tools and Studies 10. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Derrett, Duncan J. M. "Law in the New Testament: Fresh Light on the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *NTS* 11 (1964-65) 22-37.

———. *Law in the New Testament*. London: Longman & Todd, 1970.

———. "Love Thy Neighbor as a Man like Thyself?" *ExpTim* 83 (1971) 55-56.

De Vaux, Roland. *Le istituzioni dell'Antico Testamento*. Torino: Marietti, 1964.

Dodd, Charles H. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London: Nisbet, 1935.

Donahue, John R. "Tax Collector." *ABD* 6:337-38.

———. "Tax Collector and Sinners: An Attempt at Identification." *CBQ* 33 (1977) 39-61.

———. *The Gospel in Parable: Metaphor, Narrative, and Theology in the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

Donaldson, J. "The Title Rabbi in the Gospels. Some Reflections on the Evidence of the Synoptics." *JQR* 61 (1972-73) 287-91.

Downey, Glanville. "Who is my Neighbor? The Greek and Roman Answer." *ATHr* 47 (1965) 3-15.

Downing, Gerald. "The Ambiguity of 'The Pharisee and the Tax Collector' (Luke 18:9-14) in the Greco-Roman World of Late Antiquity." *CBQ* 54 (1992) 80-99.

Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1976.

- . *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*. New York: Crossroad, 1985.
- Dupont, Jacques. *Il metodo parabolico di Gesù*. Brescia: Paideia, 1978.
- Eckey, W. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004.
- Eckstein, Hans Joachim. “Pharisäer und Zöllner. Jesu Zuwendung zu den Sündern nach Lukas 18,9-14.” In *Der aus Glauben Gerechte wird leben. Beiträge zur Theologie des Neues Testaments*. Ed. Idem. Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel 5. 143-51. Münster: Lit, 2003.
- Egelkraut, Helmuth L. *Jesus’ Mission to Jerusalem: A Redaction Critical Study of the Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke, Lc 9,51–19,48*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1976.
- Eisenberg, Ronald L. *The 613 Mitzvot: A Contemporary Guide to the Commandments of Judaism*. Rockville: Schreiber, 2005.
- Ellis, Edward E. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Ellison, Henry Leopold. “Λευίτης.” *NIDNTT* 2:467-68.
- Eluvathingal, F. “Jesus’ Travel Narrative According to Luke.” *BiBh* 24 (1998) 103-13.
- Enslin, M. S. “Luke and the Samaritans.” *HTR* 36 (1943) 277-97.
- . “The Samaritan Ministry and Mission.” *HUCA* 51 (1980) 29-38.
- Ephraem. *Kommentar zum Diatessaron*. Fontes Christiani. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.
- Ernst, Josef. *Il vangelo secondo Luca*. Brescia: Morcelliana, 1985.
- Esler, Philip F. “Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of the Social Identity Theory.” *BibInt* 8 (2000) 325-57.
- Espinel, Jose L. “La vida-viaje de Jesús hacia Jerusalén (Lc 9,51–19,28).” *CB* 37 (1980) 93-111.
- Esser, Hans Helmut. “σπλάγχνα.” *NIDNTT* 2:599-600.

