THE GOSPEL OF LUKE AS REWRITTEN MARK: JESUS AS A HELLENISTIC "DIVINE MAN"

by

Tyler Dean Melton

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in
Religious Studies

Charlotte

2022

Approved by:

_____
Dr. James D. Tabor

_____
Dr. Robert McEachnie

_____
Dr. Shimon Gibson

ABSTRACT

TYLER DEAN MELTON. The Gospel of Luke as Rewritten Mark: Jesus as a Hellenistic "Divine Man."
(Under the direction of DR. JAMES TABOR)

In a society that reveres "divine men" who typically hold positions of power, it should be no surprise that an author would want the subject of their writings to emulate traits that line up with such a title – even if they are rewriting an earlier source. The book of Luke is a prime example of this notion, acting as a rewritten version of Mark that seeks to portray Jesus as yet another Hellenistic "divine man." The author utilizes multiple revision strategies to achieve such a portrayal, including placing emphasis on Jesus' divine heritage, enhancing the praise that Jesus receives for his actions, and crafting the emotions of Jesus to present an argument for his divine status. All this is done through intentional additions and redactions from the Mark text, of which there are many. These changes provide readers with information about the time period in which the Lucan author writes while also providing insight into his goal of universalizing the Jesus movement by elevating the person of Jesus to a deified state, as it relates to Roman society.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

There has been much discussion in the field of Christian Origins regarding the literary genre of our New Testament gospels—especially the gospel of Luke—and its companion volume know as Acts of the Apostles—which focuses mainly on the apostle Paul.[1] This two-volume work we know as Luke-Acts appears to reflect more particularly the kind of model we find in other biographies of "divine men" (*theios anēr*) figures in the Hellenistic world. Morton Smith and Moses Hadas laid the groundwork for these comparative studies in 1965 with their pioneering work, *Heroes and Gods: Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity*, and more particularly, Morton Smith's classic 1971 article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* "Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretalogies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus," brought this comparative

[1] The gospel of Luke is universally viewed by scholars and non-specialists alike as a two-volume work we know as Luke-Acts. It is usually dated in the last decades of the first century or the first decades of the second century CE. For various dating proposals see Frank Dicken, "The Author and Date of Luke-Acts: Exploring the Options," *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays*, ed. Sean A. Adams, Michael Pahl (Piscataway, NJ, USA: Gorgias Press, 2012), 7-26. Although it is traditionally attributed to Luke, the companion of Paul, who is named in Philemon 24 as a fellow-worker, as well as referenced in two deutero-Pauline letters (Col 4:14; 2 Tim 4:11), most scholars consider it anonymous. It is usually dated in the 80s or 90s CE, during the reigns of the Romans Emperors Titus (79-81 CE) and Domitian (81-96 CE), the two sons of Vespasian, although some place it in the early 2nd century, during the reign of Trajan (98-117 CE). Both volumes begin with first-person prologues addressed to one "Theophilus," of whom we know nothing—apparently a patron of the author (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1-2). The book of Acts also contains a first-person travel narrative (Acts 16:10–17; 20:5–15; 21:1–18; 27:1–37; 28:1-16) which may or may not reflect the experience of the author—but is surely intended to reflect such a first-hand acquaintance with Paul. Since the composite work ends abruptly with Paul's house arrest in Rome, generally dated around 60-62 CE, yet it most clearly can be dated as after the destruction of Temple and city of Jerusalem in the summer of 70 CE (Luke 21:20-24), the author purposely limits his account to a period a decade before. See Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of* Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970) and Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of AD 70 on Christianity*, 2nd edition (London: S.P.C.K., 1957). For other introductory matters see Steve Mason and Tom Robinson, "Biography, Anecdote, and History," in *Early Christian Reader* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), pp. 243-283 and Raymond Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testamen*t, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

method of gospel research to mainstream New Testament studies.[2] These initial studies has generated a wide-ranging discussion among New Testament scholars.[3] It is noteworthy that this sort of "divinization" or apotheosis is developing in wider Jewish circles during this period, with figures like Enoch, Elijah, and even Moses. The first century CE Jewish historian Josephus is a good parallel here, since he is writing in the same period as the author of Luke-Acts.[4]

One advantage of these broader studies is they have allowed traditional theological discussions of "Christology"—i.e. to what extent Jesus of Nazareth is presented as "Divine,"—to be viewed in a much broader Greco-Roman context. This is particularly the case with the gospel of Luke, as it reflects the standard pattern of other such "divine men" in the Hellenistic period—namely extraordinary or "divine" birth, miraculous deeds, wise teachings, and an exemplary death.

In my thesis I highlight the ways in which the author of Luke very consciously goes about enhancing the "divine" status and authority of Jesus over against his narrative source Mark. On the one hand Luke follows his Marcan source rather closely, much more so than Matthew, if one examines each pericope taken from Mark by Matthew and Luke respectively in

---

[2] Morton Smith, "Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretalogies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 174-198. Typically, such Hellenistic biographies as Philostratus *Apollonius of Tyana,* Porphyry *The Life of Pythagoras,* Arrian *Anabasis of Alexander* and the various figures lauded by Diogenes Laertius are compared. One of the best overview of this comparative enterprise is Walter L. Liefeld, "'Divine Man' and the Figure of Jesus in the Gospels, *Journal of Evangelical Theology*, 16:4 (Fall 1973): 195-205.

[3] The literature is extensive but see especially Charles H. Talbert, *What Is a Gospel: the Genre of the Canonical Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977) with many responses, including David Aune, "The Problem of the Genre of the Gospels: A Critique of C. H. Talbert's 'What is a Gospel'," *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, Vol. II, R.T. France and David Wenham, eds. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (1981): 9-60.

[4] James D. Tabor, "'Returning to the Divinity': Josephus' Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989) 225-238.

their edited or rewritten form. However, Luke significantly *rewrites* his core Marcan story in ways that transform it substantially—especially in regard to enhancing the "divine" status of Jesus as the "Son of the Most High God." This includes several major deliberate omissions as well as careful editing along the way in material that he retains from Mark. The author's recasting of Mark goes far beyond mere "editing" of details, as careful as he is with his core source—he shapes it in consistent and detailed ways that are reflective of his overall vision of the emerging Christian movement in the wider Roman world—and the divine/human figure of Jesus presented as fulfillment of Hebrew scriptures and a new a model for humanity.

Although abundant attention has been given by New Testament scholars and historians to both the history and theology of the composite work Luke-Acts, this *very restricted and defined method* will allow for a tightly controlled and well-defined comparative process.[5] Luke-Acts is a complex work and its multiple sources, referred to by the author in his introduction to Luke (Luke 1:1-4), are unavailable to us. Traditional Lukan scholarship identifies three sources of Luke: our gospel of Mark, the two-source Sayings materials common between Luke and Matthew that scholars usually refer to as Q, and the substantial materials unique to Luke, usually designated as L. Since we don't have Q independently of Luke and Matthew, and we have no idea about the sources of the L materials, it is noteworthy that we do have access to Luke's

[5] The historical research on Luke-Acts is immense. The classic older work by Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*. 2nd ed. (Ada, MI: Baker Academic, 1999) is foundational in terms of placing this work in its ancient literary contexts. Likewise, Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (New York: Harper, 1961) establishes the fundament theological categories. Joseph A. Fitzmyer's two volumes in the Anchor Bible, *The Gospel According to Luke* (New York: Doubleday,1979) I have found indispensable. Fitzmyer includes an extended bibliography divided according to categories (I:271-283). François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Thirty-three Years of Research (1950-1983)* (Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1987) includes extensive annotations. Specific studies upon which I have most relied I have put in the footnotes and bibliography.

source Mark.[6] It is this realization—that we *have* Luke's main narrative source—that provides the underpinning of my analysis.

