Bartosz Adamczewski

The Gospel of Luke

A Hypertextual Commentary

European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions

Edited by Bartosz Adamczewski

PETER LANG
EDITION

Introduction

This commentary greatly differs from other modern commentaries on the Gospel of Luke. The difference results from the particular methodological approach which has been adopted therein. Instead of explaining the Lucan Gospel in historical-critical terms as a result of redactional use of earlier sources or traditions, in narratological terms as a set of narrative-organizing devices, etc., this commentary aims at explaining it as a result of twofold sequential hypertextual reworking of the Pauline Letter to the Galatians.

This methodological approach, unlike many others, does not originate from any particular literary theory. It rather reflects the recent discovery of the phenomenon of the sequential hypertextual reworking of earlier texts in numerous biblical writings. This phenomenon occurs in the writings of both the Old and the New Testament: Gen, Exod-Lev-Num, Deut, Sam-Kgs, Chr; Mt, Mk, Lk, Jn, Acts, Rom, Gal, Eph, 2 Thes, Hebr, 2 Pet, and Rev.[1] These writings, taken together and measured by their extent, constitute almost a half of the Christian Bible.

Accordingly, it is fully justified to perform a thorough analysis of the Lucan Gospel, taking this important literary discovery into consideration.

Luke and Paul

The problem of the relationship between the Lucan Gospel and the Pauline letters cannot be solved only by means of analysing the similarities and the differences between their respective presentations of various theological ideas

---

1 See B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 227–399, 419–430; id., *Heirs of the Reunited Church: The History of the Pauline Mission in Paul's Letters, in the So-Called Pastoral Letters, and in the Pseudo-Titus Narrative of Acts* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 83–132; id., *The Gospel of the Narrative 'We': The Hypertextual Relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Acts of the Apostles* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 39–121; id., *Constructing Relationships, Constructing Faces: Hypertextuality and Ethopoeia in the New Testament Writings* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2011), 55–66, 79–86, 99–103, 117–119, 129–163; id., *Retelling the Law: Genesis, Exodus-Numbers, and Samuel-Kings as Sequential Hypertextual Reworkings of Deuteronomy* (EST 1; Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2012), 25–280; id., *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels* (EST 3; Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2013), 14–62; id., *The Gospel of Mark: A Hypertextual Commentary* (EST 8; Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2014), 31–196.

(the law, the significance of the cross, the apostles, etc.),[2] not least because such ideas were at times presented quite differently in various letters of the Apostle (cf. e.g. Rom and Gal) and Luke's presentation of them is also not always very consistent (cf. e.g. Lk 16:16.17). Therefore, a literary solution to this problem should finally be found.

Leaving aside the question of the use of Paul's letters in the Acts of the Apostles,[3] modern scholars generally reject the hypothesis of the use of Paul's letters in the Gospel of Luke, usually without offering any detailed justification of their opinion.[4] Nevertheless, in the last few decades some scholars opted for a limited literary use of the Pauline letters in the Lucan Gospel.[5]

For example, *Gilbert Bouwman* has tentatively suggested Luke's dependence on Paul's letters, especially First Corinthians, on the basis of some thematic and

---

2   See e.g. S. Grindheim, 'Luke, Paul, and the Law', *NovT* 56 (2014) 335–358.

3   It is not sure whether Acts was written together with the Gospel, and consequently it should not be assumed that the possible use of Paul's letters in Acts was identical with their possible use in the Gospel. Cf. A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion* (BHT 58; J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): Tübingen 1979), 161. However, G. E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup 64; E. J. Brill: Leiden · New York · Köln 1992), 333–336 argues that the proleptic conclusion of Lk and the relocations from Mk-Lk to Acts imply that Acts was already in mind when its author wrote Lk.

4   Cf. e.g. C. Schaefer, *Die Zukunft Israels bei Lukas: Biblisch-frühjüdische Zukunftsvorstellungen im lukanischen Doppelwerk im Vergleich zu Röm 9–11* (BZNW 190; De Gruyter: Berlin · Boston 2012), 11–12, 15.

5   For recent suggestions concerning some use of the Pauline letters in the Acts of the Apostles, see e.g. H.S. Kim, *Die Geisttaufe des Messias: Eine kompositionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu einem Leitmotiv des lukanischen Doppelwerks: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie und Intention des Lukas* (SKP 81; Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 1993), 193–194, 198; P. N. Tarazi, *Galatians: A Commentary* (OBS; St Vladimir's Seminary: Crestwood, NY 1994), 5–7; D. Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield Academic: Sheffield 1995), 175–179; P. Elbert, 'Paul of the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians: Critique and Considerations', *ZNW* 95 (2004) 258–268 (esp. 264–265); M. C. Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. 2007), 129–139; W. O. Walker, Jr., 'The Portrayal of Aquila and Priscilla in Acts: The Question of Sources', *NTS* 54 (2008) 479–495; R. I. Pervo, 'The Paul of Acts *and* the Paul of the Letters: Aspects of Luke as an Interpreter of the *Corpus Paulinum*', in D. Marguerat (ed.), *Reception of Paulinism in Acts / Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des Apôtres* (BETL 229; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Walpole, Mass. 2009), 141–155 (esp. 147–155); R. S. Schellenberg, 'The First Pauline Chronologist? Paul's Itinerary in the Letters and in Acts', *JBL* 134 (2015) 193–213.

linguistic correspondences between these works (virginity in Lk 1:27.34 and 1 Cor 7:38; widowhood in Lk 2:37 and 1 Cor 7:40; not being worried in Lk 10:41 and 1 Cor 7:32–34; etc.).[6]

Morton S. Enslin has noticed some similarities between the Gospel of Luke and the Letter to the Galatians in their respective literary structures. He has suggested that the sequence of some events which are described in the Lucan Gospel (Jesus' baptism in Judaea, then his return to his hometown Nazareth, and only thereafter his widespread mission in Galilee) corresponds to the sequence of events which are known from Paul's Letter to the Galatians (Paul's first visit in Jerusalem, then his return to Tarsus in Cilicia, and only thereafter his widespread mission among the Gentiles).[7] Although these correspondences are rather vague, the very idea that Luke assimilated the narrative story of Jesus to the story of Paul is certainly insightful.

In the opinion of *William O. Walker, Jr.*, some verbal parallels between the Lucan work and Paul's letters suggest that Luke used Paul's letters in the Acts of the Apostles and in his Gospel.[8] However, Walker has also noted that the usual scholarly approach to these parallels consists in suggesting that Paul knew the Jesus tradition in its Lucan form.[9]

According to *Michael D. Goulder*, the presence of several clusters of common matter (comprising words and occasionally also ideas) in 1 Cor and 1 Thes, in which they well suit Paul's rhetoric, and in the Lucan Gospel, in which they are at times used quite strangely, implies that Luke knew and used 1 Cor and 1 Thes in the composition of his Gospel, and not that Paul used some synoptic traditions.[10] Goulder's rejection of the hypothesis that Luke also used other Pauline letters (e.g. Rom) was based on the widespread theory that Luke used Q, and consequently the scholar looked for traces of the Lucan use of the Pauline letters

---

6   Cf. G. Bouwman, *Das dritte Evangelium: Einübung in die formgeschichtliche Methode*, trans. H. Zulauf (Patmos: Düsseldorf 1968), 98–112.

