DIGITAL ACCESS TO SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD
DASH.HARVARD.EDU

HARVARD LIBRARY

Silent Statements: Narrative Representations of Speech and Silence in the Gospel of Luke

Citation

Dinkler, Michal Beth. 2012. Silent Statements: Narrative Representations of Speech and Silence in the Gospel of Luke. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard Divinity School.

Link

https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HUL.INSTREPOS:37367449

Terms of use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material (LAA), as set forth at
https://harvardwiki.atlassian.net/wiki/external/NGY5NDE4ZjgzNTc5NDQzMGIzZWZhMGFlOWI2M2EwYTg

Accessibility

https://accessibility.huit.harvard.edu/digital-accessibility-policy

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. Submit a story

Silent Statements:

Narrative Representations of Speech and Silence in the Gospel of Luke

A dissertation presented

By

Michal Beth Dinkler

To

The Faculty of Harvard Divinity School

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

In the Subject of

New Testament and Early Christian Studies

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

May 2012

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

DISSERTATION ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, appointed by the

Committee on the Study of Religion

have examined a dissertation entitled

Silent Statements: Narrative Representations of Speech and Silence in the Gospel of Luke

presented by Michal Beth Dinkler

candidate for the degree of Doctor of Theology and hereby certify that it is worthy of acceptance.

Signature _____

Typed name: Prof. François Bovon

Signature _____

Typed name: Prof. Karen King

Signature _____

Typed name: Prof. Ronald Thiemann

Signature _____

Typed name: Prof. John Darr

Date: May 1, 2012

© 2012 - Michal Beth Dinkler
All rights reserved

François Bovon Michal Beth Dinkler

Silent Statements:
Narrative Representations of Speech and Silence in the Gospel of Luke

Abstract

Even a brief comparison with its canonical counterparts demonstrates that the Gospel of Luke is preoccupied with the power of spoken words. Words, Luke tells us, can deceive and mislead (21.8), entrap (20.26), or save (12.11-12). Despite this emphasis, words alone do not a language make. Just as music without silence collapses into cacophony, so speech without silence signifies nothing: silences are the invisible, inaudible cement that hold the entire edifice together. Though scholars across diverse disciplines have analyzed silence in terms of its contexts, sources, and functions, these insights have barely begun to make inroads in biblical studies.

Utilizing conceptual tools from narratology and reader-response criticism, this study represents an initial exploration of what remains largely uncharted territory – the various ways that narrative intersections of speech *and silences* function together toward particular rhetorical ends in the Gospel of Luke. Although speech and silence are often considered to be mutually exclusive – silence as the absence of speech – this common perceptual frame limits, rather than opens up, interpretive possibilities when reading ancient narratives. In the work presented here, I consider speech and silence to be mutually constituted in intricate and inextricable ways.

Specifically, I demonstrate that attention to *both* characters' silences *and* the narrator's silences (such as gaps, omissions, or delays in recounting information) helps to delineate the complex interactions between plot, characterization, theme, and readerly experience in Luke's Gospel. Focusing on both speech and silence in the Third Gospel reveals that the Lukan narrator seeks to shape readers into ideal witnesses who use speech and silence in particular ways; one way to read the Lukan text is as an early Christian proclamation – not *only* of the gospel message – but also of the proper ways to use speech and silence in light of that message. Thus, we find that speech and silence are significant matters of concern within the Lukan story *and* that speech and silence are significant tools used in its telling.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction **1**
The Multivalent Phenomenon of Silence 6
A Narrative-Critical Approach and Definitions of Key Terms 22
Silences in Luke's Gospel 49
The Design of the Dissertation 52

Chapter 1: Prologue (1.1-4) and Narrative Beginnings (1.5-4.13) **56**
Introduction 56
Narrative Beginnings in Theory 56
Speech and Silence in the Prologue and Narrative Beginnings 59
Between the Narrator and the Reader 62
The Narrative Rhetoric of Characterization through Speech and Silence 71
Illustrative Pericope: Speech and Silence in the Silencing of Zechariah 78
In Sum: Speech and Silence in Luke's Prologue and Narrative Beginnings 99

Chapter 2: Jesus' Galilean Ministry (4.14-9.50) **102**
Introduction 102
Speech and Silence in Jesus' Galilean Ministry 104
Between the Narrator and the Reader 105
The Narrative Rhetoric of Characterization through Speech and Silence 118
Illustrative Pericope: Speech, Silence, and Simon the Pharisee 148
Excursus: The Literary Technique of Internal Monologue 151
In Sum: Speech and Silence in Jesus' Galilean Ministry 161

Chapter 3: The Central Section (9.51-19.27) **163**
Introduction 163
Speech and Silence in The Central Section 166
Between the Narrator and the Reader 167
The Narrative Rhetoric of Characterization through Speech and Silence 174
Illustrative Pericope: The Pharisees' Silence Before Jesus 199
In Sum: Speech and Silence in The Central Section 203

Chapter 4: The Passion and Post-Resurrection Narratives (19.28-24.53) **205**
Introduction 205
Speech and Silence in The Passion and Post-Resurrection Narratives 206
Between the Narrator and the Reader 208
The Narrative Rhetoric of Characterization through Speech and Silence 217
Illustrative Pericope: Jesus' Trial Before Herod 242
In Sum: Speech & Silence in the Passion and Post-Resurrection Narratives 255

Conclusion **258**
Summary and Implications 259
Looking Ahead: Speech and Silence in Future Research 272

Bibliography **275**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In many ways, these past several years have been a process of discovering my own voice. Many people have encouraged and empowered me along the way. And yet, it is strange to have written so many pages – particularly on speech and silence – and then, turning to thank those who have helped me, find myself utterly speechless. The words simply do not exist to express the depth of gratitude I feel when I think of the family and friends who have made it possible for me to complete this degree.

First, I want to thank my incredible advisor, François Bovon, for these many years of care and guidance. Professor Bovon, I am profoundly grateful for your unique combination of intellectual acuity and generosity of spirit. Thank you for gifting me with your Lukan library, and thank you for the countless hours you spent reading, commenting on, and ultimately improving my work.

Thanks also go to the other members of my committee – Karen King, Ronald Thiemann, and John Darr – all of whom have pushed me, challenged me, and shaped my thinking in their own unique ways. Special thanks to Professor Darr of Boston College for serving on my committee without any institutional responsibility to do so.