- Evans, Craig A. "He Set His Face: A note on Luke 9:51." *Bib* 63 (1982) 545-48.
- . "He Set His Face: Luke 9:51 Once Again." *Bib* 68 (1987) 80-84.
- . "Jesus and Rabbinic Parables, Proverbs and Prayers." In *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies*. Ed. Idem. 381-406. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Do This and You Will Live: Tragic Coherence in Luke 10:25-28." In *Jesus in Context*. Ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. 377-80. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Evans, Christopher F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." In *Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Ed. D. E. Nineham. 37-53. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955.
- . *Saint Luke*. TPINTC. Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990.
- Farrell, Robert K. "The Structure and Theology of Luke's Central Section." *TJ* 7 (1986) 33-54.
- Feldman, E. *Biblical and Post-Biblical Defilement and Mourning: Law as Theology*. New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1977.
- Filson, Floyd V. "The Journey Motif in Luke-Acts." In *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Ed. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. 68-77. Exeter: Paternoster, 1970.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Use of *Agein* and *Pherein* in the Synoptic Gospels." In *Festschrift to Honor F. Wilbur Gingrich*. Ed. E. H. Barth and R. E. Cocroft. 147-60. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- . *The Gospel according to Luke*. AB 28. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1981-85.
- Flusser, David. *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Forbes, G. W. *The God of Old: The Role of the Lukan Parables in the Purpose of Luke's Gospel*. JSNTSup 198. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Fransen, Paul I. "La montée vers Jérusalem (Lc. 9,51-18,14)." *BVC* 11 (1965) 68-87.

- Friedrich, Gerhard. "Lk 9,51 und die Entrückungschristologie des Lukas." In *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker*. Ed. P. Hoffmann. 48-52. Freiburg: Herder, 1973.
- Funk, Robert W. "The Old Testament in Parable: The Good Samaritan." *Enc* 26 (1965) 251-67.
- . "The Good Samaritan as Metaphor." *Semeia* 2 (1974) 74-81.
- . *Parables and Presence*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- . "Parable, Paradox, and Power: The Prodigal Samaritan." In *Parables and Presence: Forms of the New Testament Tradition*. Ed. Robert W. Funk. 55-65. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- . and Bernard B. Scott. *Funk on Parables: Collected Essays*. Santa Rosa: Polebridge, 2006.
- Fusco, Vittorio. *Oltre la parabola*. Roma: Borla, 1983.
- Gagnon, Robert A. J. "A Second Look at Two Lukan Parables: Reflections on the Unjust Steward and the Good Samaritan." *HBT* 20 (1998) 1-11.
- Gasse, W. "Zum Reisebericht des Lukas." *ZNW* 34 (1935) 293-99.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *The Good Samaritan, the Good Shepherd?* ConBNT 16. Lund: Gleerup, 1958.
- . "If We Do Not Cut the Parables out of Their Frames." *NTS* 37 (1991) 321-35.
- Gewalt, D. "Der Barmherzige Samariter: Zu Lukas 10,25-37." *EvT* 38 (1978) 415-17.
- Giblin, Charles H. *The Destruction of Jerusalem according to Luke's Gospel*. AnBib 107. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1985.
- Giglioli, A. "Il giorno dell'Ultima Cena e l'anno della morte di Gesù." *RivB* 10 (1962) 156-81.

- Gill, David W. "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages." *HTR* 63 (1970) 199-221.
- Gillman, John. *Luke: Stories of Joy and Salvation, Spiritual Commentaries on the Bible*. New York: New City, 2002.
- Girard, L. C. *L'Évangile des voyages de Jésus, ou la section 9:51–18:14 de Saint Luc*. Paris: Gabalda, 1951.
- Giurisato, Giuseppe. "Come Luca struttura il viaggio e le altre parti del suo Vangelo: Una composizione paradigmatica: 12,13-34.35-48; 16,1-18.19-31." *RivB* 46 (1998) 419-84.
- Glombitza, Otto. "Der reiche Mann und der arme Lazarus." *NovT* 12 (1970) 166-80.
- Gollwitzer, Helmut. *Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
- Goulder, Michael D. "The Chiastic Structure of the Lukan Journey." *SE* 2 (1964) 195-202.
- . *The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture*. London: SPCK, 1978.
- Graves, Mike. "Luke 10:25-37: The Moral of the 'Good Samaritan' Story?" *RevExp* 94 (1997) 269-75.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien. *Sémantique structurale: recherche et méthode*. Paris: Larousse, 1966.
- Grundmann, Walter. "Fragen der Komposition des lukanischen Reiseberichts." *ZNW* 50 (1959) 252-70.
- . *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. THKNT 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966.
- Günther, Walther. "Brother, Neighbour, Friend." *NIDNTT* 2:256-59.
- . "πλησίον." *NIDNTT* 6:312-15.

- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew*. WBC 33. 2 vols. Dallas: Word Books, 1993-95.
- Harder, Günther. “*voũç*.” *NIDTT* 3:126-29.
- Harl, Kenneth W. *Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 B.C to A.D. 700*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Harrington, Wilfrid J. *A Key to the Parables*. Glen Rock: Paulist, 1964.
- . “The Parables in Recent Study (1960-1971).” *BTB* 2 (1972) 219-241.
- Hedrick, Charles W. *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- . *Many Things in Parables: Jesus and His Modern Critics*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.
- Heil, John Paul. *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts: An Audience-Oriented Approach*. SBLMS 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999.
- Hendrickx, Herman. *The Parables of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.
- Hendriksen, W. *Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke*. New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.
- Heutger, N. “Die lukanischen Samaritanererzählung in religionspädagogischer Sicht.” In *Wort der Zeit*. Ed. W. Haubeck and M. Backmann. 276-80. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- . “Münzen im Lukasevangelium.” *BZ* (1983) 97-101.
- Hoehner, Harold W. *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977.
- Horowitz, H. L. “The Sh’ma Reconsidered.” *Judaism* 24 (1975) 476–81.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. The Bible in Its World. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Irenaeus. *Against the Heresies*. ACW 55. New York: Paulist, 1992.

- Jellicoe, Sidney. "St. Luke and the Seventy (-Two)." *NTS* 8 (1960) 319-21.
- Janzen, J. G. "On the Most Important Word in the Shema (Deuteronomy VI 4–5)." *VT* 37 (1987) 280–300.
- Jaubert, Annie. *La date de la Cène*. Paris: Gabalda, 1957.
- Jervell, Jacob. "The Law in Luke-Acts." *HTR* 64 (1971) 21-36.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. New York: Scribner, 1963.
- . *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- . *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- . *Neutestamentliche Theologie*. Gütersloher: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1988.
- Johnson, Luke T. *The Gospel of Luke*. SacPag 3. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Jones, Peter Rhea. *Studying the Parables of Jesus*. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 1999.
- Just, Arthur A. *Luke*. ACCS. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003.
- Jülicher, Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976.
- Kahlefeld, Heinrich. *Paraboles et leçons dans l'évangile*. Paris: Cerf, 1969.
- Kariamadam, Paul. *The End of the Travel Narrative (Lk 18,31–19,46)*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1985.
- . "The Composition and Meaning of the Lukan Travel Narrative (Lk 9,51–19,46)." *BiBh* 13 (1987) 179-98.
- Karris, Robert J. (ed.). *Saint Bonaventure's Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. St. Bonaventure: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2001.
- Kemmer, Alfons. *Le parabole di Gesù*. Brescia: Paideia, 1990.

- Kiilunen, Jarmo. *Das Doppelgebot der Liebe in Synoptischer Sicht: Ein Redaktionskritischer Versuch über Mk 12,28-34 und Parallelen*. Helsinki: Tiedeakat, 1989.
- Kilgallen, John J. "The Plan of the 'NOMIKOS' (Luke 10:25-37)." *NTS* 42 (1996) 615-19.
- . "Martha and Mary: Why at Luke 10,38-42?" *Bib* 84 (2003) 554-61.
- . *Twenty Parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*. SubBi 32. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2008.
- Kimball, Charles A. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. JSNTSup 94. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Kingsbury, Jack D. "Major Trends in Parable Interpretation." *CTM* 42 (1971) 579-96.
- . "The Parables of Jesus in Current Research." *Di* 11 (1972) 101-7.
- . *Conflict in Luke*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Kissinger, Warren S. *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*. ATLA Bibliography Series 4. Metuchen: Scarecrow, 1979.
- Kistmaker, Simon J. *The Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980.
- . "Jesus as Story Teller: Literary Perspectives on the Parables." *MSJ* 16 (2005) 49-55.
- Klauck, Hans-Joseph. *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten*. NTbAh 13. Münster: Aschendorff, 1978.
- Kleist, James. (ed.). *The Didache, The Epistle of Barnabas, The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, The Fragments of Papias, The Epistle to Diognetus*. ACW 6. New York: Paulist, 1948.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Klostermann, Erich. *Das Lukasevangelium*. HNT 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1929.
- Knowles, Michael P. "What Was the Victim Wearing? Literary, Economic, and Social Contexts for the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *BibInt* 12 (2004) 145-74.