7   Cf. M. S. Enslin, 'Luke, the Literary Physician', in D. E. Aune (ed.), *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, Festschrift A. P. Wikgren (NovTSup 33; E. J. Brill: Leiden 1972), 135–143 (esp. 140–141).

8   Cf. W. O. Walker, Jr., 'Acts and the Pauline Corpus Reconsidered', *JSNT* 24 (1985) 3–23 (esp. 13).

9   Cf. ibid. 22 n. 53.

10 Cf. M. D. Goulder, 'Did Luke Know Any of the Pauline Letters?', *PRSt* 13 (1986) 97–112 (esp. 98–109); id., *Luke: A New Paradigm* (JSNTSup 20; Sheffield Academic: Sheffield 1989), [vol. 1] 132–143.

only in the postulated Lucan redaction of Q.[11] However, Goulder's criterion for ascertaining the existence and direction of literary dependence between the Lucan Gospel and Paul's letters on the basis of the presence of some strange features in the Gospel's fragments which have some parallel in Paul's letters (e.g. στρατευόμενοι in Lk 3:14 cf. 1 Cor 9:7), together with the absence of such strange features in the linguistically and thematically corresponding fragments of Paul's letters (e.g. στρατεύεται in 1 Cor 9:7), is certainly valid.

Similarly, in the opinion of *Wolfgang Schenk* linguistic criteria of literary dependence (the existence of three or more common words within a short space etc.) reveal several cases in which Luke was most probably dependent on Paul's letters (esp. Lk 6:28 cf. Rom 12:14; Lk 10:8 cf. 1 Cor 10:27; Lk 10:38–42 cf. 1 Cor 7:32–35; Lk 22:19–20 cf. 1 Cor 11:23–25; Lk 24:34 cf. 1 Cor 15:5).[12] The German scholar has argued that Luke created his own rhetorical images of both Paul and Jesus, which do not have much in common with the real Paul and Jesus, but which suit Luke's presentation of the origins of Christianity in terms of harmonic accord and integration.[13]

According to *Anthony J. Blasi*, Paul's authentic letters were evidently known to those who imitated them (in the Deutero-Pauline letters), and consequently they must have been widely circulating. Therefore also Luke, who made Paul the principal character in the Acts of the Apostles, must have known at least some of them. However, Blasi has rightly noticed that literary dependence does not necessarily consist in copying the source, but it may also be expressed in some compatibility with the ideas of the source. Accordingly, in Luke's Gospel scholars should look for Pauline views, and not only Pauline wording.[14] In Blasi's opinion, a number of such detectable compatibilities, like Paul and Luke's common presentation of both Abraham and Adam as the background to Jesus (Lk 3:23–38; cf. e.g. Rom 4:13; 5:14), implies that Luke in his redactional composition of the Gospel used most of Paul's authentic letters, with the surprising exception of Galatians.[15]

---

11 Cf. id., *Luke*, [vol. 1] 143.

12 Cf. W. Schenk, 'Luke as Reader of Paul: Observations on his Reception', in S. Draisma (ed.), *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*, Festschrift B. van Iersel (Kok: Kampen 1989), 127–139 (esp. 132–138).

13 Cf. ibid. 139.

14 Cf. A. J. Blasi, *Making Charisma: The Social Construction of Paul's Public Image* (Transaction: New Brunswick · London 1991), 40–41.

15 Cf. ibid. 50–61, 63–65, 67.

In fact, however, Blasi's argument against Luke's knowledge of Galatians, namely the different use of the datival phrase concerning the promise 'to Abraham and to his seed' (τῷ… Ἀβραὰμ… καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ) in Gal 3:16 and Lk 1:55,[16] is rather unconvincing, especially in view of the fact that this datival phrase rather awkwardly follows the preceding pronominal phrase (πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν) in Lk 1:55.

Paul N. Tarazi has noticed and described a great number of linguistic and thematic connections between the Lucan Gospel and the Pauline letters. Consequently, he has at length argued that Luke extensively used the Pauline letters in the composition of his Gospel.[17]

According to *Thomas L. Brodie*, in the text concerning Jesus' last supper (Lk 22:14–30) Luke sequentially used the thematically corresponding Pauline text 1 Cor 11:16–34. In fact, Brodie's argument from the common order of correspondences enabled him to discern some thematic, and not only linguistic, correspondences between the two writings.[18]

Paul Elbert has argued that Luke in his use of pneumatological motifs borrowed from Paul's letters might have worked quite freely, in the expected tradition of ancient narrative-rhetorical composition, which was described, for example, by Theon of Alexandria.[19]

Quite recently, *Richard I. Pervo* has strongly argued for Luke's use of the First Letter to the Corinthians, having noticed several thematic and linguistic correspondences between the Lucan Gospel and this Pauline letter, as well as disproving other explanations of these correspondences (Lk 3:14 cf. 1 Cor 9:7a; Lk 10:38–42 cf. 1 Cor 7:32–35; Lk 12:41–48 cf. 1 Cor 4:1–2; Lk 18:11 cf. 1 Cor 6:9–10; Lk 22:17–18 cf. 1 Cor 10:16–17; Lk 22:19–20 cf. 1 Cor 11:23–25; Lk 22:24 cf. 1 Cor 11:16; Lk 24:34 cf. 1 Cor 15:4–5).[20] Moreover, on similar grounds, he has argued for creative use of Josephus' *Antiquitates* in the Lucan Gospel (Lk 2:1–7

---

16 Cf. ibid. 60–61.

17 Cf. P. N. Tarazi, *The New Testament: An Introduction*, vol. 2, *Luke and Acts* (St Vladimir's Seminary: Crestwood, NY 2001), 6–8, 25–184.

18 Cf. T. L. Brodie, *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Developments of the New Testament Writings* (NTM 1; Sheffield Phoenix: Sheffield 2004), 139–143.

19 Cf. P. Elbert, 'Possible Literary Links between Luke-Acts and Pauline Letters Regarding Spirit-Language', in T. L. Brodie, D. R. MacDonald, and S. E. Porter (eds.), *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations in Theory and Practice* (NTM 16; Sheffield Phoenix: Sheffield 2006), 226–254 (esp. 232–243).