I also want to thank the members of the New Testament and Early Christianity Dissertation Seminar, including the professors who were not on my committee, but who gave me valuable feedback on chapter drafts: Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Laura Nasrallah, Giovanni Bazzana, and Eldon Epp. Thanks, especially, to my fellow students in the department, who are not only colleagues but also dear friends. Katherine, Mikael, Jung, Margaret, and Chris, you have helped me more than you know.

Courtney has walked every step of this journey with me with wisdom, grace, and good humor. We have gone through so much since our first days in Greek together; all the while, Courtney's superpower has been keeping me calm and giving me perspective. Courtney, I look forward to being mommies and scholars together for many, many years to come.

I very much appreciate Bill Younger and Lauren Younger, whose remarkable generosity has opened doors and directed my path in ways I could never have anticipated and for which I am supremely grateful. Bill and Lauren, it is no exaggeration to say that without you, I would never have gone to Harvard.

Thanks, also, to those who have provided childcare through these several years so that I might have the time to write and study. It has been a priceless gift to know my children were loved and well cared for while I worked.

I quite literally would not have been able to complete this degree without the love and selfless support of my incomparable family. From reading draft after draft of this manuscript, to taking trip after trip from CA to Boston, to offering prayer after prayer on my behalf, they have sacrificed so that I could pursue my calling. I am particularly grateful to my parents, who introduced me to the astonishing, enchanting vitality of words. As with everything I write, their influence and teachings saturate these pages.

My husband John has been my constant companion, stalwart supporter, and favorite friend. John, marriage with you truly is – as Nouwen says – the experience of being brought together as "two prayerful hands extended toward God and forming in this way a home for God in this world." Thank you for believing in me when I didn't believe in myself. I love you.

Our daughter Alethea and son Daelen have never known Mommy to *not* be writing her dissertation. Alethea and Daelen, you already have a marvelous capacity to remind me that my life is not my own. Thank you for being such wonderful teachers. Alethea, thank you for teaching me that the things I say matter; my words shape your sweet, tender toddler self. Daelen, thank you for teaching me in your wordless, baby way that sometimes, simply holding another person in silence is the best way to say, "I love you."

To John, Alethea, and Daelen

INTRODUCTION

As a result of him,
the thoughts of many hearts
will be revealed.
- Luke 2.35

Scholars have long agreed: Luke loves words. The language of the Gospel of Luke has been hailed as the best Greek in the New Testament, and the unstoppable divine word emerges as an undeniable motif throughout Luke-Acts.[1] Even a brief comparison with its canonical counterparts demonstrates that, thematically, the Gospel of Luke is preoccupied with the power of spoken words. Words, Luke tells us, can entrap us (20:26) or they can save us (12.11-12). Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaks (6:45),[2] and yet, words can also deceive and mislead (21.8). Tennyson was right: "Words, like nature, half reveal and half conceal the soul within."[3] Whereas in Matthew 13.54 and Mark 6.2, the people marvel at Jesus' "wisdom" and "mighty works," in the Lukan parallel, they "testify" to him and wonder "at the words of grace which poured forth from his mouth" (4.21-22). The Lukan Jesus is a proven prophet because of "his powerful deeds *and*

---

[1] The bibliography is vast. Examples include H.J. Cadbury, "Four Features of Lukan Style," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), 87-102; idem, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (HTS 6; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920); N. Turner, "The Quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts," in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (ed. J.K. Elliot; NovTSup 44; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976), 387-400; Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* (SNTSMS 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Juhwan Joseph Kim, *"What is this Word?": An Early Christian Narrative of the Universal Spread of the Spirit-Accompanied Word* (Phd. Diss.: Harvard University, 2009); Adelbert Denaux, Rita Corstjens, and Hellen Mardega, eds. *The Vocabulary of Luke: An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009).

[2] The parallel in *Gospel of Thomas* 45 does not explicitly mention *speaking*: "Out of the abundance of the heart he brings forth evil things."

[3] See Lord Alfred Tennyson's moving elegy for his lost friend, *In Memoriam A.H.H.*, in *The Works of Tennyson* (ed. Lord Hallam Tennyson; London and New York: Macmillan, 1907), 1:242.

words" (24.19). Only in Luke does the risen Jesus remind his disciples about his words (24.44), and only in Luke do the women at the empty tomb "remember his words" (24.8).

And yet, words alone do not a language make. One arranges words in sequences, ties them together with grammatical signals and rhetorical devices, and ultimately builds them into sentences and paragraphs and discourses. This much is commonly understood. What is not so well understood is the function that silence plays in the overall construction. Just as music without silence collapses into cacophony, so words without silence signify nothing. The silences are the invisible, inaudible cement that can hold the entire edifice together.

Few scholars have examined the multiple ways that the Lukan portrayals of words *and silences* function together toward particular rhetorical ends. There is, of course, a paradox here. Luke loves words, and yet I want to highlight his silences. Why? My desire to draw these two concepts together in critical analysis stems from the conviction that speech and silence are inseparable; they mutually constitute and complement one other, in text as in life. To focus on both speech and silence in the Lukan narrative is to enrich and deepen one's experience of the whole.[4] As Foucault asserts, critics must "try to determine the different ways of not saying [because] there is not one but many silences, and they are *an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses*."[5] In this dissertation, I propose various ways of mapping the "not one but many silences" that "underlie and permeate" Luke's Gospel.

---

[4] Lisa Mazzei puts it this way: "A search for the whole of speech is not possible without a commensurate search for the silence therein." *Inhabited Silence in Qualitative Research: Putting Poststructural Theory to Work* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 32.

[5] David Couzens Hoy, ed., *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 931. Emphasis mine.

Let me illustrate: Consider the MGM movie version of *The Wizard of Oz* (1939). The scenes where Dorothy Gale is going about her everyday, mundane life in Kansas appear in black-and-white, but as soon as she opens the door onto Munchkinland, Technicolor floods the scene. The magical world of Oz is depicted entirely in color, and the film only returns to black-and-white when Dorothy has returned to her drab, colorless life on the farm. Adding the dazzling color cinematography when Dorothy entered Oz created a level of nuance and detail to the picture that for viewers – especially at the time of the movie's release – was quite striking. This play between black-and-white and color was intentional, meant to contrast the dusty Kansas landscape with the wonder and magic of the Land of Oz;[6] the movie would not have been the same if it had been filmed entirely in black-and-white, or entirely in color. What I hope to show in the pages that follow is that attention to the distinctive terrain of Luke's speech and silences – Luke's narrative soundscape – similarly adds a layer of nuance and detail to Luke's narrative that expands and enriches our understanding of its messages. Reading Luke's Gospel without attending to Luke's silences is like deciding ahead of time to watch *The Wizard of Oz* only in black-and-white, as though this were the only option the filmmakers had when creating it.