- Krauss, Samuel. *Talmudische Archäologie*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1966.
- Lacocque, André. “L’herméneutique de Jésus au sujet de la loi dans la parabole du bon Samaritain.” *ETR* 78 (2003) 25-46.
- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. *Évangile selon Saint Luc*. Paris: Gabalda, 1927.
- Lambrecht, Jan. “The Message of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-37).” *LS* 5 (1974) 121-35.
- . *Once More Astonished*. New York: Crossroad, 1981.
- . *Le parabole di Gesù*. Bologna: Dehoniane, 1982.
- Lapointe, Roger. “L’espace-temps de Lc 9,51–19,27.” *EgT* 1 (1970) 275-90.
- Leenhardt, F. J. “La parabole du Samaritain (schéma d’une exégèse existentialiste).” In *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne*. Ed. F. S. M. Goguel. 132-38. Paris: Neuchâtel, 1950.
- Le Donne, Anthony. “The Jewish Leaders.” In *Jesus among Friends and Enemies: A Historical and Literary Introduction to Jesus in the Gospels*. Ed. Chris Keith and Larry W. Hurtado. 199-217. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Linnemann, Eta. *Gleichnisse Jesu*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Lohfink, Gerhard. *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu. Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts und Erhöhungs-texten bei Lukas*. SANT 26. München: Kösel, 1971.
- Lohse, Eduard. “Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach dem Evangelium des Lukas.” *TLZ* 10 (1954) 1-13.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Challenge of Jesus’ Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Maccoby, Hyam. “How Unclean Were Tax-Collectors?” *BTB* 31 (2002) 60-63.
- Macdonald, John. *The Samaritan Chronicle*. BZAW 107. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.
- MacKinlay, G. “St. Luke’s Theefold Narrative of Christ’s Last Journey to Jerusalem.” *The Interpreter* 7 (1910) 261-78.

- Magen, Yitzhak. "The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in the Light of the Archaeological Evidence." In *Judah and Judeans in the Fourth Century BC*. Ed. Oded Lipschitz, Gary N. Knoppers and Rainer Albertz. 157-211. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Maggioni, Bruno. *Le parabole evangeliche*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1993.
- McArthur, Harvey K. "The Origin of the 'Q' Symbol." *ExpTim* 88 (1976-77) 119-20.
- Malina, Bruce J. and Jerome H. Neyrey. "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome H. Neyrey. 25-65. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- . *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
- Mandonnet, Thomas P. and Marie F. Moos (eds.). *Thomae Aquinatis Scriptum Super Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi Episcopi Parisiensis*. Paris: Lethielleux, 1929.
- Mann, J. "Jesus and the Sadducean Priests: Luke 10:25-27." *JQR* 6 (1914) 417-19.
- Manns, Frédéric. *La preghiera d'Israele al Tempo di Gesù*. Bologna: Dehoniane, 1996.
- Manson, Thomas W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Marshall, Howard I. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.
- Mason, Steve. *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees*. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Matera, Frank J. "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (9:51–19:44): A Conflict with Israel." *JSNT* 51 (1993) 57-77.
- . *New Testament Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.
- Mattill, A. J. "The Good Samaritan and the Purpose of Luke-Acts." *Enc* 33 (1972) 359-76.