20 Cf. R. I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Polebridge: Santa Rosa, Calif. 2006), 64–70, 139, 225–227.

cf. *Ant.* 18.1–5; Lk 3:1–2 cf. *Ant.* 18.237; 20.138; Lk 3:10–14 cf. *Ant.* 18.117; Lk 3:19 cf. *Ant.* 18.109–119; Lk 19:11–27 cf. *Ant.* 17.222–342).[21]

It is worth noting that Pervo's analyses point to the cases of Luke's highly creative reworking of earlier texts. Pervo does not use the notion of hypertextuality, but his suggestions concerning Luke's compositional techniques evidently lead in this direction. For example, according to Pervo the Pauline text 1 Cor 5:3–5 was used in Acts 5:1–11 in such a way that the latter story can be classified as 'a narrative inspired by 1 Corinthians 5:3–5'.[22] Likewise, the use of Josephus' story of a Jewish magician from Cyprus in the entourage of a Roman governor (*Ant.* 20.141–143) in Luke's story of Elymas (Acts 13:6–12) must have been highly creative because there are also numerous significant differences between the two stories (the characters involved, the reasons for the activity of the magician, etc.).[23]

Somewhat similarly, *Simon Butticaz* has recently argued that the use of Paul's letters in the Lucan Gospel and Acts can best be explained in Gérard Genette's category of hypertextual derivation.[24] In the opinion of Butticaz, Luke's use of the Pauline letters can be classified in terms of (*a*) narrativizing the Pauline tradition, (*b*) commenting on some Pauline errors, and (*c*) negatively reworking Pauline ideas.[25] Accordingly, the reception of Paul's letters in the Lucan work was creative, and not archiving.[26]

This short presentation of the previous research on the literary dependence of the Lucan Gospel on the Pauline letters reveals that twentieth-century scholars who favoured such dependence (e.g. M. D. Goulder and W. Schenk) mainly concentrated on the linguistic argument from the presence of several Pauline clusters of words in the Lucan Gospel. However, the number of such clusters is

---

21 Cf. ibid. 158–161, 178–179, 183–185, 197.

22 Ibid. 73.

23 Cf. ibid. 186–187.

24 Cf. S. Butticaz, '"Has God Rejected His People?" (Romans 11.1): The Salvation of Israel in Acts: Narrative Claim of a Pauline Legacy', in D. P. Moessner [et al.] (eds.), *Luke the Interpreter of Israel*, vol. 2, *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Paul's Claim upon Israel's Legacy in Luke and Acts in the Light of the Pauline Letters* (LNTS 452; T&T Clark: London 2012), 148–164 (esp. 163); id., 'La relecture des *lapsi* pauliniens chez Luc: Esquisse d'une typologie', in C. Clivaz [et al.] (eds.), *Écritures et réécritures: La reprise interprétative des traditions fondatrices par la littérature biblique et extra-biblique: Cinquième colloque international du RRENAB, Universités de Genève et Lausanne, 10–12 juin 2010* (BETL 248; Peeters: Leuven · Paris · Walpole, Mass. 2012), 319–330 (esp. 319).

25 Cf. id., 'Relecture', 320–329.

26 Cf. ibid. 329.

evidently too low to persuade other scholars that Luke knew and used the Pauline letters, especially in view of the fact that there are also more or less evident differences between the Lucan theology and the Pauline ideas.

In line with the development of modern research on intertextuality, especially in the aftermath of Gérard Genette's introduction of the concept of hypertextuality,[27] more recent scholars point to the possibility of Luke's highly creative use of Paul's letters, which should not be limited to mere repetition of some particular words, but which could include free reworking of Paul's (and Josephus') texts in the Lucan stories.

Luke and Mark, Josephus, and other works

Modern scholars working on the so-called synoptic problem generally accept the hypothesis of Marcan priority, according to which Luke in his literary activity used the Gospel of Mark. However, the use of the Marcan Gospel by Luke was by no means slavish and uniform.

Detailed analyses of the Lucan use of the Marcan material reveal that Luke knew the whole Marcan Gospel (Mk 1:1–16:8, including the so-called 'Big Omission': Mk 6:45–8:26) and that he used this material not only in its original order, form, and wording, but also in the form of isolated motifs,[28] which were creatively reworked and used by Luke in various other sections of his work (including the so-called 'Big Interpolation': Lk 9:51–18:14).[29]

Accordingly, at times Luke rather faithfully reproduced the Marcan story. However, at times he reworked the Marcan accounts quite freely: 'Luke repeatedly excises a pericope from its Markan location, strategically advances the pericope to an earlier location in the narrative sequence, and retains only key traces of the original pericope's basic structure.'[30]

---

27 Cf. G. Genette, *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré* (Seuil: [*s.l.*] 1982).

28 For a discussion concerning the intertextual use of earlier literary motifs in the Lucan work, cf. J. M. Morgan, 'How Do Motifs Endure and Perform? Motif Theory for the Study of Biblical Narratives', *RB* 122 (2015) 194–216 (esp. 204–206, 210).

29 Cf. R. von Bendemann, *Zwischen ΔΟΞΑ und ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ: Eine exegetische Untersuchung der Texte des sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukasevangelium* (BZNW 101; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2001), 51–55.

30 G. Carey, 'Moving Things Ahead: A Lukan Redactional Technique and Its Implications for Gospel Origins', *BibInt* 21 (2013) 302–319 (here: 318). Cf. also M. J. Kok, 'The Flawed Evangelist (John) Mark: A Neglected Clue to the Reception of Mark's Gospel in Luke-Acts?', *Neot* 46 (2012) 244–259 (esp. 246–249).

Consequently, it is difficult to prove that in his literary activity Luke used any oral traditions: 'When one takes seriously the larger patterns of redaction—rather than assessing things one passage at a time—the argument for independent streams of memory simply fails to persuade.'[31]

Moreover, Barbara Shellard has argued that Luke most likely used Josephus' *Bellum*, quite likely used *Antiquitates*, and possibly used *Contra Apionem*.[32] The hypothesis of Luke's creative use of the works of Josephus is also strongly supported by Steve Mason[33] and Richard I. Pervo.[34]

Besides, Karl A. Kuhn has recently suggested that Luke knew some texts contained in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[35]

My own research has suggested that Luke, especially in the composition of the Acts of the Apostles, used not only Paul's authentic letters, but also post-Pauline letters, including the Pastoral Letters, as well as the ethopoeic letters of James and Peter, Josephus' writings, some Greek classical writings, and some texts known to us from the Dead Sea Scrolls.[36]

The problem of the relationship between the Lucan Gospel and the Gospel of Matthew, including the hypothesis of the existence of the so-called 'Q source', will not be discussed here because the research of myself and other scholars reveals that the Gospel of Luke was used in the Gospel of Matthew, and there was no 'Q source'.[37]

Implied author

The implied author of the Lucan Gospel is rather difficult to identify. The vague 'me' in the preface to the Gospel (Lk 1:3) yields no particular clue as to his identity. However, if the hypothesis of the intended unity of the Lucan Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles is accepted, the implied author of the Gospel can be identified indirectly through his identification with the implied author of Acts.