I believe that the Lukan narrator[7] seeks to shape the reader/hearer[8] into an ideal witness to his message – an ideal witness who listens to, receives, and perceives the

---

[6] Writer Herman Mankiewicz wrote before even beginning the script, "As discussed, this part of the picture…will be shot in black and white, but every effort should be made, through tinting, to emphasize the grey nature of the landscape and Dorothy's daily life." Qtd. in Aljean Harmetz, *The Making of the Wizard of Oz: Movie Magic and studio Power in the Prime of MGM —and the Miracle of Production* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977), 27.

[7] In this study, I will use the name "Luke" to designate the Gospel traditionally known by that name. I will also use "Luke" to refer to the implied author of this narrative, noting that debates over the flesh-and-blood historical author of this Gospel continue, but do not impact my discussion. "Lukan narrator" refers to the

divine word correctly. In this, I am presupposing and building upon the work of John Darr, who has argued convincingly that, "the Lukan text is designed to persuade its readers to become believing witnesses,"[9] specifically, to become "certain kinds of

---

narrator – the storyteller – constructed by the implied author to tell the story from a particular perspective. For more on the literary concepts of implied author and narrator, see Wayne Booth's classic formulation in *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (2nd ed.; Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 1983), 70-76 and 428-31 and the more recent Tom Kindt and Hans-Harald Müller, *The Implied Author: Concept and Controversy* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006). The distinction between the "real" (historical) author and the narrator has become commonplace, but Seymour Chatman (expanding upon Booth's *The Rhetoric of Fiction*) popularized a third "authorial" category – the *implied author* – which is "an image of the author in the text" that differs from the actual historical author. In chapter 5 of *Coming to Terms*, "In Defense of the Implied Author," Chatman insists that the term "implied author" is necessary, especially when the "real" (historical) author is unknown, as is the case with Luke's Gospel. Seymour Chatman, *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990). However, other narratologists (notably, Gerard Genette) reject the notion of the implied author as superfluous except in cases wherein the real author differs notably from the vision of the author that the text creates for the reader (such as in the case of unreliable narration). I agree with those who argue that the implied author should not be considered a ubiquitous narrative principle. As Chatman himself says, "The question is whether the real author and the narrator between them account for all the distinctions we sense in actual texts." *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Discourse and Film* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1978), 81. Though Chatman would answer this question in the negative, my view is that a third-person omniscient narrator is closer to the "implied author" than first-person, unreliable narrators would be, and therefore, narrative analysis of Luke's Gospel functions perfectly well without positing an additional third category of authorial agency. Thus, I refer to the storyteller as the *narrator*, who is distinct from the historical author (and/or the Lukan redactor).

[8] It is common to note that Luke's "implied readers" (the intended recipients of the narrative) likely were not readers at all, but *hearers*, which raises two major issues. First, reading and hearing are two different psychological activities, and second, print-dominated cultures often view texts as static objects, whereas oral cultures tend to conceive of speech as an event. This is Stephen Moore's critique of "literary" approaches to the gospels: "to call the evangelist's intended listening audience 'the reader' and then produce minute analyses of a reading that in all probability never occurred . . . would seem the ultimate waste of time." *Literary Criticism and the Gospels* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 87. Still, despite their differences, oral and written narratives also share common traits. For instance, both inherently unfold sequentially. In fact, Moore admits that, "The left-to-right reception of the verbal string, which figures so prominently in Iser's phenomenology of reading . . . has clear affinities with the syllable-by-syllable experience of hearing a text read" (88). Both readers and hearers share common strategies for meaning-making: they assume that events in a story are somehow causally connected and that the writer has written for a specific discernible reason, and they draw upon extratextual knowledge and conventions to make sense of what they read or hear. Thus, it is not sufficient simply to point out that aural and visual receptions of a text are different; one must determine how the specific differences are relevant to the analysis in question. I will refer to the Lukan "reader" throughout this work, but my observations will be applicable to "hearers," as well. It is worth noting that some narrative critics, such as Whitney Shiner [*Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 2003)] do attempt to recreate the auditory experiences of an original audience, and thus self-consciously avoid the "minute analyses" of close readings to which Moore refers.

[9] Emphasis original. John Darr, *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 53.

hearers (attentive, receptive, discerning, committed, tenacious) and *retellers* (accurate, bold, effective, persistent)" of the gospel message.[10] I want to add to this two further observations: first, Luke's ideal witnesses will use speech and silence strategically when communicating the divine word with others, and second, speech and silence are themselves crucial strategies by which the Lukan narrator attempts to persuade readers to become believing witnesses. One way to read the Lukan text is as an early Christian proclamation – not *only* of the gospel message, as so very many readers have rightly understood – but also of the proper ways to use speech and silence in light of that message. Three further contentions inform this hypothesis:

1) One, although speech and silence are often considered to be mutually exclusive – silence as the absence of speech – this common perceptual frame limits, rather than opens up, interpretive possibilities when reading ancient narratives.[11]
2) Two, that right uses of speech and silence are key aspects of religious identity;
3) Three, that attention to speech and silence at times complicates and at other times corroborates traditional scholarly assessments of the Lukan narrative.

---

[10] Emphasis original. John Darr, "'Watch How You Listen' (Lk. 8.18): Jesus and the Rhetoric of Perception in Luke-Acts," in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (ed. E.S. Malbon and E.V. McKnight; JSNTSup 109; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994), 87.

[11] A related view is that silence is the absence of any noise at all. One notorious example is the so-called "silent piece" of John Cage, composer, entitled *4'33*, which consists of four minutes and thirty-three seconds of the performer making no noise whatsoever. It was first performed on August 29, 1952. For his own reflections on the piece, see John Cage, *The Charles Eliot Norton Lectures*, in *I-VI* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1990).

My aim is to explore and describe what remains largely uncharted territory – the complex ways that narrative intersections of speech and silences can be useful touch-points for understanding how the Lukan narrative attempts to shape its readers.

The first step when embarking on an expedition through uncharted territory is, of course, to survey the landscape: to get the lay of the land. That is the goal of this chapter. However, because Lukan scholars already have emphasized the topic of speech in Luke's Gospel, I will call particular attention to recent developments in scholarship on silence.[12] The chapter is divided into four major sections. Part I consists of an overview of previous scholarship on silence, both generally and in antiquity. Part II makes the case for using a narrative critical methodology to explore the silences in Luke's Gospel, and defines key narratological concepts. Part III introduces the silences in the Gospel of Luke, and Part IV describes the approach of the dissertation.