In this Lukan rewriting of Mark, we see a consistent effort to distance Jesus from the more human depiction of the Marcan narrative and bring him closer to a divine status. The author does this in a variety of ways that I will analyze including a heightened authority for Jesus as cosmic Christ and "Lord," enhancing his status in terms of praise, and downplaying Mark's portrayal of Jesus' emotions. In addition, the Lukan author presents the miracles of Jesus in a way that closely relates him to the Yahweh, the God of Israel, and his power as manifested through the divine anointed figure of Jesus who singularly fulfills the core eschatological promises of the Hebrew Prophets.

[6] The classic work on New Testament gospel relationships is B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins* (New York: Macmillan, 1925). In this thesis I am accepting the fundamental arguments he makes for "Marcan priority," that is that Mark is our earliest gospel and that both Matthew and Luke use Mark as their main narrative source.

First-Century Royal Divinity

Before exploring the classification of Jesus as "divine man", it is important to have some understanding of what a "divine man" looked like in his world. As mentioned above, there are shared traits that exist between Hellenistic figures who were commonly perceived as possessing a divine nature. These traits – extraordinary or "divine" birth, miraculous deeds, wise teachings, and an exemplary death – are prominent in records of significant Roman figures, specifically emperors. However, they also mirror many of the reasons that Jesus is considered a "divine man." For a better understanding of their similarities, consider the accounts of Caesar Augustus and Vespasian.

Caesar Augustus

The deification of Roman emperors begins with Julius Caesar, but the practice continues long after his death. However, when Roman citizens attempted to label Caesar Augustus as a "divine man" for his status as emperor and expansion of the empire towards the beginning of the first century, he rejected such notions. Despite his efforts, the Roman senate still imposed upon him the title of "Divus" – meaning "the deified" – following his death in 14 A.D. and encouraged that he be worshipped as a god. [7] This worship manifested itself on one particular occasion in the form of an inscription attributed to the high priest Apollonius. The homage to Octavian speaks on the divine nature of his birth, saying that he was intentionally created by providence to be born as a god. Additionally, the inscription mentions Augustus' role as savior

[7] See Henry Burton, "The Worship of the Roman Emperors," *The Biblical World* 40, no. 2 (1912): 82-83.

of generations, ender of wars, and creator of order. Another interesting aspect is the proclamation that with his birth came forth a "gospel/good tiding" for the world.[8] While specific "miracle" and "teaching" terminology is not utilized, the mention of Augustus' ability to end wars, create order, and save generations can be considered miraculous deeds and wise teachings. Combine that with the intentionality suggested regarding his birth and the inscription provides an almost-complete description of a "divine man." The only aspect of a "divine man" that is missing from the inscription is an exemplary death, but this can be found in Suetonius' account of the final moments of Augustus.[9]

As a result, Caesar Augustus establishes a precedent for the "divine man" leading into the first century, only a few years before the birth of Jesus. Such traits will continue to be emulated by other Roman emperors, even after the time of Jesus.

Vespasian

Perhaps a more theatrical example of a Hellenistic "divine man" is the Roman emperor Vespasian. Ruling after the time of Jesus, Vespasian fulfills his role as a "divine man" in a

---

[8] Known as Priene Inscription 105/the Priene Calendar Inscription, this two-tablet work is believed to have been cut in 9 BC and is currently held by the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Craig Evans references the inscription in his work "Mark's Incipit and the Priene Calendar Inscription: From Jewish Gospel to Greco-Roman Gospel," and even includes a translated portion of the piece, which reads: "It seemed good to the Greeks of Asia, in the opinion of the high priest Apollonius of Menophilus Azanitus: 'Since Providence, which has ordered all things and is deeply interested in our life, has set in most perfect order by giving us Augustus, whom she filled with virtue that he might benefit humankind, sending him as a savior [σωτήρ], both for us and for our descendants, that he might end war and arrange all things, and since he, Caesar, by his appearance [έπιφανειω] (excelled even our anticipations), surpassing all previous benefactors, and note even leaving to posterity any hope of surpassing what he has done, and since the birthday of the god Augustus was the beginning of the good tidings for the world that came by reason of him…which Asia resolved in Smyrna."

[9] See D. Wardle, "A Perfect Send-off: Suetonius and the Dying Art of Augustus (Suetonius, Aug. 99)," *Mnemosyne* 60, no. 3 (2007): 443-63.

supernatural fashion that mirrors the Nazarene fairly well. The attribute of Vespasian that stands out the most is his ability to perform miracles.

In the fourth book of Tacitus, an account of the miracles performed by Vespasian is provided. It reads:

> In the months during which Vespasian was waiting at Alexandria for the periodical return of the summer gales and settled weather at sea, many wonders occurred which seemed to point him out as the object of the favour of heaven and of the partiality of the Gods. One of the common people of Alexandria, well known for his blindness, threw himself at the Emperor's knees, and implored him with groans to heal his infirmity. This he did by the advice of the God Serapis, whom this nation, devoted as it is to many superstitions, worships more than any other divinity. He begged Vespasian that he would deign to moisten his cheeks and eye-balls with his spittle. Another with a diseased hand, at the council of the same God, prayed that the limb might feet the print of a Caesar's foot…And so Vespasian, supposing that all things were possible to his good fortune, and that nothing was any longer past belief, with a joyful countenance, amid the intense expectation of the multitude of bystanders, accomplished what was required. The hand was instantly restored to its use, and the light of day again shone upon the blind.[10]

This account parallels Mark 8:22-26, which tells of Jesus spitting on a man's eyes to heal his sight. The similarity in the two stories furthers the idea that miracles were identifiers of a "divine

[10] See Tacitus, *The Histories,* book IV, as translated by W.H. Fyfe.

man" in the first-century Hellenistic world, as it is a recurring trait present in those who are associated with a divine nature. However, the connections between Jesus and Vespasian are not the primary focus of the argument, rather the nature of a "divine man" in the first century.

In addition to Tacitus, Josephus writes about Vespasian's status as "divine man," going so far as to refer to him as a "Messiah."[11] More than anything, Vespasian and Caesar Augustus should serve as examples of the first-century Hellenistic "divine man" trope and display the fact that divine men were prominent in Greco-Roman society. This sets up a proper reading for the Lucan text, especially when considering it as a rewrite of the Mark text with a goal of presenting Jesus as one of these "divine men."

[11] See Josephus, *The Jewish War*, 6.5.4, as translated by William Whiston.

Son of the Most High

In rewriting Mark, the most obvious addition Luke makes is his inclusion of two long chapters on the births of John the Baptist and Jesus right at the beginning (Luke 1-2). These act as a kind of "Preface" to his use of Mark as his primary "narrative" framework that he begins only in Luke 3:4-21 which parallels in an expansive way, Mark's opening in 1:1-11.