---

31 G. Carey, 'Moving', 318.

32 Cf. B. Shellard, *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context* (JSNTSup 215; Sheffield Academic: London · New York 2002), 31–34.

33 Cf. S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (2nd edn., Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass. 2003), 251–295.

34 Cf. R. I. Pervo, *Dating*, 158–161, 178–179, 183–185, 197.

35 Cf. K. A. Kuhn, *Luke: The Elite Evangelist* (Paul's Social Network: Brothers and Sisters in Faith; Liturgical: Collegeville, Minn. 2010), 11.

36 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Constructing*, 79, 87, 91, 95, 105, 112, 142–145, 148–152.

37 Cf. ibid. 153–155; id., *Hypertextuality*, 80–85.

Traditionally, the third canonical Gospel has been attributed to Luke, one of Paul's co-workers. This attribution can be explained as resulting from the facts that (*a*) Phlm 24 mentions Luke together with the imprisoned Paul, (*b*) Col 4:14 likewise presents Luke as the companion of the imprisoned Paul and refers to him as 'beloved' by the Apostle, and (*c*) 2 Tim 4:11 similarly refers to Luke as the only faithful companion of Paul during his Roman imprisonment. In antiquity, these features came to be regarded as compatible with the features of the narrative 'we' in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 16:10–17; 20:5–15; 21:1–18; 27:1–28:16). Consequently, they led to the assumption that the third canonical Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, which are anonymous in themselves, were written by Luke.[38] The first explicit identification of the author of the third canonical Gospel with Luke, the companion of Paul, can be found in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.1.1 (*c.* AD 180?).[39]

In fact, the Acts of the Apostles presents itself as having been written by a close companion of Paul's missionary activity, especially of Paul's last journey to Jerusalem and to Rome (Acts 27:1–28:16). This impression is created by means of the literary device of the narrator's identification with the character of the narrative 'we' in Acts 16:10–17; 20:5–15; 21:1–18; 27:1–28:16.

However, a close analysis of the particular features and movements of this narrative character reveals that they generally correspond to those of the character of Titus in the letters of Paul the Apostle. In particular, according to Gal 2:1.3 Titus (and consequently also the narrative 'we' in Acts) was the only person who, apart from Barnabas, accompanied Paul in his second journey to Jerusalem. Moreover, according to 2 Cor 8:6.16.23; Gal 2:1.3 Titus (and consequently also the narrative 'we' in Acts) was the only person who, unlike Barnabas, (John) Mark, and Silvanus/Silas, had access to both Paul and Peter in the critical period of Paul's missionary career, namely during the organization and delivery of the Gentile Christian collection for the Jerusalem 'saints'. For this reason, in the Acts of the Apostles Titus became a reliable, although anonymous, ethopoeic transmitter of Peter and Paul's apostolic tradition (Acts 1:1; cf. Lk 1:2–3) and a narrative witness of the important events which took place in Troas, Philippi, Jerusalem, Crete (cf. Tit 1:4–5), and Rome (Acts 16:10–17; 20:5–15; 21:1–18; 27:1–28:16).[40]

The identification of the implied author of the Acts of the Apostles with the ethopoeic character of Titus also partly explains the phenomenon of the abrupt ending of Acts (Acts 28:30–31). According to 2 Tim 4:10.16, Titus was present

---

38 Cf. U. Schnelle, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (UTB 1830; 8th edn., Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2013), 312, 315.

39 Cf. ibid. 311.

40 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Heirs*, 121–124; id., *Constructing*, 147.

with Paul in Rome, but left Rome before Paul's trial. Therefore, also the narrative 'we' is present in Acts 27:1–28:16, but absent in the concluding section Acts 28:17–31, apparently not knowing what happened to Paul after his two-year-long stay in Rome.

Moreover, since according to Gal 2:2–3 Titus personally knew not only Paul, but also the Jerusalem community, including James the Lord's brother (hence the presence of the narrative 'we' in Acts 21:17–18), thanks to this contact the implied author of Acts could have obtained some family-related information concerning Jesus' birth and childhood (Lk 1–2; cf. 1:2), as well as that concerning the beginnings of the Jerusalem community (Acts 1–12).

Accordingly, the third canonical Gospel should be called the 'Gospel of Titus' or, more adequately, the Gospel of Pseudo-Titus. Nevertheless, in this commentary the traditional terms: 'Luke', 'Lucan', etc. will be used for the sake of clarity.

Literary genre

The Gospel of Luke cannot be adequately construed as biography because the character of Jesus is presented therein in a highly sophisticated intertextual way, with the use of a lot of allusions to the Septuagint,[41] Paul's letters, Greek literature, etc. Accordingly, the Gospel of Luke should not be interpreted as a simple biography, but rather as a literary work in which complex intertextual references to other works are presented in the well-known form of biography.

In fact, the Lucan work should be categorized, similarly to the Gospel of Mark, as 'scriptural biography' because of its authoritative status for the believers, its sequential hypertextual use of earlier theological texts, its apparently biographic form, and its very loose connection with the historical facts.[42]

However, in comparison to the Marcan Gospel, the Gospel of Luke evidently has much more features of literary biography. To the narrative framework of the Marcan Gospel, which only apparently resembled a Hellenistic biography,[43] Luke added several topics and motifs which could be found in Graeco-Roman biographies: preface (Lk 1:1–4), birth (Lk 2:1–39), childhood and education

---

41 Cf. D. P. Moessner, 'How Luke writes', in M. Bockmuehl and D. A. Hagner (eds.), *The Written Gospel* (Cambridge University: Cambridge · New York 2005), 149–170 (esp. 161).

42 Cf. T. Dykstra, *Mark, Canonizer of Paul: A New Look at Intertextuality in Mark's Gospel* (OACB: St Paul, Minn. 2012), 201–220, who argues for the genre of 'scriptural historiography' in the similar case of the Gospel of Mark.

43 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Mark*, 17, 33–34.

(Lk 2:40–52), ancestry (Lk 3:23–38), appearances after the death (Lk 24:13–50), and ascension into heaven (Lk 24:51).[44] In this way, he created a work which came to be regarded as a true, historically reliable biography of Jesus.