PART I: THE MULTIVALENT PHENOMENON OF SILENCE

Several trends in recent scholarship point toward a rising tide of interest in silence across a wide variety of disciplines, and gesture toward existing lacunae in Lukan studies; as such, they serve as warrants for the work undertaken here.

---

[12] Many scholars focus on Jesus' spoken teachings, often mining them for evidence of theological redactions and tradition transmission, but the studies are too numerous to list here. Bultmann famously classified Jesus' sayings taxonomically (prophecy, apophthegms, logia, etc.). *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963); *Jesus and the Word* (New York: Scribner's, 1958). See also Eugene Boring, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1982). Jesus' utterances – and his silence in the passion narrative – appear in discussions of doctrine, such as debates over New Testament Christologies. For example, J.C. O'Neill hypothesized that Jesus' silence in the passion narrative indicates his Messiahship. "The Silence of Jesus," *NTS* 15 (1968-69): 153-167. See also Bas Van Iersel, *"Der Sohn" in den synoptischen Jesusworte. Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbst-bezeichnung Jesu?* NovTSup. (Leiden: Brill, 1961); Ferdinand Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum.* FRLANT 83. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); Anthony Thiselton, "Christology in Luke, Speech-Act Theory, and the Problem of Dualism in Christology after Kant," in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ. Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Theology* (ed. Joel Green and Max Turner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

Previous Scholarship on Silence in General

Understandably, the concept of silence often escapes notice altogether. Silence is slippery; trying to describe it is like trying to grab hold of running water. Still, many different critical approaches offer conceptual tools to aid in this task; silence has been profitably analyzed in terms of its *context of expression* (silence in a library differs from silence in a torture chamber),[13] its *source* (personal choice or external pressure, for example),[14] and its interpersonal *functions* (silence can alienate, or silence can unify).[15] On a most basic level, we can distinguish between silences that are external or internal to the communication process. Some silences – such as students reading silently in a classroom – are not expected to communicate anything; they are external to the communication process. Other silences – such as conversational pauses or eloquent silences[16] – function within the communication process and are therefore internal to it.

---

[13] Richard Johanneson distinguishes between silence that occurs in human thought, in interpersonal communication, in political/civil life, or in pathological settings. See "The Functions of Silence: A Plea for Communication Research," *Western Speech* 38 (1974): 25-35.

[14] Most of the literature outlining the multivalent functions of silence distinguishes between unintentional and intentional silences. Unintentional silences refer to those instances in which a person is silent due to circumstances outside of his or her control, such as memory loss or being overwhelmed with an emotion like fear, awe, or grief. Intentional silences, by contrast, reflect the active, intentional choice of the silent person not to speak; at times, this might be strategic silence utilized to convey a particular message, while at other times, one might choose to remain silent without also intending to communicate a specific message. Muriel Saville-Troike was one of the first to emphasize the distinction between externally or internally imposed silences in "The Place of Silence in An Integrated Theory of Communication," in *Perspectives on Silence* (ed. Deborah Tannen and Saville-Troike; Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1985), 3–18.

[15] Vernon Jensen identifies five functions of silence: linkage, affecting, revelational, judgmental, and activating. See Jensen, "Communicative Functions of Silence," *ETCA Review of General Semantics* 30 (1973): 249–257.

[16] Ulrich Schmitz defines "eloquent silence" as "silence which says something." See "Eloquent Silence," trans. Allen Mundy, online at http://www.linse.uni-due.de/linse/publikationen/silence.html, from "Beredtes Schweigen – Zur sprachlichen Fülle der Leere. Über Grenzen der Sprachwissenschaft," *Osnabrücker Beitrage zur Prachtheorie*, Heft 42 (1990): 5-58. Leona Toker's use of "eloquent reticence" is similar: she

The latter type, those silences internal to the communication process, provoke varying responses from observers. Cinema again provides a helpful illustration. Consider the difference between silent films and the "talking pictures" that appeared onscreen in the 1920s.[17] Silent cinema was defined by its lack of synchronized recorded dialogue; Charlie Chaplin declared that "talkies" were "ruining the great beauty of silence."[18] And yet, pitting silence against sound obscures the complex relationship between them and ignores the experiential effects silence can have on viewers. Even after sound effects were introduced into film production, silence remained a crucial and powerful aspect of movie soundtracks.[19] Imagine, for instance, film editor Walter Murch's use of silence in *The English Patient* (1996): after the main character Caravaggio cries out in protest while his torturers prepare to cut off his thumbs, he is met with…silence. The effect is chilling. In this sense, we might say that silence is itself a sound effect. Silences in literary texts similarly function as foundational features of the narrative soundscape, educing readerly responses that often are essential to the readerly work.

As such, silences can be meaningful discursive events, powerful aspects of – not simply absences of – linguistic exchange.[20] In this dissertation, I am concerned with a

---

explores the rhetorical impact of a narrator withholding information in *Eloquent Reticence: Withholding Information in Fictional Narrative* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1993).

[17] Powerful silent films continue to be made and celebrated today. A silent film, *The Artist*, won five Academy Awards in 2012, including best picture.

[18] "Charlie Chaplin Attacks the Talkies," *Motion Picture Magazine* (May 1929); Qtd. in Charles J. Maland, *Chaplin and American Culture: The Evolution of a Star Image* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1991), 113.

[19] As Paul Théberge notes about cinematic texts, "patterns of sound and silence emerge that contribute to the overall structure of the narrative." Paul Théberge, "Almost Silent: The Interplay of Sound and Silence in Contemporary Cinema and Television," in *Lowering the Boom: Critical Studies in Film Sound* (ed. Jay Beck and Tony Grajeda; Champaign, 2008), 51.

theorizing of silence that, as Lisa Mazzei writes, "locates silence as 'data,' not as absence, lack, or omission, but as positive, strategic, purposeful, and *meaning full*."[21] At the same time, I recognize with Leona Toker that "a comprehensive paradigm of the dependence of effects on techniques is impossible and unnecessary."[22] Instead, I aim to trace *possible* readerly responses and "relate [them] to the rhetorical devices that condition [them]."[23] To this end, rather than attempting an exhaustive outline of the diverse lines of inquiry to which I allude above, I will note several fundamental observations that are shared across many fields and will prove helpful in the narrative analysis of Luke's Gospel to come.