The addition of these birth narratives is primary to Luke and sets the stage for his presentation of Jesus as a Divine Man. Although he does include Jesus' royal genealogy as stemming from king David, unlike Matthew who puts in his Davidic lineage in the very first chapter (Matthew 1:1-17), it only comes after the baptism of Jesus in Luke 3:23-38. Jesus for Luke does indeed sit on the "throne of David" as Messiah (Luke 1:32), but this human pedigree is of much less significance than Luke's unique declaration—"He will be great and will be called *the Son of the Most High"* (Luke 1:32).[12] This term "the Most High" is used over forty times in the Hebrew Bible as a designation for Yahweh, the God of Israel.[13]

When Luke recounts Jesus' lineage he traces it back to Adam, who he calls "the son of God,"—not just King David— he clearly wants to make the point that this human aspect of Jesus' origins is not what distinguishes him from all other human beings. He is indeed the

[12] This particular phrasing, of one being called "the Son of the Most High," is only found in one other text of the period, one of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q246). Although its interpretation in that fragment is not entirely clear, the designation itself is certainly of note since it never occurs anywhere else in Jewish literature. See J. A. Fitzmyer, "The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," *Biblica* 74 (1993): 153-174 and F. Garcia Martinez, "The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246," in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies in Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992): 162-172. Both Fitzmyer and Martinez see the figure as heavenly and divine—not just a human ruler or king.

[13] A few examples: Genesis 14:10; Numbers 24:16; Deuteronomy 32:8; 2 Samuel 22:14; eighteen times in the Psalms, and throughout the book of Daniel.

prophesied “Christ,” of Hebrew Scriptures, but also a kind of new Adam for humanity. Rather, as Luke makes very clear—although Mary has never known a man, she will indeed become pregnant by the Holy Spirit of God—and *that unique origin* is what makes him the Holy Son of God (Luke 1:35). In contrast, although Matthew also includes a birth story for Jesus, the emphasis there is on Joseph discovering Mary’s pregnancy—and being told in a dream to marry her anyway. Whereas in Luke the entire focus is on Mary. Although a virgin she nonetheless is pregnant by the power of the Most High overshadowing her—and is accordingly the “Son of the Most High” (Luke 1:32-35). So Luke is able to combine the “heavenly” with the “earthly,” in presenting Jesus as “the Savior, who is Christ the Lord (Luke 2:11), as well as “Son of God” (Luke 1:36) and “Son of the Most High” (Luke 1:32) because he is engendered by the “power of the Most High” (Luke 1:35).

In Luke’s account of Jesus birth one of the main emphases is the “good news of great joy” that his birth will bring to all the people—a theme I will return to below in dealing with the ways that the deeds of Jesus generate praise and joy toward God in Luke—including in his rewriting of some of Mark’s stories (Luke 2:9).

This material gives a new and more significant context to the three accounts of Jesus’ “temptations” in the desert after his baptism. Mark 1:12-13 merely states that Jesus was driven by the Spirit into the desert to be tempted by Satan, whereas in Luke his first encounter with the “Devil” begins with the specific challenge: “If you are the Son of God,” which is then repeated in his final testing (Luke 4:1-13). Even though this account, paralleled in Matthew 4:1-11, is from the two-source scholars call Q—given Luke’s birth narratives that phrase *Son of God*—and the cosmic power it implies—carries much more weight.

Further, this is followed immediately, by Luke's unique scene when Jesus returns to his hometown of Nazareth and reads from Isaiah 61:1-2—one of the most explicit passages in the Hebrew Bible about one "anointed of the spirit" not merely with oil—as was the case with a Davidic king (Luke 4:16-19). In fact, we have a Dead Sea Scroll fragment that applies this very passage from Isaiah to a "Messiah who rules heaven and earth" heals the sick, and even raises the dead.[14] This particular set of cosmic "qualifications" for the Messiah are reflected again later in Luke 7:18-23, when John the Baptist is told "signs" of Jesus as Messiah—in contrast to one who is a mere Davidic ruler. None of these materials are in Mark—and their juxtaposition in Luke 3-4 is surely intended to set the stage for Jesus as a Messiah—but very much one akin to a Divine Man. So, when Luke picks up the narrative from Mark 1:14-39, the Jesus we are following has been completely recast as the heavenly Messianic Son of God. We see that immediately in Luke 4:40-41 where Mark 1:32-24 has Jesus "casting out many demons" whereas in Luke they cry out "You are the Son of God!"

So here, right at the beginning of just the first chapter of Mark—Luke has expanded his presentation of Jesus into four chapters—each emphasizing this unequivocal "Divine" status of Jesus—even from his birth.

In Mark, Luke's narrative source, the identity of Jesus as "Christ Son of God" is presented as a secret until the very end with a series of prohibitions as to revealing his wondrous deeds (Mark 1:1; 1:25, 42; 3:11-12; 5:43; 8:29-30). At the very end, as Jesus breathes his last on the cross, a Roman centurion declares: "Surely this man was the Son of God" (15:39). In Mark this climatic confession of Jesus as the suffering servant who gave his life for many—dead on

---

[14] See James D. Tabor and Michael O. Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study," *Qumran Questions*, ed. James Charlesworth (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 151-163.

the cross, is central. Luke has no such confession—rather he rewrites Mark and says that the centurion praised God and declared "Surely this man was innocent" (Luke 23:47). Luke's crucifixion scene has Jesus forgiving even his enemies and declaring one of the brigands crucified beside him that he would "be with him today in Paradise" when he cried out for salvation (Luke 23:34, 43). Also, in Mark, Jesus cries out that he has been forsaken by God—and breaths his last (Mark 15:37). Luke removes that cry of despair and has Jesus as the one who says to the Father "into your hands I commit my spirit," thus expiring (Luke 23:46). Jesus remains in control of the entire scene until the last moment, forgiving and saving others and even causing his Roman executioner to praise God.

LORD of the Sabbath

One of the more striking statements regarding the authority of Jesus is his pronouncement in the gospel of Mark in defense of his disciples "picking grain on the Sabbath," which the Pharisees considered a violation of the Sabbath—one of the Ten Commandments (Exodus 20; Deuteronomy 5):

> And he said to them, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath, so the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath" (Mark 2:27)[15]

Although the phrase "Son of man" often occurs in Mark as a self-designation for Jesus, in this account the emphasis is not upon the *authority* of Jesus but rather that laws are for people, not people for laws—so that the phrase "son of man" in this context could mean simply—human beings, as it is most often used in the Hebrew Bible (Numbers 23:19; Job 25:6; Psalm 8:4).

[15] Biblical quotations are form the Revised Standard Version.

However, when Luke recounts this Marcan story, he most significantly *removes* the phrase "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," giving the conclusion a completely different force:

> And he said to them, "The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath." (Luke 6:5)

Even though the omission might be considered minor it changes the argument of the entire passage. Rather than a point about human need—in this case the disciples being hungry—it become an assertion of the authority of Jesus as the "Son of Man," more akin to the kind of usage one finds in Daniel 7:14 and 1 Enoch 46:1–4, 48:2–7, 69:26–29. There the Messiah is exalted to heaven with Divine attributes and authority to render judgment. However, in Luke's version, there is more implied. Clearly the text hearkens back to Genesis 2:1-3 where the LORD God (*Yahweh 'Elohim*) is the one who makes the Sabbath holy and commands one to rest on the seventh day of the week. The idea that Jesus now is "Lord" of the Sabbath seems to imply that by his authority and position he can act in the place of the LORD—going back to Genesis 2.