Date of composition

The *terminus a quo* of the composition of the Lucan Gospel is determined by the date of the composition of the Gospel of Mark, which was in turn written after the writings of Flavius Josephus, so not earlier than *c.* AD 100–110, maybe even as late as *c.* AD 130–135.[45]

On the other hand, the *terminus ad quem* is constituted by the extensive use of the Lucan Gospel by Marcion, so presumably not later than *c.* AD 145,[46] and in Justin's *Apologia I* (cf. e.g. *1 Apol.* 33.4–5 and Lk 1:35.26–28.31–32; *1 Apol.* 50.12 and Lk 24:25–27.49.51), so presumably not later than *c.* AD 153.[47]

Accordingly, the Gospel of Luke was most likely written *c.* AD 120–140.[48]

---

44 Cf. R. A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTSMS 70; Cambridge University: Cambridge 1992), 133–134, 146, 161–162, 178–180; id., 'Biography', in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 b.c.–a.d. 400* (Brill: Boston · Leiden 2001), 371–391 (esp. 379–381, 383); M. W. Martin, 'Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and Other *Bioi*?', *NTS* 54 (2008) 18–41 (esp. 36–38); S. A. Adams, *The Genre of Acts and Collected Biography* (SNTSMS 156; Cambridge University: Cambridge 2013), 257–260, 264–278.

45 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Mark*, 110 n.12, 158–159 n. 140, 202 n. 17.

46 The fact that Marcion seems to have protested against the pro-Jewish 'falsification' of the Pauline gospel in the Gospel of Luke, with its theological combination of the gospel with the Law and the Prophets, especially in Lk 1:1–4:30 (cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.27.2; Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.5.4–4.7.1), suggests that the Lucan Gospel appeared not long before AD 144, when Marcion left the Christian community and 'censured' the Lucan work. On the relative priority of the canonical Gospel of Luke against Marcion's Gospel, see recently D. T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel* (NTTSD 49; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2015), 437–438.

47 Cf. Justin, *Apologie pour les chrétiens*, ed. C. Munier (SC 507; Cerf: Paris 2006), 28.

48 Cf. C. Mount, *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul* (NovTSup 104; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 2002), 168: 'sometime before about AD 130'. For a similar dating of Acts, see recently W. O. Walker, Jr., 'Portrayal', 495: in the middle of the second century AD; R. I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary*, ed. H. W. Attridge (Hermeneia; Fortress: Minneapolis 2009), 5, 20: *c.* AD 115; id., 'Acts in the Suburbs of the Apologists', in T. E. Phillips (ed.), *Contemporary Studies in Acts* (Mercer University: [*s.l.*] 2009), 29–46 (esp. 46: *c.* AD 110–130).

Sequential hypertextuality

The research on the sequential hypertextual relationship between the Lucan Gospel and the Pauline letters is difficult mainly due to the lack of universally accepted methods of research on the phenomenon of intertextuality.

The problems already begin with the use of the concept of intertextuality. Some scholars, on the grounds of a particular ideological origin and context of the use of the term 'intertextuality' in literary criticism, strongly object to the use of this term for an analysis of the presence of allusions to an earlier text in a later text.[49] However, these scholars seem to forget what they are arguing for, namely that the authorial intent in coining a given term is not decisive for its meaning. Accordingly, even if Julia Kristeva's intent in coining the term 'intertextuality' may have been quite particular, it does not preclude using this term in ways which somehow differ from her authorial intent,[50] especially if a number of biblical scholars agree to apply this term to a method of analysing literary connections between two texts, and not to a particular ideology in literary criticism.

Such a diachronic concept of intertextuality[51] was developed by Gérard Genette, who argued for using the term *hypertextuality* in the cases of loose intertextual relationships. According to the French scholar, hypertextuality can be defined as any relationship uniting a text B (which is in such a case called hypertext) to an earlier text A (which is called hypotext), upon which it grafts itself in a manner that is not that of commentary.[52]

In the case of a truly hypertextual relationship between two given texts, a high degree of literary creativity and imagination on the part of the author of the hypertext should be allowed for. For example, the authors of hypertexts frequently make various kinds of thematic, diegetic, and pragmatic transposition,[53] especially

---

49 See e.g. D. I. Yoon, 'The Ideological Inception of Intertextuality and its Dissonance in Current Biblical Studies', *CBR* 12 (2012) 58–76.

50 Cf. L. A. Huizenga, 'The Old Testament in the New, Intertextuality and Allegory', *JSNT* 38.1 (2005) 17–35 (esp. 25).

51 Cf. J. Barton, 'Déjà lu: Intertextuality, Method or Theory?', in K. J. Dell and W. Kynes (eds.), *Reading Job Intertextually* (LHBOTS 574; Bloomsbury: New York [et al.] 2013), 1–16 (esp. 7–9, 12, 14–15); W. Kynes, 'Intertextuality: Method and Theory in Job and Psalm 119', in K. J. Dell and P. M. Joyce (eds.), *Biblical Interpretation and Method*, Festschrift J. Barton (Oxford University: Oxford 2013), 201–213 (esp. 202–206).

52 Cf. G. Genette, *Palimpsestes*, 13: 'Hypertextualité [:] J'entends par là toute relation unissant un texte B (que j'appellerai *hypertexte*) à un texte antérieur A (que j'appellerai, bien sûr, *hypotexte*) sur lequel il se greffe d'une manière qui n'est pas celle du commentaire.'

53 Cf. ibid. 418.

by using the sophisticated procedures of transdiegetization,[54] interfigurality,[55] internymic deviation,[56] transsexuation,[57] temporal translation,[58] spatial translation,[59] transpragmatization,[60] transmotivation,[61] transvalorization,[62] elaboration, compression, conflation, substitution of images and ideas, and form-change.[63]

In fact, numerous examples of very subtle, at times hardly identifiable allusions to earlier texts, as well as highly creative reworkings of them, can be found both in classical literature[64] and in biblical writings.[65] The ancient metaphor of bees producing honey from various flowers, so that the product clearly differs from its sources, aptly illustrates the ancient hypertextual procedure of rhetorical *aemulatio*.[66]

---

54 Cf. ibid. 419–421.

55 Cf. W. G. Müller, 'Interfigurality: A Study on the Interdependence of Literary Figures', in H. F. Plett (ed.), *Intertextuality* (RTT 15; de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 1991), 101–121; K. Schiffner, *Lukas liest Exodus: Eine Untersuchung zur Aufnahme ersttestamentlicher Befreiungsgeschichte im lukanischen Werk als Schrift-Lektüre* (BWANT 9.12; W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2008), 40–42.

56 Cf. W. G. Müller, 'Interfigurality', 104–105.

57 Cf. G. Genette, *Palimpsestes*, 423–424.

58 Cf. ibid. 431.

59 Cf. ibid.

60 Cf. ibid. 442.

61 Cf. ibid. 457.

62 Cf. ibid. 483.

63 Cf. T. L. Brodie, *Birthing*, 10–13. Cf. also T. L. Brodie, D. R. MacDonald, and S. E. Porter, 'Conclusion: Problems of Method—Suggested Guidelines', in eid. (eds.), *Intertextuality*, 284–296 (esp. 288–290), who list 39 techniques of literary adaptation and group them into the categories of basis adaptation techniques, combinations and rearrangements, focus techniques, transformation, and substitution.