Silence is Multivalent

Max Picard's landmark study on silence, *Die Welt des Schweigens* (1948),[24] introduced the ontological significance of silence into contemporary scholarly discourse, and several decades later, Bernard Dauenhauer's *Silence: The Phenomenon and Its Ontological Significance* further developed Picard's work.[25] With their treatments of silence as a

---

[20] As Jaworski puts it, "the absence of speech does not imply the absence of communication." Adam Jaworski, *The Power of Silence: Social and Pragmatic Perspectives* (Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications, 1993), 46.

[21] Mazzei, *Inhabited Silence*, 29. Emphasis original.

[22] Toker, *Eloquent Reticence*, 16.

[23] Toker, *Eloquent Reticence*, 16.

[24] Max Picard, *Die Welt des Schweigens* (Zurich: Rentsch, 1948). English transl.: *The World of Silence* (trans. Stanley Goodman; Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952).

[25] Bernard Dauenhauer, *Silence: The Phenomenon and Its Ontological Significance* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1980).

fundamentally multivalent phenomenon, these two philosophical considerations of silence sparked a wide variety of scholarly perspectives on the subject.

For example, silence is an especially celebrated theme in both ancient and contemporary[26] theologies. In the context of spiritual and theological writings, silence can be the means of entrance into a mystical realm beyond speech,[27] or it can mark a recognition of the inherent inability of language to describe the ineffable God.[28] Today, ritualized silence is explored in scholarship on prayer, as well as expression(s) of the sacred.

Silence can also mark a deep pessimism regarding the efficacy of language.[29] For instance, authors dealing with the atrocities of the Holocaust remind us that some realities

---

[26] E.D. Blodgett and H.G. Coward, eds., *Silence, the Word and the Sacred* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1989). For modern Jewish theological treatments of speech and silence, see David J. Wolpe, *In Speech and In Silence: The Jewish Quest for God* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1992); Ernestine Schlant, *The Language of Silence: Meanings of the Holocaust* (London: Routledge, 1999); André Neher, *L'exil de la parole: du silence biblique au silence d'Auschwitz* (Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1970); on Chan Buddhism, see Youru Wang, "Liberating Oneself from the Absolutized Boundary of Language: A Liminological Approach to the Interplay of Speech and Silence in Chan Buddhism," *Philosophy East and West* 51.1 (Jan., 2001): 83-99. From a Christian perspective, see Rachel Muers, *Keeping God's Silence: Towards a Theological Ethics of Communication* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004); Claudia Kunz, *Schweigen und Geist: Biblische und patristische Studien zu einer Spiritualität des Schweigens* (Freiburg: Herder, 1996).

[27] See, for example, references to the Valentinian goddess *Sige* (silence) in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.13.6 and descriptions of *Sige* and *Sophia* in *Tripartite Tractate* 56,32-57,7. In the *Gospel of Mary*, as Karen King notes, "It is in silence that one ultimately encounters God." "Hearing, Seeing, and Knowing God: *Allogenes* and the *Gospel of Mary*," in *Early Christian Voices in Texts, Traditions, and Symbols: Essays in Honor of François Bovon* (ed. David H. Warren, Ann Graham Brock, David W. Pao; Boston: Brill, 2003), 325. See also Tilde Bak Halvgaard, "The Sound of Silence: Theology of Language in *The Thunder Perfect Mind* (NHC VI, 2) and *The Trimorphic Protennoia* (NHC XIII, 1)," unpublished paper (University of Copenhagen; 2010). The thirteenth-century poet and mystic Rumi wrote that the soul resides in "silent breath." J. Rumi, *The Essential Rumi* (trans. C. Barks; San Francisco: Harper, 1995), 21.

[28] See Joseph Mazzeo on Augustine's *deus absconditus*: "St. Augustine's Rhetoric of Silence," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 23 (1962): 175-96. For a compilation of apophatic discourses, see William Franke, ed., *On What Cannot be Said: Apophatic Discourses in Philosophy, Religion, Literature and the Arts*, Vol. 1: Classic Formulations (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2007).

[29] Elisabeth Loevlie describes the "Dream of Silence" as a mythical, prelapsarian "other" to language, interpreting "the Fall into sin [as] also the fall into language." *Literary Silences in Pascal, Rousseau, and Beckett* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 13. Mortley argues for a massive shift in Greek thought, "from the discovery of logos to the discovery of the inefficacy of logos." *From Word to Silence: The Rise and Fall of Logos* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1986), 11.

and experiences are inexplicable; trying to put them into words ultimately does an injustice to the inexpressible (as Adorno so famously put it, we can have "no poetry after Auschwitz").[30] Often, the same authors simultaneously highlight a different kind of silence – the dysfunctional silencing that stems from denial or shame. They insist that while the former silence must be respected, the latter form of silence must be overcome.[31]

In the above cases, silence attests to what T.S. Eliot calls the "frontiers of consciousness beyond which words fail, though meanings still exist."[32] And yet, silence is not *merely* an alternative to failed speech.[33] Silence itself can be a powerful mode of communication – it can express shame or fear,[34] admiration or domination.[35] Silence can signify protective or oppressive censorship, but it can also indicate resistance or generate anticipation.[36]

---

[30] See, among many others, Roger Gottlieb, *Thinking the Unthinkable: Meanings of the Holocaust* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990); André Neher, *L'exil de la parole: du silence biblique au silence d'Auschwitz* (Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1970).

[31] "To forget would be not only dangerous but offensive; to forget the dead would be akin to killing them a second time." Elie Wiesel, *Night* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006), xv.

[32] T.S. Eliot, *The Music of Poetry: The Third W. P. Ker Memorial Lecture Delivered in the University of Glasgow 24th February 1942* (Glasgow: Jackson, 1942). Or consider how Lord Alfred Tennyson begins *In Memoriam A.H.H.*: "I sometimes hold it half a sin/ To put in words the grief I feel." *The Works of Tennyson*, 1:242.

[33] As Max Picard states, silence is "more than the mere negative renunciation of language." *The World of Silence*, 15. See, also, the classic work by George Steiner, *Language and Silence*: *Essays on Language, Literature and the Inhuman* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).

[34] For an ancient example of silence that stems from shame, see *Hero and Leander* II.160-62. Or consider Aeneas, who is dumbstruck with fear in *Aeneid* 4.279-95.