Jason Staples has argued that our earliest use of the Greek term "Lord" (*kurios*) for the Tetragrammaton YHVH or Yahweh are witnessed by Christian copies of the Septuagint (LXX)—that is translations of the Hebrew Bible into Greek. Once one begins to refer to the LORD God of Israel with the same Greek word *kurios* as one uses for Jesus as "Christ the Lord," the two are easily conflated, at least in terms of authority. So, although *kurios* or "Lord" can mean any sort of human "master," if it refers to a Divine Man with cosmic authority and power—that one can easily take on the function of Yahweh himself. Staples observes:

> The first and most obvious evidence for Jews reading (if not writing) κύριος in place of the Tetragram in the first century is that furnished by the New Testament authors

> themselves, since, as Rosel points out, 'the citations of the New Testament require at least that κύριος…had been uttered when the Scriptures of Israel were read aloud and studied'. Fitzmyer similarly protests: 'If [κύριος] is a device found only in Christian copies of the OT, where did Luke get it when he quoted Deut. 6.5 [using κύριος]?'…It is more likely that the New Testament authors built on an established tradition, with κύριος already the most common Greek surrogate for the name by that time.[16]

This phenomenon has been well established in the letters of Paul, where texts from the Hebrew Bible that refer clearly to Yahweh (YHVH) are quote by Paul to refer to Jesus as LORD—for example in Philippians 2:11, which is shaped by Isaiah 45:23, where Yahweh declares that He is God, there is no other, "To me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."[17]

This would not mean that every reference to "Lord" in the gospel of Luke refers to Yahweh—the God of Israel, however, when Jesus is portrayed as acting with "cosmic authority" whether forgiving sins, healing, or raising the dead—the line between the "human" and the "Divine" grows quite thin and transparent. This is particularly true given the much broader use of the term "divine" or *theios* in Greco-Roman sources in which extraordinary humans are regularly presented as "gods" or "demi-gods."[18]

---

[16] Staples, Jason A. Staples "'Lord, Lord': Jesus as YHWH in Matthew and Luke," *New Testament Studies* 64, no. 1 (2018): 1–19.

[17] David Capes, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology* (Baylor: Baylor University Press, 2017), and more recently, *The Divine Christ: Paul, the Lord Jesus and the Scriptures of Israel* (Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2018).

[18] See Talbert, *What is a Gospel* where he surveys the various uses of terms for gods, demi-gods, and "Divine men."

Some of the other uses of *kurios* or "Lord" for Jesus that well might imply something akin to LORD/Yahweh, are a series of "Judgment" stores unique to Luke in which the "Master" or "Lord" has the power to return to his subjects and judge them for their behavior, casting them out of his "kingdom." Luke 12:35-44 is one such example, and Jesus there equates himself to the "Lord" or Master of cosmic judgment.

Staples further argues that the double use of "Lord, Lord," in Luke 6:46, particularly in the context of this idea of final judgment, is a direct reflection of the Shema—with the repetition in Greek— "The Lord (*kurios*) our God, the Lord (*kurios*) is One."[19]

Enhanced Praising of Jesus

The act of praise is usually utilized in reference to some form of deity or authoritative figure, especially within the confines of a first-century society. It is no wonder, then, that a gospel which seeks to heighten the divine status of Jesus also emphasizes the act of praise more than the others. Scholars of Luke-Acts, including Henry Cadbury, have spoken at length about the significance and presence of praise in the gospel.[20] However, Kindalee De Long's details all the references to praise in Luke-Acts.[21] Fitzmyer references three of the five miracles that display praise responses, including the praise that occurs in the story of the centurion I have already mentioned.[22] De Long goes further. She evaluates multiple different aspects of these

---

[19] Staples, "'Lord, Lord': Jesus as YHWH in Matthew and Luke."

[20] See Henry Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 192, 268.

[21] See Kindalee De Long, *Surprised by God: Praise Responses in the Narrative of Luke-Acts*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 2009).

[22] Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981-1985), 658.

moments of praise, mainly focusing on the relationship between praise and conversion, revelation, and healing. The topic of praise and healing is especially intriguing because it provides insight to where Jesus wanted the praise for his efforts to be directed. In the following table De Long outlines six instances in Luke-Acts where a moment of praise, whether communal or individual, takes place following a miraculous healing performed by Jesus:

Table 1: Pattern of praise in six healing stories in Luke-Acts.

	Reference	Scene	Individual praise	Communal praise
1)	Lk 5:17–26	Paralyzed man lowered through the roof	The healed man glorifies God (δοξάζω)	The crowd glorifies God (δοξάζω)
2)	Lk 7:11–17	Widow's son at Nain		The crowd glorifies God (δοξάζω)
3)	Lk 13:11–17	Straightened woman	The healed woman glorifies God (δοξάζω)	[The crowd rejoices (χαίρω) at the wonderful things (ἔνδοξος) Jesus is doing]
4)	Lk 17:11–19	Ten men with leprosy	One healed man returns, praising God (δοξάζω) in a loud voice	[Nine men fail to give praise (οὐχ εὑρέθησαν . . . δοῦναι δόξαν)]
5)	Lk 18:35–43	Man born blind at Jericho	The healed man glorifies God (δοξάζω)	The crowd gives praise to God (πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἰδὼν ἔδωκεν αἶνον τῷ θεῷ)
6)	Acts 3:8–4:21	Paralyzed man at the Beautiful Gate	The healed man praises God (αἰνέω)	The crowd glorifies God (δοξάζω)

Here, she makes the important connection that praise seems to frequently follow healing in Luke-Acts. The most intriguing aspect of this connection lies within whom the praise is addressed to. Instead of praise being given to Jesus as a human man, it seems to be directed towards Jesus as the divine manifestation of God. In that way, the Lukan author has structured these instances of praise in ways that allow Jesus to be more closely aligned with God himself. However, it is worth noting that the depiction of Jesus that the Lukan author seeks to achieve is not one where the benefactors and witnesses of these miracles turn away from him, fix their eyes on the sky and begin praising a distant god. Rather, he wants the reader to envision these moments as instances where Jesus is recognized as the "divine" Son of God and by his deeds generating praise of God. I want to take a closer look at three of the examples De Long presents here, two from materials unique to Luke and one reflecting his editing of Mark.

Luke 17:11-19

This account of Jesus healing ten lepers is only found in Luke, in his special section (Luke 9:51-18:14). They are told to go show themselves to the priests as required by Jewish law for such circumstances, but one of them turns back and returns to Jesus: "Then one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, praising God with a loud voice; and *he fell on his face at Jesus' feet, giving him thanks"* (Luke 17:16 emphasis mine).

Notice how this passage indicates that a turning back to the direction of Jesus, even falling at Jesus' feet to thank him, was associated with his praise of God. Accordingly, the only one who is recognized as properly praising God is the one who turned back to praise Jesus—and he was a Samaritan. Jesus then asks—"Where are the nine? Was no one found *to return and give praise to God* except this foreigner?"—indicating that the failure of the nine to *return to him* was

equivalent to a failure to praise God (17:17-18). Although Jesus is never explicating declared to be "God" in the Synoptic tradition—and according to some even in the gospel of John—his role as a "Divine Man" in Luke is implicit.[23]

Luke 13:11-17

This passage is also unique to Luke. In this story, a woman who is bent over is healed by Jesus. In response, the woman immediately begins praising God—yet another indication that the Lukan author wants his readers to associate Jesus with the deity. The wider context of the story is again built around the issue of how the Sabbath should be observed but here Jesus is presented in the typical "Divine Man" role of offering wise sayings that best his enemies and put them to shame:

> But the Lord answered him and said, "You hypocrites! Does not each of you on the sabbath untie his ox or his donkey from the manger, and lead it away to give it water? And ought not this woman, a daughter of Abraham whom Satan bound for eighteen long years, be set free from this bondage on the sabbath day?" When he said this, all his opponents were put to shame; and the entire crowd was rejoicing at all the wonderful things that he was doing (Luke 13:15-17).

[23] Bart Ehrman makes the argument that Jesus never once truly calls himself God, discounting the "I am" statements made in the book of John, see *How Jesus Became God: The Exaltation of a Jewish Preacher from Galilee*, (New York: HarperOne, 2014). James Dunn agrees, see his *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of Incarnation*, 2nd edition (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996).