64 Cf. S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (RLIC; Cambridge University: Cambridge 1998), esp. 17–47, 99–122; E. Finkelpearl, 'Pagan Traditions of Intertextuality in the Roman World', in D. R. MacDonald (ed.), *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (SAC; Trinity International: Harrisburg, Pa. 2001), 78–90 (esp. 82–90); T. L. Brodie, *Birthing*, 8–17.

65 Cf. M.-É. Kiessel, 'Intertextualité et hypertextualité en Jn 11,1–12,11', *ETL* 81 (2005) 29–56; D. Ziegler, *Dionysos in der Apostelgeschichte – eine intertextuelle Lektüre* (Religion und Biographie 18; Lit: Berlin 2008), *passim*; S. Butticaz, 'Has God', 148–164; J. Descreux, 'Apocalypse 12 ou de l'art d'accommoder les mythes', in C. Clivaz [et al.] (eds.), *Écritures*, 345–359 (esp. 355–356).

66 Cf. K. O. Sandnes, *The Gospel 'According to Homer and Virgil': Cento and Canon* (NovTSup 138; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2011), 39–41.

The research on hypertextuality is fascinating because 'in this process, every sign in a text can trigger an intertextual relation. Once a marker is recognized, other texts come into focus and readers can look for further elements proving or supporting their first association.'[67] This phenomenon was very well known to the Fathers of the Church, who interpreted biblical texts as closely related to other biblical texts, even if at times the existence of such a relationship was postulated on the basis of just one particular association.[68]

The second problem with the use of the concept of hypertextuality concerns methodology. In the related project concerning the relationship between the Marcan Gospel and the Pauline letters, its leading scholars maintain that 'further progress with regard to the question about the Mark/Paul relationship will have to rely, not on scholars' imaginative powers or on their capacities for reading the texts, but on their achieving the utmost clarity concerning theoretical and methodological framework with which they as scholars approach the issue.'[69]

However, if biblical scholarship should not rely on scholars' capacities for reading the texts, then on what should it ultimately rely: on abstract methods, devised in other fields of research, mainly to analyse interpretatively much simpler texts? With all due respect for the quest for scholarly objectivity, methods should be adequate to the object of study, and not vice versa. Therefore, especially in the humanities, obsession with following abstract methods is not always advisable. In this area, the capacity to interpret the objects of study is much more important.

Moreover, in the case of biblical scholarship, the old maxim, already somehow known to the Fathers of the Church, should be taken into due methodological consideration: 'What was written with imagination must be read with imagination.'[70] Again, with all due respect for the quest for methodological clarity, nothing can substitute for the use of imagination in analysing works of culture and art in which earlier motifs were reworked in highly creative ways.

In fact, the way of reworking of the Letter to the Galatians in the Lucan Gospel is very creative, resembling a haggadic midrash illustrating legal matters rather

---

67 S. Gillmayr-Bucher, 'Intertextuality: Between Literary Theory and Text Analysis', in T. L. Brodie, D. R. MacDonald, and S. E. Porter (eds.), *Intertextuality*, 13–23 (here: 19).

68 Cf. J. Barton, 'Déjà lu', 1–2.

69 E. -M. Becker, T. Engberg-Pedersen, and M. Müller, 'Mark and Paul – Introductory Remarks', in eid. (eds.), *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II: For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark* (BZNW 199; De Gruyter: Berlin · Boston 2014), 1–10 (here: 10).

70 L. Alonso Schökel with J. M. Bravo, *A Manual of Hermeneutics*, trans. L. M. Rosa, ed. B. W. R. Pearson (BibSem 54; Sheffield Academic: Sheffield 1998), 170.

than a simple reproduction of the Pauline letter, with the use of its key words etc. For this reason, it should not be categorized as 'rewritten Scripture', 'parascriptural literature', etc., but it should rather be analysed within the broader category of 'hypertextuality'.[71] Neither should Luke's intertextual procedures be limited to those of mimesis and direct citation.[72] Rather, Luke's sequential hypertextual reworking of the Letter to the Galatians in the form of biography of Jesus should be compared with Luke's literary models, namely the sequentially organized hypertextual-historiographic Scriptures (Gen-Kgs),[73] as well as the sequentially organized hypertextual-biographic Gospel of Mark.[74] Luke evidently wanted to compose a confessional narrative (cf. Lk 1:4), and therefore he followed the scriptural and Marcan, sequential-hypertextual confessional models, rather than pagan ones.[75]

Accordingly, the analysis of the use of Paul's letters in the Lucan Gospel should not be limited to finding intertextual allusions or echoes, regarded as repetitions of some words or phrases,[76] or even clusters of words and ideas, as it was done

---

71 For recent discussions concerning the definitions and application of these terms, see e.g. A. Lange, 'In the Second Degree: Ancient Jewish Paratextual Literature in the Context of Graeco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature', in P. S. Alexander, A. Lange, and R. J. Pillinger (eds.), *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature* (Brill: Leiden · Boston 2010), 3–40 (esp. 13–19); A. K. Petersen, 'Textual Fidelity, Elaboration, Supersession or Encroachment? Typological Reflections on the Phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture', in J. Zsengellér (ed.), Rewritten Bible *after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes* (JSJSup 166; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2014), 13–48 (esp. 19–31); J. G. Campbell, 'Rewritten Bible: A Terminological Reassessment', in J. Zsengellér (ed.), *Rewritten*, 49–81 (esp. 51–69).

72 *Pace* A. W. Pitts, 'Source Citation in Greek Historiography and in Luke(-Acts)', in S. E. Porter and A. W. Pitts (eds.), *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament* (TENT 9; Early Christianity in Its Hellenistic Context 1; Brill: Leiden · Boston 2013), 349–388 (esp. 378–388).

73 Cf. G. E. Sterling, *Historiography*, 357–363. For an analysis of the sequentially organized, hypertextual features of these Scriptures, see B. Adamczewski, *Retelling*, *passim*.

74 Cf. G. E. Sterling, *Historiography*, 350–352. For an analysis of the sequentially organized, hypertextual features of the Marcan Gospel, see B. Adamczewski, *Mark*, *passim*.

75 *Pace* U. Luz, 'Die Geburtsgeschichten Jesu und die Geschichte', in P. von Gemünden [et al.] (eds.), *Jesus – Gestalt und Gestaltungen: Rezeptionen des Galiläers in Wissenschaft, Kirche und Gesellschaft*, Festschrift G. Theißen (NTOA 100; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2013), 167–191 (esp. 187).