[35] Silence "may express dominance or disapproval, or it may indicate submission." Laura McClure, "Introduction," in *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001), 8. See also Deborah Tannen, *Gender and Discourse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[36] King-Kok Cheung proposes five "tonalities" or modes of silence that often overlap: 1) Stoic (silence of heroic endurance); 2) Protective (shielding someone from hearing something negative); 3) Attentive (acute listening); 4) Inhibitive (embarrassed); 5) Oppressive (exiling the other). *Articulate Silences: Hisaye Yamamoto, Maxine Hong Kingston, Joy Kogawa* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1993).

Feminist scholars helpfully highlight patterns of speech and silence as socio-historical markers of disenfranchised people groups who are rendered ideologically voiceless by those in power. In these cases, silence is the result of *silencing* – the enforced censoring or oppression of the marginalized. As Robin Clair points out in *Organizing Silence*, such gendered and racialized silences are insidiously and thoroughly embedded within institutional structures.[37] At the same time, however, bell hooks offers a salutary reminder: in a sense, some communities are silenced even when they speak because the dominant group refuses to listen. African American women, writes hooks, "have not been silent…[Thus] our struggle has not been to emerge from silence to speech but…to make speech that compels listeners, one that is heard."[38] The common thread throughout these diverse approaches to silence is that silence itself is extraordinarily multivalent.

Silence is Contextually Determined

The task of deciphering the myriad intentionalities behind silence – interpreting, or "hearing" what remains unsaid – can be daunting. However, this task is aided by the recognition that conceptions and practices of silence acquire specificity within particular contexts. For instance, certain practices that are considered "silent activities" in one time period often are not conceptualized in the same way in other historical contexts; reading and prayer are two obvious examples.[39] Or consider how the same type of silence can be

---

[37] Robin Patric Clair, *Organizing Silence: A World of Possibilities* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998).

[38] bell hooks, *Talking Back: Thinking feminist, Thinking Black* (Boston: South End Press, 1989), 6.

enabling in some contexts, but disempowering in others. Cheung cites "protective silence" as an example: parents often shield their children from harmful racism, though as the children mature, the same "protective silence" can infantilize them.[40] Additionally, the conventional silences of one culture can be easily misunderstood by another culture;[41] the stereotypically "silent Swedes" are consistently misunderstood by "talkative Americans."[42] Temporal, historical, and social contexts shape the meaning of individual instances of silence.

Silence is Rhetorically Powerful

For too long, silence has been equated with passivity, weakness, and submission.[43] And yet, the multivalence and contextually-determined nature of silence make it a particularly potent rhetorical tool. Scholars have begun to explore silence as a purposeful rhetorical stance – an active means of expressive power in and of itself. Indeed, Cheryl Glenn calls for "serious investigation" into silence as an "as yet underexamined rhetorical art."[44] In

---

[39] Pieter W. van der Horst, "Silent Prayer in Antiquity," *Numen* 41 (1994): 1-25; Paul Saenger, *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford, 1997). In ancient Greek practice, prayers were spoken in a low voice or kept completely silent only when there was a danger perceived in speaking them out loud; see Montiglio, *Silence in the Land of Logos* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 9-45.

[40] Cheung, *Articulate Silences*, 139.

[41] Charles Braithwaite, "Cultural Uses and Interpretations of Silence," in *The Nonverbal Communication Reader* (ed. Laura Guerrero, Joseph DeVito, and Michael Hecht; Prospect Heights: Waveland, 1999), 163-72.

[42] Consider the famous Swedish proverb, "Tala är silver, tiga är guld" (To speak is silver; to remain silent is gold). Christina Johansson Robinowitz and Lisa Werner Carr, *Modern-Day Vikings: A Practical Guide to Interacting with the Swedes* (Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, 2001).

[43] For example, when considering ancient democracy, Zumbrunnen warns against the common tendency to take "the silence of ordinary citizens as a sign of their disempowerment or irrelevance." John Zumbrunnen, *Silence and Democracy: Athenian Politics in Thucydides' History* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2008), 10.

particular, Glenn reminds us that interpersonal communication always entails power negotiations:

> Like speech, the meaning of silence depends on a power differential that exists in every rhetorical situation: who can speak, who must remain silent, who listens, and what those listeners can do.[45]

Linguist Thomas Huckin similarly explores the rhetoricity of "textual silences," which he defines as, "the omission of some piece of information that is pertinent to the topic at hand."[46] Huckin helpfully classifies some textual silences as "covert," meaning that the reader does not know s/he is missing information, and others as "collaborative," meaning that the writer assumes the reader will readily supply the missing information from a shared extratextual repertoire[47] in order to make sense of the text.[48] As Huckin rightly points out, both types of textual silences can be either "rhetorically benign," or "rhetorically manipulative."[49] To the extent that they guide readers' interpretive decisions, textual silences are on par with more commonly recognized rhetorical tools.

The foregoing discussion has outlined how current theoretical treatments of silence point us toward an understanding of silence as a multivalent, contextually-

---

[44] Cheryl Glenn, *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004), 2, 4.

[45] Glenn, *Unspoken*, 9. See also Perret-Clermont, Schubauer-Leoni, and Trognon, "L'Extorsion des Reponses en Situation Asymetrique," in *Verbum: Conversations Adulte/Enfants* (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1992), 3-32.

[46] Thomas Huckin, "On Textual Silences, Large and Small," in *Traditions of Writing Research* (ed. Charles Bazerman et al.; New York: Routledge, 2010), 420.

[47] Darr lists the following as key elements of readers' extratextual repertoires: 1) language; 2) social norms and cultural scripts; 3) classical or canonical literature; 4) literary conventions; 5) reading rules; 6) commonly known historical and geographical facts. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 34-36.

[48] Huckin, "On Textual Silences," 420.

[49] Huckin, "On Textual Silences," 420.

determined rhetorical strategy. With this understanding in mind, I take up Glenn's challenge to seriously investigate silence as a rhetorical art. In this study, I do so with a specific ancient text in view: Luke's Gospel. A full investigation of silence in Luke necessitates reflection on two key topics: silence in antiquity, and silence in narratives. These two topics raise a host of related questions: How was silence conceptualized in antiquity? Who was silent before whom, and why? How do various silences function in narratives specifically, and to what ends? How are "covert" and "collaborative" silences rhetorically articulated in narrative, and what difference do these make in how readers might understand a story? We turn now to previous studies of silence in antiquity.