He directs his ire against the leaders of the synagogue but in contrast, the "entire crowd" rejoices as all the wonderful things that he was doing—once again connected with "praising God" as well as bringing "good news of great joy to all the people" (Luke 2:10).

Luke 18:35-43

Here we have a Marcan story of the healing of the blind man at Jericho (Mark 10:46-52). I tis noteworthy that the man recognizes him as "Son of David," but that role is muted and silenced. Mark concludes the story with "And immediately he received his sight and followed him on the way" (Mark 10:52). This reflects a key theme of Mark—what it means to "follow Jesus on the way," to the cross—even though the man was told to "go your way." There is no reference to praising God or even thanking Jesus. Luke rewrites Mark's ending in the following way:

> And immediately he received his sight and followed him, *glorifying God; and all the people, when they saw it, gave praise to God* (Luke 18:43).

This addition, though only a few words, shifts the entire emphasis of the story and serves to highlight this element of the praise of the people—which is characteristic of Luke's view of Jesus as the Divine Man who can elicit such a response as Son of David, Savior, Lord, and Son of the Most High God—Luke's cluster of descriptive designations for Jesus.

Human and Divine Emotions

Several scholars who have worked on the ways in which Luke edits his source Mark have noted his tendency to play down, mute, or even eliminate references to Jesus as a mere human

who expresses unguarded emotions. I would suggest this is in keeping with his overall goal of presenting Jesus after the model of a Divine Man. This Lukan tendency has been noted by Cadbury and Fitzmyer, two of the most prominent scholars who have emphasized the ways in which Luke constructs his gospel. Fitzmyer offers the following summary analysis:

> . . . certain redactional modifications of the Marcan source material can be seen to stem from a delicate sensitivity which tends to make Luke eliminate anything that smacks of the violent, the passionate, or the emotional…Similarly, the description of Jesus moved by human emotions in the Marcan Gospel is normally eliminated in the Lukan story, even if they are expressions of love, compassion, or tenderness. The Marcan episodes depict Jesus in a more human way, perhaps too human for the nobility of character that Luke sought to depict. This may seem somewhat strange to us, even a stroke of what has been labeled his bourgeois piety; but it obviously is an aspect of Luke's concern for *asphaleia*, "assurance," which he offers to the Christians of the period for which he writes.[24]

However, David G. George, in a 2012 dissertation, has advanced beyond what Cadbury and Fitzmyer had noted, by including a more comprehensive listing.[25] George concludes, somewhat similarly to Cadbury:

---

[24] Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 94-95; Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method*, 90-96.

[25] George, David. "Jesus' Lack of Emotion in Luke: The Lukan Redactions in Light of the Hellenistic Philosophers." (2012). Available on-line: https://curate.nd.edu/downloads/8623hx13x49 or a print edition through ProQuest UMI https://www.amazon.com/Jesus-Lack-Emotion-Luke-Philosophers/dp/1248949552. George wrote his dissertation under James H. Charlesworth for a doctorate from the University of Notre Dame.

> It is primarily the Stoic tradition (and in particular the popular rendering of these in the Roman imperial authors) that leads the author of Luke to present his auditors with a Jesus character (quite to the contrary of Mark) without emotion, an exemplum of *apatheia*.[26]

Below is a summary of the passages George lists with his major categories of analysis:

Anger/Indignation		
Mark 3:5	Luke 6:10	Luke removes anger from Jesus
Mark 10:14a	Luke 18:16	Luke removes anger/indignation from Jesus
Mark 11:15-16	Luke 19:45	Luke removes Jesus' angry and violent actions
Anger/Stern Speech		
Mark 1:43-44	Luke 5:14a	Luke softens tone of Jesus' speech
Mark 3:12	Luke 6:19/4:41	Luke removes Jesus' harsh speech
Mark 5:19a	Luke 8:38b	Luke softens tone of Jesus' speech
Mark 5:40,43	Luke 8:53,56	Luke removes/softens Jesus' harsh speech
Mark 6:8a	Luke 9:3a	Luke removes harsh tone of Jesus' speech
Mark 9:9	Luke 9:36	Luke removes Jesus's admonition to the disciples
Mark 8:30	Luke 9:21	Luke softens tone of Jesus' command
Mark 8:32-33	Luke 9:22	Luke removes Jesus' stern speech and harsh rebuke
Mark 11:14	Luke 13:6-9	Luke removes Jesus' cursing of the fig tree
Grief/Sadness		
Mark 2:25a	Luke 6:3a	Luke removes Jesus' "emotional" neediness
Mark 3:5a	Luke 6:10a	Luke removes Jesus' state of grief
Mark 8:12a	Luke 11:16/12:54	Luke removes sadness or anger from Jesus
Compassion/Mercy		

[26] George, "Jesus Lack of Emotion," (Abstract).

Mark 1:41	Luke 5:13	Luke removes Jesus' compassion
Mark 6:34	Luke 9:11a	Luke removes Jesus' compassion and sentimentality
Mark 5:19-20	Luke 8:39	Luke removes Jesus' self-described mercy
Love/Affection		
Mark 10:21	Luke 18:22	Luke removes Jesus' love
Mark 9:36	Luke 9:47-48	Luke removes Jesus' signs of affection
Mark 10:15-16	Luke 18:17	Luke removes Jesus' signs of affection[27]

This list includes every instance in which George believes the Lukan author takes an emotional portrayal of Jesus from Mark and changes it in some way.[28] Cadbury's list differs slightly in that he does not include five of the instances that George does.[29] These additions by George, namely Mark 2:25a/Luke 6:3a, Mark 3:12/Luke 6:19, Mark 5:19a/Luke 8:38b, Mark 6:8a/Luke 9:3a, and Mark 9:9/Luke 9:36, are performed because of the emotional considerations he believes the Lukan author assessed upon his revision of these Marcan texts.[30]

If Mark provides us with a more "emotional" Jesus, and the Lukan author goes out of his way to soften or even remove many of those emotions, it seems clear that he was purposely

---

[27] This listing can be found in chapter four of David George's doctoral dissertation titled *Jesus' Lack of Emotion in Luke: The Lukan Redactions in Light of the Hellenistic Philosophers*, p. 168-169.

[28] It should be noted that George finds issue with including the Mark 8:12a/Luke 11:16,12:54 passage as evidence of his proposed pattern because of its belonging to the "great omission" texts. Still, he includes the passage because of the emotional portrayal of Jesus it provides, despite not considering it a true parallel.

[29] Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method*, 90-96.

[30] These passages concern the narrative of Jesus plucking grain on the Sabbath (Mk 2:25a/Lk 6:3a), Jesus' harsh commands to the unclean spirits (Mk 3:12/Lk 6:19), the Gerasene Demoniac (Mk 5:19a/Lk 8:38b), and the commissioning of the twelve (Mk 6:8a/Lk 9:3a), and the admonition to the disciples (Mk 9:9/Lk 9:36). Cadbury eliminates the Mk 2:25a/Lk 6:3a passage because he, like many scholars, views the story as a moment of physical, rather than emotional neediness. It is unclear why the other four passages are omitted, as Cadbury makes it a point to include other instances of stern speech redactions, Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method*, 100-101.

editing Mark to reflect the image of a Hellenistic Divine Man. Although George sees Luke's motivation grounded in the ideal Stoic philosopher of the Imperial period, these characteristics one also finds in the broader portrayals of the ideal Hellenistic *Theios Aner*—with the addition of such elements as a divine birth, miraculous deeds and wonders, and an extraordinary death—often including ascent to heaven. However, emotions are not removed from the character of Jesus entirely by Luke, so this Stoic ideal of *apatheia* is not the only factor at work here.