76 Cf. J. Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (University of California: Berkeley · Los Angeles · London 1981), 62–132.

by previous scholars,[77] but it should also include tracing echoes regarded more broadly as 'structuring an account along the lines of a specific tradition, while not expressly using any common vocabulary'.[78]

However, it should not be axiomatically assumed that Luke intended his audience to 'hear' his echoes and allusions,[79] including those to the Pauline letters. As was noticed above, scholars have traced a number of allusions to Paul's letters in the Lucan work, but given Luke's evident avoidance of any direct reference to these letters, it is by no means certain that he expected his readers, at least all of them, to recognize such allusions. Rather, it seems that he envisaged two kinds of reading of his narrative: a 'catechetic' one, intended to convey Pauline and post-Pauline ideas in a narrative form to more general audience (cf. Lk 1:4b), and an 'apologetic' one, offering an edifying interpretative key to Paul's letters for those who might be unsettled by their highly polemical contents (cf. Lk 1:1–4a).

Accordingly, the task of tracing the literary interplay between the Lucan narrative and Paul's letters, the Septuagint, Josephus' writings, other Jewish works, classical literature, etc. was most probably intentionally reserved for the most curious and most educated readers. The same, however, also refers to other biblical writings, with their hidden allusions to the prophetic writings in Deuteronomy, to the Mesopotamian literature in Genesis, etc.[80]

Therefore, even if the research on intertextual allusions in the Lucan Gospel methodologically resembles skating over thin ice, it is worth undertaking because Luke was evidently fond of making literary allusions to earlier authoritative texts, for example to the Septuagint.[81]

In any truly scholarly research on hypertextuality in the Gospels, some relatively reliable criteria for detecting intertextual allusions should be applied.

---

77 Cf. e.g. M. D. Goulder, *Luke*, [vol. 1] 132–143; W. Schenk, 'Luke', 132–138.

78 K. D. Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; T&T Clark: London · New York 2005), 55. Cf. S. Holthuis, *Intertextualität: Aspekte einer rezeptionsorientierten Konzeption* (Stauffenburg Colloquium 28; Stauffenburg: Tübingen 1993), 91–94, 140–147, 214–215; R. Reuter, 'Clarifying the Issue of Literary Dependence', in K. Liljeström (ed.), *The Early Reception of Paul* (SESJ 99; Finnish Exegetical Society: Helsinki 2011), 23–35 (esp. 24–30).

79 *Pace* K. D. Litwak, *Echoes*, 61, 64.

80 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Retelling*, 25–181.

81 Cf. A. Denaux, 'Old Testament Models for the Lukan Travel Narrative: A Critical Survey', in id., *Studies in the Gospel of Luke: Structure, Language and Theology* (TTS 4; Lit: Münster 2010), 39–70 (esp. 41).

Otherwise, this kind of research would consist in offering merely subjective interpretative proposals.

Among the criteria for detecting a hypertextual relationship between the Lucan Gospel and the Letter to the Galatians, those proposed by Dennis R. MacDonald[82] seem to be particularly useful. The criterion of *accessibility* is met if it is likely that the author of the Lucan Gospel had access to the letters of Paul the Apostle. The criterion of *analogy* is met if it can be shown that other authors used the Letters to the Galatians in a similar way. The criterion of *density* is met if it can be demonstrated that the correspondences between the Lucan Gospel and the Letter to the Galatians are numerous enough to postulate the existence of a truly literary connection. The criterion of *order* is met if the correspondences between the Lucan Gospel and the Letter to the Galatians in both works appear in the same order. The criterion of *distinctive traits* is met if some correspondences between the Lucan Gospel and the Letter to the Galatians are peculiar to them both, and not simply generic. The criterion of *interpretability* is met if the understanding of the Lucan Gospel gains something when this Gospel is viewed against the background of the Letter to the Galatians.

In fact, the most important criterion for detecting hypertextual relationships, at least between biblical writings, is the criterion of *order*. If two given works reveal thematic or other correspondences which follow a sequential pattern, it is reasonable to suppose that the author of one of these works in a hypertextual way reworked the other work, preserving the basic sequence of its themes, ideas, and at least selected literary motifs.[83] In such a case, the relationship between these works may be called *sequential hypertextuality*.

With the use of this criterion, Christopher F. Evans has suggested that the content of the Lucan 'central section' (Lk 9:51–18:14) is modelled on the content of the Book of Deuteronomy (esp. Deut 1–26).[84] However, the thematic and verbal

---

82 Cf. D. R. MacDonald, 'A Categorization of Antetextuality in the Gospels and Acts: A Case for Luke's Imitation of Plato and Xenophon to Depict Paul as a Christian Socrates', in T. L. Brodie, D. R. MacDonald, and S. E. Porter (eds.), *Intertextuality*, 211–225 (esp. 212).

83 Cf. e.g. ibid.; A. M. O'Leary, *Matthew's Judaization of Mark: Examined in the Context of the Use of Sources in Graeco-Roman Antiquity* (LNTS 323; T&T Clark: London · New York 2006), 21.

84 Cf. C. F. Evans, 'The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel', in D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels*, Festschrift R. H. Lightfoot (Basil Blackwell: Oxford 1955), 37–53 (esp. 42–50).

correspondences postulated by him and some other scholars are mostly non-specific and quite vague.[85]

In other fields of biblical research, Beate Kowalski has argued that the Book of Revelation is a sequentially organized reworking of the Book of Ezekiel.[86] Likewise, David P. Wright has argued that the Covenant Code is a sequentially organized revision of the Laws of Hammurabi.[87]

Quite recently, Annette Steudel has argued that the Damascus Document closely follows the textual organization of 1QS V–VII.[88] It is interesting to note that according to her intertextual analysis, the correspondences between the two works may be of a very divergent nature, so that (*a*) sometimes both texts show a close, even literal relationship; (*b*) sometimes the later text is largely elaborating the earlier one; (*c*) at other times, much harder to see, a link through keywords builds a connection between the two texts; and (*d*) sometimes both texts simply share the same topic.[89] Accordingly, the spectrum of sequential literary reworking in Jewish literature of the turn of the era could range from an almost verbatim quotation (as it often also happens in Luke's reworking of the Gospel of Mark) to a vague thematic correspondence with no verbal link between the two texts (as it often also happens in Luke's reworking of the Letter to the Galatians and other works).[90]

In the cases in which the level of verbal agreement between fragments of two given texts (a feature which in biblical scholarship usually functions as a token of literary dependence) is very low, and consequently the relationship between both texts is truly hypertextual, the criterion of order is particularly useful. In such cases, the weakness of purely linguistic signals of literary dependence (quoted

---

85 Cf. A. Denaux, 'Old Testament', 43–44, 46–48.

86 Cf. B. Kowalski, *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes* (SBB 52; Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart 2004), 307–426, 464–472.