- Mayer, E. *Die Reiseerzählung des Lukas (Lk 9,51–19,10): Entscheidung in der Wüste*. EHS 23/554. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Mazamisa, Llewellyn Welile. *Beatific Comradeship: An Exegetical-Hermeneutical Study on Lk 10:25-37*. Kampen: Kok, 1987.
- McCown, C. C. “The Geography of Luke’s Central Section.” *JBL* 57 (1938) 63-70.
- McFarland, Ian A. “Who Is My Neighbor? The Good Samaritan as a Source for Theological Anthropology.” *Modern Theology* 17 (2001) 57-66.
- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. ABRL. 4 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1991-2009.
- . “The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans: What can be Said?” *Bib* 81 (2000) 202-32.
- Menken, Maarten J. “Position of *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* and *σπάγχνα* in the Gospel of Luke.” *NovT* 30 (1988) 107-14.
- Metzger, Bruce M. “Seventy or Seventy-Two Disciples?” *NTS* 5 (1958) 299-306.
- Meynet, Roland. *Język przypowieści biblijnych*. Kraków: WAM, 2005.
- . *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1994.
- Míguez, Néstor O. “La Parábola del Buen Samaritano: Contexto, sujeto e interpretación.” *Cuadernos de Teología* 22 (2003) 65-78.
- Miyoshi, Michi. *Der Anfang des Reiseberichts Lk 9,51–10,24*. AnBib 60. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1974.
- . “Das jüdische Gebet Šema‘ und die Abfolge der Traditionsstücke in Luke 10–13.” *AJBI* 7 (1981) 70–123.
- Moessner, David P. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

- Monselewski, Werner. *Der Barmherzige Samariter*. BGBE 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1967.
- Montefiore, Claude. *The Synoptic Gospels*. London: Macmillan, 1909.
- Morgenthaler, Robert. *Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis*. ATANT. 15. Zürich: Zwingli, 1949.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel according to Saint Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Mullins, Michael. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary*. Dublin: Columbia, 2010.
- Neirynek, F. “La matière marcienne dans l’évangile de Luc.” In *L’évangile de Luc*. Ed. Idem. BETL 32. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. (ed.). *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Nissen, Andreas. *Gott und der Nächste im Antiken Judentum: Untersuchungen zum Doppelgebot der Liebe*. WUNT 15. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1974.
- Noël, Filip. *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9,51–19,28*. Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België, 2004.
- Nolland, John. *Luke*. WBC 35. 3 vols. Dallas: Word Books, 1989-93.
- . “The Role of Money and Possessions in the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32).” In *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*. Ed. Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton. 178-209. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Oakman, Douglas E. “The Buying Power of Two Denarii: A Comment on Luke 10:35.” *Forum* 3 (1987) 33-38.
- . “The Countryside in Luke-Acts.” In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome H. Neyrey. 151-79. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- . “Was Jesus a Peasant? Implications for Reading the Samaritan Story (Luke 10:30-35).” *BTB* 22 (1992) 117-25.

Ogg, G. "The Central Section of the Gospel According to St. Luke." *NTS* 18 (1971-72) 39-53.

Oppenheimer, A'haron. *The 'Am Ha-Aretz: A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. ALGHJ 8. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

———. and Benjamin H. Isaac. *Studies on the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Tel Aviv: Ramot, 1996.

Orbe, Antonio. *Parábolas Evangélicas en San Ireneo*. BAC. Madrid: La Editorial Católica, 1972.

Origen. *On First Principles*. Ed. G. W. Butterworth. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973.

———. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John: Books 1-10*. Ed. Ronald E. Heine. FC 80. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1989.

———. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John: Books 13-32*. FC 89. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1993.