One of the ways in which an author can "rewrite" or incorporate a source can include supplementing specific passages but also expanding the base text with unique and significant additions, or adding similarly motivated editing to passages in common with Matthew that most scholars refer to as Q. In both cases the motivations behind the redaction of Mark per se can be reflected in the unique Lukan material as well as Q. In fact, the editing of Mark is what allows us to signal and pick up on the concerns that are central to Luke—as we have something textually that we can compare.

Stephen Voorwinde's work highlights the emotions of Jesus that appear to be most emphasized in Luke.[31] I will summarize below the passages he isolates and categorizes, specifically those in which Jesus exhibits amazement, compassion, joy, and weeping.[32]

---

[31] Stephen Voorwinde, "The Sympathetic Son: Jesus' Emotions in Luke's Gospel," in Jesus' Emotions in the Gospels (New York: T&T Clark International, 2011), 123-148.

[32] Voorwinde also performs an analysis of the emotions "distress" and "anguish" as experienced by Jesus, but due to major textual issues with the passages that present these emotions, analysis of these two terms will be foregone.

Amazement

In his analysis of the amazement that Jesus experiences, Voorwinde highlights the entire account of the Roman centurion and his slave.[33] However, the main verse to be examined from this passage occurs rather late in the story, reading:

> When Jesus heard this, he was amazed at him, and turning to the crowd following him, he said "I tell you, I have not found such great faith even in Israel."[34]

For the first time in the Lukan text, Jesus has displayed his capability to express human emotion.[35] So the question must be asked, as it will be for each of the emotions that Voorwinde highlights, why *this* emotion? Why is "amazement" the first emotion that readers of the Lukan text are allowed to see?

I am convinced that the Lukan author chooses "amazement" as the introductory emotion not because of the emotion itself, but because of what the emotion is occurring in response to. Voorwinde observes:

> For Matthew and Luke that surprise is expressed for the very same reason. This centurion, of all people, would appear to be the first to recognize Jesus' authority for what it is. He has profound insight into the identity of Jesus. What the angel Gabriel has said to Mary at the beginning about the greatness of Jesus is now recognized by the centurion. He may not have appreciated all that was implied in

---

[33] Luke 7:1-10; Matt. 8:5-13.

[34] Luke 7:9, Matt. 8:10; Matthew utilizes slightly different terminology, replacing "amazed" with "marveled."

[35] Voorwinde, "The Sympathetic Son," 123.

> Jesus' divinity and messiahship, nor did he address him as "son of David", but he recognized that Jesus had authority from God."[36]

In a text that puts so much effort into redacting the emotions of Jesus, it must be assumed that the addition of certain emotions is done with complete intentionality. In this instance, the intention seems to be an additional emphasis being placed on the divine nature and message of Jesus. The Lukan author wants to use this story of a Roman centurion being the first to recognize Jesus as divine and empowered by God to show the reader the degree to which Jesus exhibited just how divine Jesus actually was. I believe that this operates on two different levels. First, there is an implication made by the Lukan author about the divinity of Jesus in that the Roman centurion can acknowledge it. In other words, Jesus was *so* extraordinary that even a Gentile could recognize him as such. Second, the Luke text includes more detail about the centurion's beckoning to Jesus in an effort to emphasize Jesus' overall significance and authority, especially as it relates to the Jewish community. In Luke, the centurion takes additional measures to convince Jesus to come see the slave, an action that would not be necessary if Jesus were just a typical healer.[37] He calls upon Jewish elders to plead the slave's case to Jesus, making sure to mention his contributions to the construction of the synagogue and his overall love of the nation.[38] This hints at the suggestion that the centurion not only recognized Jesus' authority from

---

[36] Voorwinde, "The Sympathetic Son," 124.

[37]See Bibliowicz, Abel, *Jews and Gentiles in the Early Jesus Movement: An Unintended Journey*, 66.

[38] Luke 7:3-5. It should be noted that the parallel to this passage in Matthew (Luke 7:1-10, Matt. 8:5-13) does not include this information. Therefore, the inclusion of Jewish persuasion appears to be uniquely attributable to the Lukan author.

God, but also the significance of Judaism to Jesus, or rather the significance of Jesus to Judaism, in that authority. Perhaps this is an additional attempt made by the Lukan author to associate Jesus with the Jewish messiah. Regardless, the Lukan author appears to allow Jesus to express amazement before any other emotion so that emphasis can be placed on the authority and divinity of Jesus himself.

Compassion

The second emotion of Jesus that readers of Luke are allowed to see takes place in the very same chapter as the first. However, the emotion surfaces much earlier in the story. The passage starts with Jesus noticing a widow with her dead son.[39] Before the climax of this story even occurs, Luke says that "When the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her."[40] As a result of this sense of compassion, Jesus decides to raise the young man from the dead. As Voorwinde puts it, "His compassion is the sole driving force behind the miracle."[41] This distinction will be important when evaluating "compassion" as an emotion later.

First, the entire story is completely unique to Luke. Also, verse 13 of this passage contains the first instance that the Lukan author himself refers to Jesus as "the Lord."[42] This means that, for the first time, Luke is making his view on the relationship between Jesus as

---

[39] Luke 7:11-17 encompasses this entire story, however only 7:13 will be analyzed thoroughly.

[40] Luke 7:13.

[41] Voorwinde, "The Sympathetic Son," 127. It is worth noting that Voorwinde references Leon Morris' work (*The Gospel According to St. Luke: An Introduction and Commentary* (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974), p. 140) when making this claim.

[42] Ibid., 127.

"Lord" and Yahweh as LORD implicit. So what is the significance of Jesus' display of compassion here? Similar to the significance of the amazement found in 7:1-10, the main emphasis is being placed on the context of the emotion rather than the emotion itself. Again, the assumption that the limited use of emotions in Luke intentionally heightens the significance of the settings around the emotions that *are* included is essential. Voorwinde explains why this passage is so significant when he says:

> By raising a dead man Jesus does what only God can do. In the Old Testament there were also two only sons who had been raised from the dead. Elijah had raised the son of the widow of Zarephath (1 Kgs 17.17-24), and Elisha had raised the Shunamite woman's son (2 Kgs 4.32-37), but with a crucial difference. They had prayed fervently to God for the resuscitation of these boys. All Jesus had to do was say the word. He is therefore more than a prophet, since as the Son of the Most High he simply gives the order and the dead man obeys…They were prophets of God; he was the Son of God.[43]

By presenting Jesus as performing actions that only God has been able to do previously, the Lukan text furthers the argument that Jesus is of divine nature and origin. Additionally, the emotion of "compassion" itself contributes to this argument. For this, we revisit the George dissertation and his conversation about the Lukan emotions of Jesus. He identifies a correlation between God and compassion as one of the emotional themes of the overall Lukan narrative, also saying that Jesus himself is not necessarily associated with this emotion.[44] To George's credit, a

---

[43] Ibid., 127.