87 Cf. D. P. Wright, *Inventing God's Law: How the Covenant Code of the Bible Used and Revised the Laws of Hammurabi* (Oxford University: New York 2009), *passim* (esp. 347).

88 Cf. A. Steudel, 'The Damascus Document (D) as a Rewriting of the Community Rule (S)', *RevQ* 25 (2012) 605–620.

89 Cf. ibid. 608.

90 The recognition of this spectrum is important in the context of modern tendencies to restrict scholarly analyses of allusive use of earlier texts to cases in which there is some significant or extensive verbal parallelism: cf. e.g. P. Foster, 'Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament', *JSNT* 38.1 (2005) 96–111 (esp. 109). Understandably, in cases of low verbal agreement other criteria of allusive use of another text (order etc.) should be taken into due consideration.

or imitated sentences, reproduced characteristic phrases, etc.) is recompensed by the consistency of strictly sequential reworking of the conceptual elements (ideas, images, arguments, references to time, directions of movement, functions of characters, etc.) of one work in the other one.

The criterion of order is particularly compelling if it refers not only to larger sections or pericopes, but also to individual sentences or even clauses, phrases, and words. In such cases, its argumentative force is very high, even if the level of verbal or formal agreement between the compared texts is very low. It is namely true that the detection of a sequence of several similar elements, something which is at times used in scholarship for postulating the existence of various chiastic, concentric, and parallel patterns in biblical texts, can be regarded as more or less subjective. However, the degree of interpretative subjectivity is much lower if the common sequence of conceptually corresponding elements consists of tens or hundreds of sequentially arranged items.[91]

Another criterion which is very important for detecting hypertextual relationships, at least between biblical writings, is the criterion of *interpretability*. In case the literary features of a given writing can be understood better if it is regarded as a reworking of an earlier text, than this type of analysis should not be regarded as purely subjective[92] and consisting in merely looking for parallels ('parallelomania').

This criterion is particularly convincing if both major, well-known literary problems and small, rarely noticed, not easily perceivable *surprising features* of a given literary work can be explained by the hypothesis that this work is an imperfect reworking of an earlier text, in which such problems and surprising features are absent.[93] In fact, every reworking of something else leaves some traces, and even a gifted and creative reworker, such as Luke, is not always capable of eliminating all of them, especially if they are barely noticeable.[94] Paying due

---

91 Cf. T. L. Brodie, *Birthing*, 45.

92 On the other hand, it should be noticed that interpretation is always an art, and there are no criteria which would provide absolute objectivity and reliability of a given interpretative proposal.

93 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q?*, 201–202. Cf. also the use of this criterion in M. D. Goulder, *Luke*, [vol. 1] 132–143 for ascertaining not only the existence, but also the direction of literary dependence between the Lucan Gospel and Paul's letters.

94 *Pace* G. Genette, *Palimpsestes*, 555, who has argued that the hypertext, being semantically autonomous, does not contain any perceivable internal 'agrammaticality'. Genette's general idea does not always refer to all minor details of the hypertext because the inevitable tension between the intratextual and intertextual levels of the meaning of

attention to such small, intriguing literary ungrammaticalities, which are usually neglected or only superficially explained by most commentators,[95] may give important clues to the discovery of a hypertextual relationship of a given text to a hypotext.[96]

Therefore, there is no other way for good exegesis than being curious and patient, and not being deceived by merely hypothetical, easily manipulable solutions offered by many scholars (lost sources, numerous redactional strata, widely circulating oral traditions, insufficient knowledge on the part of the author, only later attested customs,[97] not adequately proven events,[98] complicated narrative strategies, etc.).

In fact, the criterion of interpretability is particularly reliable if it explains not only the presence, but also the *function of the allusions* to other texts in the hypertext.[99] In such cases, the danger of mere 'parallelomania' is greatly reduced. Accordingly, in such cases the criterion of interpretability can be regarded as decisive for ascertaining the existence of a hypertextual relationship between two given writings.

---

the hypertext often results in some consciously or unconsciously created disruptions to its intratextual logic. On the other hand, the hypertext does not necessarily contain aberrant features, ungrammaticalities, anomalies, inconsequences, non sequiturs, the loss of narrativity, etc. which are so evident that they function as really sylleptic, and consequently compulsory in their impelling the reader to pursue the search for a hypotext, as it has been argued by M. Riffaterre, *Fictional Truth* (Parallax: Re-visions of Culture and Society; 2nd edn., The John Hopkins University: Baltimore · London 1993), 90–91.

95 Cf. D. Seccombe, 'Incongruity in the Gospel Parables', *TynBul* 62 (2011) 161–172 (esp. 162, 171). However, there is no adequate reason for attributing such intriguing and bizarre details to the historical Jesus, and not to the evangelist.

96 Cf. R. L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (ISBL; Indiana University: Bloomington · Indianapolis 1995), 14.

97 It should be noted that, for example, rabbinic traditions which refer to various Jewish customs cannot be regarded as by definition uninfluenced by the New Testament writings.

98 In biblical scholarship, the historical facticity of many events is often postulated on the basis of the biblical writings which somehow refer to them. However, such a procedure is based on the erroneous presupposition concerning the historical value of the biblical works as relatively faithfully reflecting the historical realities. See B. Adamczewski, *Constructing*, *passim*; id., *Retelling*, *passim*.

99 Cf. A. M. O'Leary, *Matthew's Judaization*, 22. Cf. also T. L. Brodie, *Birthing*, 46, who uses the criterion of the intelligibility of the differences between both texts.

The main aim of this commentary consists in analysing the sequential hypertextual reworking of the Letter to the Galatians in the Gospel of Luke. Therefore, other Lucan allusions will only be analysed here in a selective way, in order not to overload the work with mentioning all possible intertextual references.

It is also evident that this commentary has been written from a particular interpretative perspective. As such, it resembles modern commentaries which are based on a particular interpretative approach: reader-response, reception-historical, social-scientific, feminist, etc.[100] Therefore, it significantly differs from 'traditional' commentaries, which aim at describing and evaluating various scholarly solutions to all problems that are posed by the commented text.[101] Nevertheless, it answers the most basic questions which are discussed in every commentary: the meaning of words, phrases, clauses, sentences, pericopes, and ultimately the meaning of the whole book.[102]

---

100   For a discussion on such a way of writing commentaries, see M. Y. MacDonald, 'The Art of Commentary Writing: Reflections from Experience', *JSNT* 29.3 (2007) 313–321 (esp. 317–320).

101   For this type of commentary, see e.g. B. Adamczewski, *List do Filemona, List do Kolosan: Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz* (NKBNT 12; Edycja Świętego Pawła: Częstochowa 2006).

102   Cf. M. Y. MacDonald, 'Art', 320.