———. *Homilies on Luke, and, Fragments on Luke*. Ed. Joseph T. Lienhard. FC 94. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.

Osborne, T. P. "Deux grandes structures concentriques centrales et une nouvelle approche du plan global de l'Évangile de Luc." *RB* 110 (2003) 197-221.

Osterley, William Oscar Emil. *The Gospel Parables in the Light of Their Jewish Background*. London: SPCK, 1936.

Parsons, M. C. "Landmarks along the Way: The Function of the "L" Parables." *SwJT* 40 (1997) 33-47.

Patella, Michael. *The Gospel according to Luke*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005.

Patte, D. "An Analysis of Narrative Structure of the Good Samaritan." *Semeia* 2 (1974) 1-26.

———. *Structural Exegesis for New Testament Critics*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Pearce, Keith. "The Lucan Origins of the Raising of Lazarus." *ExpTim* 96 (1985) 359-61.

- Pelikan, Jaroslav J., Oswald C. Hilton and Helmut T. Lehman (ed.). *Luther's Works*. vol. 54. Saint Louis: Concordia, 1955.
- Perkins, Pheme. *Hearing the Parables of Jesus*. New York: Paulist, 1981.
- Pesch, Rudolf. "Jesus und Hauptgebot." In *Neues Testament und Ethic*. Ed. H. Merklein. 99-109. Freiburg: Herder, 1989.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928.
- Prete, Benedetto. *L'opera di Luca*. Torino: Elledici, 1986.
- . *Le parabole della preghiera nel vangelo di Luca*. Torino: Elledici, 2003.
- Pritchard, James B. (ed.). *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- Rabin, Chaim. "Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century." In *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Ed. Shemuel Safrai and Menahem Stern. 2:1007-39. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Radl, Walter. *Das Lukasevangelium*. EdF 261. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988.
- Ramaroson, Léonard. "Comme 'Le Bon Samaritan,' ne chercher qu' aimer (Lc 10,29-37)." *Bib* 56 (1975) 534-45.
- Rau, Eckhard. "Jesu Auseinandersetzung mit Pharisäern über seine Zuwendung zu Sünderinnen und Sündern. Lk 15.11-32 und 18,10-14a als Worte des historischen Jesu." *ZNW* 89 (1998) 5-29.
- Reicke, Bo. "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative." In *Studia Evangelica I*. Ed. Kurt Aland. TU 87. 206-16. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959.
- Rengstorff, K. H. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. NTD 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.

- Resseguie, James L. "Interpretation of Luke's Central Section (Luke 9:51–19:44) since 1856." *SBT* 5 (1975) 3-36.
- . "Point of View in the Central Section of Luke (9:51–19:44)." *JETS* 25 (1982) 41-48.
- . *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Ringe, Sharon H. *Luke*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Rius-Camps, Josep. "Questions sobre la doble obra lucana. Lc 10:25-18:30: una perfecta estructura concèntrica dins la Secció del Viatge (9,51–19,46)." *RCT* 8 (1983) 283-357.
- Rossé, Gérard. *Il vangelo di Luca*. Roma: Città Nuova, 2001.
- Roukema, Riemer. "The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity." *VC* 58 (2004) 56-74.
- Royster, Dmitri. *The Parables: Biblical, Patristic and Liturgical Interpretation*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary, 1997.
- Ruzer, Serge. "The Double Love Precept in the New Testament and the Rule of the Community." In *Jesus' Last Week: Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospel*. Ed. Steven R. Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker. 81-106. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Safari, Shemuel and Menahem Stern (ed.). *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . "Pharisees." *ABD* 5:289-303.
- Sanchis, D. "Samaritanus ille. L'exègese augustinienne de la parabole du Bon Samaritan." *RSR* 49 (1961) 406-25.
- Schaarschmidt, Rektor. "Der Reisebericht im Lukasevangelium (Luk. 9,51–18,14)." *TSK* 82 (1909) 12-28.