[44] George, "Luke's Redactions of Mark," 237.

strong argument is presented in this direction that builds upon proposals made by scholars like Joseph Fitzmyer and Robert Tannehill.[45] However, he identifies one instance within Luke that seems to disrupt this theory, and it happens to be the 7:11-17 passage. On this oddity, George says:

> Not only does the Lukan narrator describe Jesus' emotional state as one of compassion, but the emotion is the actual impetus for the healing. There has been no acceptable scholarly explanation for this odd case, even from the few commentators who similarly acknowledge the Lukan principle of removing emotion from Jesus…Not only is the compassion of Jesus the motive for the miracle, but the miracle is the first occasion on which Luke, as narrator, calls Jesus Lord…Luke seems to be using the very few instances of Jesus expressing emotion for important emphasis.[46]

The rarity of this occurrence furthers the idea that the few emotions that Jesus *is* allowed to show places emphasis on the surrounding and resulting events. Perhaps the point of emphasis that George references is the divine nature of Jesus, especially considering the role that "the Lord" terminology plays in this passage.

One potential issue that some might find with attributing compassion to Jesus comes with George's chart. As he lists, the Lukan author appears to reduce the compassion of Jesus on two

---

[45] See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1071-72, and Tannehill, *Luke*, 339.

[46] George, 241-242.

separate occasions (5:13, 9:11a).[47] This calls into question how a redacted emotion can still be effectively used to describe the character of Jesus. However, I believe the answer to this question lies within each passage and the knowledge we have about the Lukan author's overall mission. In 5:13, Jesus automatically follows up the healing of the leper by charging the man to "tell no one" of the deed.[48] When considering the other emotional passages, where the Lukan author undoubtedly wants to draw attention to the divine power of Jesus, it makes sense that the "compassion" would be stripped away here. Why would the Lukan author disrupt his recurring theme of emphasizing the few instances where an emotional Jesus both demonstrates his divinity *and* is recognized by others as divine? I believe that he struggled to understand the Marcan desire to encourage silence and, rather than omitting that portion, chose to remove the "compassion" aspect, considering the frequency with which Luke uses emotion to tell readers about the divinity of Jesus.

As for Luke 9:11a, it seems as though the Lukan author sought to eliminate "compassion" from the narrative for the very same reason, but in a different way. Looking back to the 7:17 passage, Jesus' compassion is what leads to the resurrection of the dead man, not the other way around. In this instance, the Mark text explains that the large group was already there by the time Jesus arrived.[49] In other words, Jesus did not do anything directly that caused a miraculous movement of these people. Instead, the group was merely seeking out Jesus' teachings, and the Lukan author does not seem to have an interest in emphasizing the role of

---

[47] Mark 5:19-20/Luke 8:39 are also listed, but this passage deals more with mercy than compassion and will therefore not be discussed.

[48] Luke 5:14.

[49] Mark 6:33.

Jesus as teacher. For these reasons, I think the choice to redact certain aspects of Jesus' compassion as displayed in the Mark texts came from an intent to limit the emotions of Jesus *effectively*, so that when readers *do* get to experience his compassion, they walk away with a greater understanding of his role as deity and compassion's role as a divine emotion.

Joy

In addition to "compassion", George highlights another emotion that he believes the Lukan author attributes to the character of God—that of "Joy." Although exhibited by Jesus, this quality of "Joy" is uniquely reflective of the divine nature of God.[50] There are specifically three parables that George points to as echoing God's ability to experience joy, found in Luke 15:11-32, 3-7, and 8-10.[51] On these, George says:

> Luke intricately links the parable of the prodigal son with the two parables preceding it - the parable of the lost sheep (15:3-7) and the parable of the lost coin (8-10). The three contribute to the Lukan themes of God's mercy/compassion and joy over finding that which was lost…[52]

While this fails to say much about the significance of joy as it relates to Jesus, it does display the Lukan author's belief that joy is an emotion that God experiences, and the only reason we know that is because of Jesus' parables.

---

[50] See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 258.

[51] Ibid., 238.

[52] George, 238.

The passage in Luke that introduces readers to a joyful Jesus hardly focuses on the emotion at all. Instead, much time is spent covering the conversation Jesus has with his "Father" while being full of joy. One particular passage is highly relevant in this regard:

> At that time Jesus, full of joy through the Holy Spirit, said, "I praise you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and learned, and revealed them to little children. Yes, Father, for this was your good pleasure. All things have been committed to me by my Father. No-one knows who the Son is except the Father, and no-one knows who the Father is except the Son and those to whom the Son chooses to reveal him" (Luke 10:21-22).

This is an exceptionally revealing passage when considering the portrayal of Jesus the Lukan author is seeking to put forward. It has already been established that joy is a godly emotion in the Lukan narrative. Now, as a result of this passage, we get to see Jesus experience this godly emotion while communicating with God himself, which also provides information about their relationship with one another. On Jesus' dialogue about this relationship, Voorwinde says:

> He rejoiced in the wonderfully intimate relationship that he had with the Father. In the space of just two verses (vv. 21-22) Jesus refers to God as "Father" no fewer than five times and to himself as "the Son" three times. The titles "the Son of the Most High" (1.32) and "the Son of God" (1.35). With which Gabriel introduced Jesus even before his conception, have now come to their own. Nowhere else in Luke's Gospel is the Father-Son relationship as developed as it is

> here. In these verses "we reach a christological peak in the Gospel of Luke". The focus is on the intimacy and the reciprocity of their relationship…Jesus has an exclusive and intimate relationship with the Father, and when he reflects on it he is full of joy in the Holy Spirit.[53]

The emotional response of Jesus results from the success of his sending out of seventy-two disciples to preach his message of "good news," which in Luke means "tidings of great joy to all the people," which his birth had inaugurated (Luke 2:10). to the success of his seventy-two occurs after he confirms that he is in fact the one who provided them with the authority to succeed.[54] Because of that, he distinguishes himself as an individualized deity, neither reliant on God's power nor completely separated from him.

Weeping

There are only two instances in the traditional gospels where Jesus is portrayed as weeping, and one exists in the Lukan text.[55] Interestingly enough, the one in Luke is also exclusive to Luke, meaning that it is neither taken from Mark nor the Q-Source. The relevant passage reads:

> As he approached Jerusalem and saw the city, he wept over it and said, "If you, even you, had only known on this day what would bring you peace - but now it is hidden from your

---

[53] Voorwinde, "The Sympathetic Son," 131.

[54] Ibid., 128.

[55] The other reference to a weeping Jesus is given in the gospel of John (11:35).

> eyes. The days will come upon you when your enemies will build an embankment against you and encircle you and hem you in on every side. They will dash you to the ground, you and the children within your walls. They will not leave one stone on another, because you did not recognize the time of God's coming to you." (Luke 19:41-44).

There are various possibilities as to why Jesus is weeping on this occasion. It is possible that Luke's Jesus is simply overcome with emotion because, upon seeing the city, the reality of his messianic fate is beginning to set in. This theory stems from the assumption that Jesus is in fact referring to himself earlier in the Luke text when he says:

> "I must keep going today and tomorrow and the next day—for surely no prophet can die outside Jerusalem! O Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets and stone those sent to you, how often *I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings*, but you were not willing! Look, your house is left to you desolate. I tell you, you will not see me again until you say, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. (Luke 13:33-35 emphasis mine).

In this rather extraordinary passage both the weeping and the compassionate longing is directly associated with God—who is portrayed in this very image—as a mother bird fluttering over her young and protecting them and one weeping for the destruction of Jerusalem during the Babylonian Exile (Deuteronomy 32:11; Jeremiah 14:17). But most important—Jesus in Luke speaks in the *first person*—that *he* would gather his people—a phrase used exclusively and repeatedly for Yahweh in the Hebrew Prophets—so that the concluding declaration, "You will

not see me again until . . .” is a direct reference to his Divine status as the one who comes in future judgment “in the name of Yahweh.” (Isaiah 43:5; 54:7; Jeremiah 23:3; Ezekiel 11:17).