Previous Scholarship on Silence in Antiquity

Several recent scholarly projects have begun to advance our understanding of silence in antiquity, and thus form the backdrop for my approach to Luke's Gospel. In *Silence in the Land of Logos*, for example, Silvia Montiglio explores the exceedingly complex ways that "silence resonates" in what she deems the pervasively vocal culture of archaic and classical Greece.[50] Considering a wide range of sources from Homeric narratives to Athenian oratories, Montiglio highlights how in Greek religion, silence often is considered a shield, thereby paradoxically pointing toward the mysterious power of the spoken word. Although Montiglio mentions several ways in which the ancient Greek context differs from that of the first century CE, she does not explore the latter period in depth.[51]

[50] Montiglio, *Silence in the Land of Logos*.

[51] For instance, she points out that ancient Greek references to their audiences as appropriately vocal differ from the positive, attentive listening she finds in Roman literature. *Silence in the Land of Logos*, 151-52.

One finds explicit references to silence scattered throughout various early Christian texts. For instance, in the *Acts of Peter* (2nd cent. C.E.), Peter teaches that the divine voice is "heard through silence."[52] Early Christian apologist Ignatius of Antioch taught about three "mysteries" accomplished by God in silence.[53] Currently, scholars are exploring similar themes in Nag Hammadi texts, where God dwells in silence, and the Word comes forth from silence,[54] powers are created and mysteries are hidden in silence,[55] Sophia is dubbed "Silence" (Σιγή),[56] and silence and mystery coexist in Jesus.[57] Thus, Kim Haines-Eitzen's call for scholars to attend to "the role of sound in the early Christian imagination" is quite appropriate.[58] As Haines-Eitzen points out, early Christian texts often exhibit a complex relationship "between sound, silence, and the sacred," and therefore require more nuanced approaches that "move beyond a simple

---

[52] *Acts of Peter* 39.

[53] Ign. *Eph.* 19.1.

[54] *Allogenes* 61.1-22; 62.24-25; 63.34-35; *Val. Exp.* 22.21-27.

[55] *Ap. John* 2.1-2; 6.35-7.4. See Karen King, "Mystery and Secrecy in *The Apocryphon of John*," in *Mystery and Secrecy in the Nag Hammadi Collection and Other Ancient Literature: Ideas and Practices* (ed. John Turner, Ismo Dunderberg, Christian H. Bull and Liv Ingeborg Lied; Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2011), 61-85.

[56] *Eugnostos* 88.5-12.

[57] *1 Apoc. Jas.* 28.1-3. See J. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition* (Québec: Le Presses de l'Université Laval, 2001).

[58] Kim Haines-Eitzen, "Imagining Sound and Silence," paper presented at the AAR/SBL national meeting, San Francisco, Calif., 2011, 14. Related to the topic of sound in early Christian literature is the growing body of scholarship devoted to performance criticism. See, for example, Bernard Brandon Scott, who writes argues that "the amphitheater forms the primary metaphor for communication in the ancient world and sound is the medium of communication." See Bernard Brandon Scott, "A New Voice in the Amphitheater: Full Fidelity in Translating," in *Fidelity in Translation: Communicating the Bible in the New Media* (ed. Robert Hodgson and Paul Soukup; New York: Sheed & Ward, 1999), 110. See also www.biblicalperformancecriticism.org.

dichotomy of opposites or binaries like presence and absence, active and passive, power and impotence."[59]

Literary critics considering the Holocaust also have made strides toward overcoming the strict presence/absence binary. As Ernestine Schlant asserts in *The Language of Silence*, literal absence can constitute a powerful form of presence.[60] Indeed, present/absent figures also have their analogues in written texts.[61] In 1 Corinthians 5.3, for example, Paul refers to the subjective sense in which one can be "absent in body, but present in spirit" (ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι).[62] One of the assumptions underlying my exploration of Luke's Gospel is that simplistic dichotomies like presence/absence, active/passive, and power/impotence are inadequate for reading the silences of the Lukan narrative.

Feminist biblical scholars also attend to silence in ancient texts, but in a different key: they draw special attention to the silencing of women by ancient texts themselves,[63]

---

[59] Kim Haines-Eitzen, "Imagining Sound and Silence," 14.

[60] Ernestine Schlant, *The Language of Silence*, 1.

[61] On this, see especially Thomas Docherty, *Reading (Absent) Character: Towards a Theory of Characterization in Fiction* (Oxford University Press, 1983). William James considers "presence in absence" to be a form of "pointing" to something about which one knows, but with which one is not directly acquainted (in short, something that is physically absent, but present in one's mind). See his lecture from December 1894, printed as "The Knowing of Things Together," in *Essays in Philosophy* (ed. Frederick Burkhardt and Fredson Bowers; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978), 73.

[62] Of course, the reverse is also possible. One can be physically present, but mentally or emotionally absent, not functioning fully due to illness or some other distraction. In business, this has been called "presenteeism." See Paul Hemp, "Presenteeism: At work – but out of it," *Harvard Business Review* (2004): 1-9.

[63] Aristotle asserted, "Silence gives grace to a woman-though that is not the case likewise with a man." *Politics* 1.5.9. Or consider Homer's *Odyssey*, where Telemachus tells his mother, "speech (μῦθος) will be for men, for all, but most of all for me; for mine is the authority in the house" (*Od.* 1.359). The biblical admonition continues to be influential in many Christian circles today: "Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent" (1 Tim. 2.11-12). Regarding the Lukan text, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza maintains that Luke consistently excludes

as well as by the scholarship that interprets them. Commensurate with recognizing such silences, then, scholars face the greater challenge of recovering women's voices from history.[64] Melanie Johnson-DeBaufre summarizes the questions that are by now so familiar in feminist biblical scholarship: "How do we read the silences and biases of the text? Were there no wo/men present because no wo/men are mentioned?"[65] Such work often focuses on speech as an index of power,[66] and correlatively, silence as a mark of – and prescription for – subordination. For example, Turid Karlsen Seim, discussing Mary's silence in Lk. 10:38-42, asks, "Does the idealisation of Mary mean that a woman's relationship to the word is to be understood in terms of silence?"[67] Feminist biblical scholars offer crucial insights into speech and silence in biblical texts.[68] Still, I

---

women from leadership; she designates this "the Lukan silence." "Biblische Grundlegung," in *Feministische Theologie: Perspektiven zur Orientierung* (ed. M. Kassel; Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1988), 32, 35-38. Similarly, Jane Schaberg writes in the *Women's Bible Commentary* that Luke is "an extremely dangerous text, perhaps the most dangerous in the Bible" because contrary to many people's impressions, Luke "fosters women's silence in the Gospel as a whole, although the women at the tomb do speak out" (Expanded Edition; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 363, 368.