- . “Die Einschaltung im Lukasevangelium (9,51 bis 18,14) als Grundlage der biblischen Geschichte von Jesus.” *TSK* 101 (1929) 357-80.
- Schmid, Josef. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. RNT 3. Regensburg: Pustet, 1955.
- Schmidt, Karl L. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.
- Schneider, Johannes. “Zur Analyse der lukanischen Reiseberichtes.” In *Synoptische Studien. Alfred Wikenhauser zum siebzigsten Geburtstag, dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*. Ed. J. Schmid and A. Vogtle. 207-29. München: Zink, 1953.
- Schnider, Franz. “Ausschliessen und ausgeschlossen werden. Beobachtungen zur Struktur des Gleichnisses vom Pharisäer und Zöllner.” *BZ* 24 (1980) 42-56.
- Schottroff, Luise. *The Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ 175 B.C.–A.D. 135*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973.
- Scott, Bernard Brandon. *Parable Interpretation in America: The Shift to Language*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988.
- . *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Sedlmeier, F. “‘Höre, Israel! JHWH: Unser Gorr (ist er) . . .’ (Dtn 6, 4f.)” *TTZ* 108 (1999) 21-39.
- Sellew, Philip. “Interior Monologue as a Narrative Device in the Parables of Luke.” *JBL* 111 (1992) 239-53.
- Sellin, Gerhard. “Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: Die Erzählung vom barmherzigen Samariter (Lk 10,25-37).” *ZNW* 66 (1975) 19-60.
- . “Komposition, Quellen und Funktion des Lukanischen Reiseberichtes Lk 9:51–19:28.” *NovT* 20 (1978) 100-35.

- Shams, Christine. *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*. JSOTSup 291. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Shanks, H. "Origins of the Title Rabbi." *JQR* 59 (1968-1969) 152-57.
- Siede, Burghard. "λαμβάνω." *NIDNTT* 5:747-52.
- Smith, B. T. D. *The Parables in the Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937.
- Smith, Dennis E. "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke." *JBL* 106 (1987) 613-38.
- Snodgrass, Klyne R. *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Sorg, Theo. "καρδία." *NIDNTT* 2:184.
- Spencer, Scott F. "2 Chronicles 28:5-15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *WTJ* 46 (1984) 317-49.
- . *The Gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2008.
- Spijkerman, Augustus. "Coins Mentioned in the New Testament." *SBFLA* 6 (1955/56) 279-98.
- Stagg, Frank. "The Journey towards Jerusalem in Luke's Gospel. Luke 9:51–19:27." *RevExp* 64 (1967) 499-512.
- Stein, Robert H. "The Interpretation of the Parable of the Good Samaritan." In *Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation*. Ed. Ward D. Gasque and William Sanford LaSor. 278-95. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Stein, Robert H. "The Parables of Jesus in Recent Study." *WW* 5 (1985) 248-57.
- Stern, M. "Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and Other Classes." In *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Ed. Shemuel Safrai and Menahem Stern. 2:561-630. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

- Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo*. Ed. Horace Leonard Jones and J. R. Sitlington Street. 8 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Strack, Hermann Leberecht and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 6 vols. München: Beck, 1922-61.
- Stegner, William Richard. "The Parable of the Good Samaritan and Leviticus 18:5." In *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*. Ed. Dennis E. Groh and Robert Jewett. 27-38. Lanham: University Press of America, 1985.
- Streeter, Burnett H. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates*. London: Macmillan, 1926.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Missoula: Scholars, 1974.
- . *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2002.
- Tan, Betty O. S. "The Parable of Pharisee and the Tax Collector in Luke 18:9-14: A Study on the Practice of Prayer." *AJT* 14 (2000) 286-303
- Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986-90.
- . *Luke*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- Teske, Roland. "The Good Samaritan (Lk 10:29-37) in Augustine's Exegesis." In *Augustine: Biblical Exegete*. Ed. Frederick Van Fleteren and Joseph C. Schnaubelt. 347-67. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Tiedtke, Erich and Hans-Georg Link. "δεῖ." *NIDNTT* 2:664-67.
- Tolbert, Mary A. *Perspectives on the Parables. An Approach to Multiple Interpretations*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Torrance, David W. and A. W. Morrison (eds.). *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries: A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke: And the Epistles of James and Jude*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Traina, Robert. *Methodical Bible Study*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980.