It is important to note that the messianic fate of Jesus is not characterized by his death alone. Instead, the implications upon Jerusalem that follow are also a part of this fate, as is heavily indicated by Jesus himself as predicted in the Hebrew Prophets—a key point that Luke emphasizes after Jesus is resurrected. All that happens—both to him and the city of Jerusalem and its corrupt Temple—are not only fated but determined by the will of God and prophesized in the Scriptures:

> Then he said to them, “These are my words which I spoke to you, while I was still with you, that everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled.” [45] Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures, [46] and said to them, “Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, [47] and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem.” (Luke 24:44-47)

Jesus’ portrayal as “weeping” by the Lukan author is indicative of these implications, fully reflecting the gravity of the situation at hand and the one to come. The Lukan author wants his readers to understand that Jesus knows *everything* that is about to happen—not just the crucifixion and resurrection, but also the destruction of the temple that will occur forty years later—to that very generation.

Another important aspect of this passage is what it reveals about the time in which the Lukan lived. His clear description of the siege of Jerusalem in Luke 19:41-44 and below in Luke

21, including the resulting second Exile of the Jewish people, is a precise reflection of the events of 70 CE:

> "But when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near. [21] Then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains, and let those who are inside the city depart, and let not those who are out in the country enter it; [22] for these are days of vengeance, to fulfil all that is written. [23] Alas for those who are with child and for those who give suck in those days! For great distress shall be upon the earth and wrath upon this people; [24] they will fall by the edge of the sword, and be led captive among all nations; and Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled" (Luke 21:20-24).

Luke is following the "Synoptic Apocalypse" of Mark 13 here but he significant rewrites the entire chapter to reflect a time looking back on the tragic events of 70 CE with the destruction of the Temple and the city of Jerusalem so that it looks *forward* to the "Parousia" or arrival of Son of Man "in a cloud with power and great glory" (Luke 21:27). This is a direct echo of Daniel 7:14—when such a "Divine Man" figure is given all power, rule, and authority to bring about the Kingdom of God.[56]

---

[56] Brandon, Samuel G F. *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of AD 70 on Christianity*. 2nd edition. London: S.P.C.K., 1957 and Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another; Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels.* Supplements to Novum Testamentum v. 23. (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

Given their context in the Lukan narrative these passages that describe Jesus showing amazement, compassion, joy, and weeping, are all part of his "Divine" nature, paralleling the ways in which God is portrayed in the Hebrew Bible. The *apatheia* of the Stoic philosopher is one part of the cultural ideal, but the Hellenistic portrait of the Divine Man, which Luke cultivates, includes an affiliation with the Deity that reflects Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible as well as the life-cycle of a divine birth, miraculous deeds, wise teachings, exemplary death, and ascent to heaven.

CONCLUSION

In this overview of Luke's rewriting of Mark, as well as the parallel motifs found in his own unique material and his Q source, I am convinced that one of his primary goals is to present Jesus after the model of the Hellenistic Divine Man—well known to his Roman readers in the imperial period. At the same time, he wanted to connect his portrait with the concepts of Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible and his life and death according to the Messianic predictions of the Hebrew Prophets. He wants to universalize the message for the wider Greco-Roman world and present the figure of Jesus in ways that would draw and attract them. Jesus' last words in Luke echo this worldwide mission—that repentance and remission of sins be preached in the name of this glorified Christ to all the nations (Luke 24:47). I believe this was accomplished through the deliberate emotional alteration of Jesus, where only the emotions that most reflect a divine nature are allowed to be seen. I also believe that the use of certain terminology in the Lukan text, specifically κύριος as a manifestation of YHWH, also contribute to the Lukan author's goal of deifying Jesus because of the prevalence and nature of such terminology. Finally, I believe that the enhanced praise seen in the Luke text can only be attributed to the idea that Jesus is worthy of such praise because of his close relationship with and equivalence to God himself, in the perspective of the Lucan author.

WORKS CITED

Aune, David. "The Problem of the Genre of the Gospels: A Critique of C. H. Talbert's 'What is a Gospel.'" In *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, Vol. II, eds. R.T. France and David Wenham, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (1981): 9-60.

Barrett, C.K. Luke the Historian in Recent Study. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.

Bovon, François. *Luke the Theologian: Thirty-three Years of Research (1950-1983)*. Translated by Ken McKinney. Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1987.

Brandon, Samuel G F. *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of AD 70 on Christianity*. 2nd edition. London: S.P.C.K., 1957.

Brown, Raymond, *An Introduction to the New Testament*. ed. Marion Soards. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. 2nd edition, with a new introduction by Paul Anderson. Ada, MI: Baker Academic, 1999.

Capes, David. *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology*. Baylor: Baylor University Press, 2017.

_____. *The Divine Christ: Paul, the Lord Jesus and the Scriptures of Israel* (Ada, MI: BakerAcademic, 2018).

Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke.* New York: Harper, 1961.

De Long, Kindalee. *Surprised by God: Praise Responses in the Narrative of Luke-Acts*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Dicken, Frank. "The Author and Date of Luke-Acts: Exploring the Options." In *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays*, edited by Sean A. Adams, Michael Pahl, 7-26. Piscataway, NJ, USA: Gorgias Press, 2012.

Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of Incarnation*, 2nd edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Ehrman, Bart. *How Jesus Became God: The Exaltation of a Jewish Preacher from Galilee*. New York: HarperOne, 2014.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Two volumes. In The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1979.

_____. "The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," *Biblica* 74 (1993): 153-174

Gaston, Lloyd. *No Stone on Another; Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels.* Supplements to Novum Testamentum; v. 23. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

George, David. "Jesus' Lack of Emotion in Luke: The Lukan Redactions in Light of the Hellenistic Philosophers." (2012). Available on-line: https://curate.nd.edu/downloads/8623hx13x49.

Hadas, Moses, and Morton Smith. *Heroes and Gods: Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Josephus, Flavius. *The Wars of the Jews.* Translated by William Whiston. Digireads.com Publishing, 2020.

Liefeld, Walter L. "'Divine Man' and the Figure of Jesus in the Gospels. *Journal of Evangelical Theology*, 16:4 (Fall 1973): 195-205.

Mason, Steve and Tom Robinson, ed. "Biography, Anecdote, and History." In *Early Christian Reader*, 243-283. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

Marcus, Joel. "The Jewish War and the Sitz im Leben of Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992) 441-462.

Martinez, Garcia F. “The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246.” In *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies in Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992): 162-172

Smith, Morton. “Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretalogies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 174-198.

Staples, Jason A. “‘Lord, Lord’: Jesus as YHWH in Matthew and Luke.” *New Testament Studies* 64, no. 1 (2018): 1–19.

Streeter, B. H. *The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.

Tabor, James D., and Michael O. Wise, “4Q521 ‘On Resurrection’ and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study,” *Qumran Questions*, ed. James Charlesworth (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 151-163.

_____. “’Returning to the Divinity’: Josephus’ Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989) 225-238.

Tacitus, Cornelius. *The Histories.* Translated by W.H. Fyfe. New York: Oxford, 1997.

Talbert, Charles H. *What Is a Gospel: the Genre of the Canonical Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Voorwinde, Stephen. “The Sympathetic Son: Jesus’ Emotions in Luke’s Gospel.” In *Jesus’ Emotions in the Gospels*. London: Continuum International Publishing, 2011.

Wardle, D. “A Perfect Send-off: Suetonius and the Dying Art of Augustus (Suetonius, Aug. 99).” Mnemosyne 60, no. 3 (2007): 443-63.