- Trela, Janusz. *Przypowieści Jezusa*. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski, 1997.
- Trompf, G. W. "La section médiane de l'évangile de Luc: l'organisation des documents." *RHPR* 53 (1973) 141-54.
- Tucker, Jeffrey T. *Example Stories: Perspectives on Four Parables in the Gospel of Luke*. JSNTSup 162. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Van Eck, Ernest. "When Patrons are not Patrons: A Social-Scientific Reading of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-26)." *HTS* 65 (2009) 346-56.
- Van Elderen, Bastiaan. "Another Look at the Parable of the Good Samaritan." In *Saved by Hope*. Ed. James I. Cook. 109-19. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Verhoef, Eduard. "Eternal Life and Following the Commandments: Lev 18,5 and Luke 10,28." In *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Ed. Christopher M. Tuckett. BETL 131. 571-77. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Via, Dan Otto. *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- . "Parable and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach." *Semeia* 1 (1974) 105-33.
- Von Bendemann, Reinhard. *Zwischen Δόξα und Σταυρός. Eine Exegetische Untersuchung Der Texte Des Sogenannten Reiseberichts Im Lukasevangelium*. BZNW 101. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.
- Von der Osten-Sacken, P. "Zur Christologie des lukanischen Reiseberichts." *EvT* 33 (1973) 476-96.
- Wailes, Stephen L. *Medieval Allegories of Jesus' Parables*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Walker, N. "Concerning the Jaubertian Chronology of the Passion." *NovT* 3 (1959) 317-20.
- Walle, R. "Love Yahweh Your God with All Your Heart: The Deuteronomist's Understanding of Love." *Jeev* 13 (1983) 122-29.

- Wegner, Paul D. *A Student's Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible: Its History, Methods & Results*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006.
- Weigelt, Horst. “δύω.” *NIDNTT* 1:315-16.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien*. Berlin: Reimer, 1905.
- West-Watson, C. “The Peraen Ministry.” *JTS* 11 (1910) 269-74.
- Wickes, Dean R. *The Sources of Luke's Perean Section*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1912.
- Wilkinson, John. “The Way from Jerusalem to Jericho.” *BA* 38 (1975) 10-24.
- . *Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1982.
- Willoughby, B. E. “A Heartfelt Love: An Exegesis of Deuteronomy 6:4-19.” *ResQ* 20 (1977) 73-87.
- Wilson, S. G. *Luke and the Law*. SNTSMS 50. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Wink, Walter. “The Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan: A Communal Exegesis Approach.” *RevExp* 76 (1979) 199-217.
- Wolter, Michael. *Das Lukasevangelium*. HNT 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Young, Brad H. *Jesus and His Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching*. New York: Paulist, 1989.
- Young, Norman H. “The Commandment to Love Your Neighbor as Yourself and the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37).” *AUSS* 21 (1983) 265-72.
- Zedde, Italo. “Il racconto della Passione nei Vangeli Sinottici.” In *Vangeli sinottici e Atti degli Apostoli*. Ed. M. Làconi. 361-79. Torino: Leumann, 1999.
- Zerwick, Max. *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples*. Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici 114. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001.

Zimmermann, Heinrich. *Jesus Christus: Geschichte und Verkündigung*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973.

Zimmermann, Ruben. "Un amore toccante." In *Compendio delle parabole di Gesù*. Idem. 845-73. Brescia: Queriniana, 2011.