[64] For a variety of perspectives, see André Lardinois and Laura McClure, eds., *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).
[65] Melanie Johnson-DeBaufre, "'Gazing Upon the Invisible': Archaeology, Historiography, and the Elusive Women of 1 Thessalonians," in *From Roman to Early Christian Thessalonike: Studies in Religion and Archaeology* (ed. Laura Nasrallah, Charalambos Bakirtzis, and Steven J. Friesen; Harvard Theological Studies; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010). Silence as invisibility is a common topos in a wide range of biblical studies and theological texts. See, for example, the helpful discussion in Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Breaking the Silence—Becoming Visible," in "Women: Invisible in Church and Theology," in *Concilium: Religion in the Eighties* (ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Mary Collins; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1985).

[66] When characters do speak, terms of address and deferential forms can index different social relationships between speakers. See, among others, Lk. 5.8, 12; 7.6, 9.59, 61; 10.17; 12.41; 18.41.

[67] Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 116.

[68] For a discussion of the Lukan tendency to honor Peter over Mary Magdalene, see Ann Graham Brock, *Mary Magdalene, The First Apostle: The Struggle for Authority* (HTS 51; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 19-40. On women's prophetic speech in early Christian literature, see Karen King, "Prophetic Power and Women's Authority: The Case of the Gospel of Mary (Magdalene)," in *Women Preachers and Prophets through Two Millennia of Christianity* (ed. Beverly Kienzle and Pamela J. Walker; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

want to emphasize that focusing on silence as indicative of powerlessness can obfuscate the fact that silence also can denote power.[69]

Scholars of rhetoric like Cheryl Glenn and Krista Ratcliffe remind us that an interest in silence as a powerful rhetorical tool is quite ancient: "Westerners have long forgotten (if we ever knew in the first place) the ancient Egyptian and Pythagorean beliefs in the value of silence and listening."[70] They cite examples such as the Egyptian vizier Kagemeni, who viewed silence as a means of establishing a good reputation, and Pythagoras, who famously enjoined novices to maintain a five-year vow of silence.[71] Kathy Maxwell draws evidence for her claim that "authors use silence to speak to their audience" from the ancient rhetorical handbooks of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and the progymnasmata, among others.[72] Over sixty years ago, Ernest Dutoit observed that the Roman historian Livy utilized *silentium* as a rhetorical technique that heightens emotion and creates a foil to action.[73] Projects like these demonstrate that silence was a pervasive and serious concern among ancient authors; in that demonstration, they raise the

---

[69] Laird cites Ovid's love elegy *Amores* as an example of the speaker who is in a subordinate role to the silent addressee. *Powers of Expression*, 19.

[70] Cheryl Glenn and Krista Ratcliffe, "Why Silence and Listening Are Important Rhetorical Arts," in *Silence and Listening as Rhetorical Arts* (Carbondale, Il: Southern Illinois University Press, 2011), 1.

[71] The Pythagoreans' vow of silence was seen to indicate their *enkrateia* – self-mastery. See Iamblichus, *On the Pythagorean Life* 74. See also the joke about this in Lucian, *Demon*. 14.

[72] Kathy Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines: The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu* (New York: T & T Clark, 2010), 1. Maxwell identifies six tools commonly used by ancient rhetoricians to encourage audience participation: 1). Access to privileged information; 2). Specific Omissions; 3). Open-ended comparisons; 4). Hidden meanings; 5). Question and Answer; 6). Allusion (49-78). Though she focuses on the Lukan narrative, Maxwell does not consider the silences of the characters in the story.

[73] E. Dutoit, "Silences, dans l'oeuvre de Tite-Live," in *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à J. Marouzeau* (Paris, 1948), 141–51.

possibility that interpretations of ancient texts are inadequate to the extent that they ignore these issues.

I will also argue that one of the Lukan narrator's key rhetorical aims is to advance a particular kind of Christian identity. Here, previous work connecting speech ethics with identity formation in antiquity will be useful. Drawing from a wide range of ancient texts, Jeremy Hultin demonstrates that despite the great diversity in particulars, there was widespread agreement throughout the ancient world that speech was connected to moral character.[74] In particular, vocal brevity (often, silence explicitly) indicated self-control,[75] and loquacity signified foolishness.[76] Discussing the ancient regulation of "foul language," Hultin emphasizes that in early Christian circles, "the discipline of the tongue was bound up with the creation of religious identities."[77] The Epistle to James is a frequently cited early Christian example, with its emphasis on being "slow to speak" (βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, 1.19) and controlling "the tongue" (γλῶσσα, 1.26-27, 3.5-8). James 1.26 specifically connects the bridling of the tongue to authentic religion: "If someone thinks he is religious but does not bridle his tongue, so deceiving his heart, his

---

[74] Jeremy Hultin, *Watch Your Mouth: The Ethics of Obscene Speech in Early Christianity and Its Environment* (Ph.D. dissertation; Yale University, 2003). Douglas Moo agrees: "The problem of uncontrolled speech is a frequent theme among secular moralists and in OT and Jewish Wisdom literature. Especially is this motif prominent in Proverbs, which constantly singles out speech habits as a key marker of godliness (see, e.g., 10:8, 11, 21; 11:9; 12:18, 25; 13:3; 16:27; 17:14; 18:7, 21; 26:22)…[these references] would have been widely known among those with even a minimal acquaintance with Hellenistic culture." Douglas Moo, *The Letter of James* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 148.

[75] Hultin says this is because "the tongue had come to be listed, alongside the belly and the genitals, as one of the body parts that had to be restrained to achieve enkrateia, self-mastery." *Watch Your Mouth*, viii.

[76] See the many relevant references in Luke Timothy Johnson, "Taciturnity and True Religion," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. David Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne Meeks; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 329-39.

[77] Hultin, *Watch Your Mouth*, viii.

religion is futile."[78] As I explore further in chapters 2 and 3, the Lukan narrative participates in these larger ancient conversations linking speech control with religious identity.[79]

Though scholars across a wide range of disciplines have begun to consider silence as a multivalent, contextually-determined, and rhetorically powerful site of scholarly inquiry, these converging intellectual trajectories have only barely begun to make inroads in biblical studies. Instead, sight remains a nearly ubiquitous trope in biblical scholarship. Perhaps this ocular-centrism is to be expected; after all, ancient writers themselves often employed sight as a metaphor for knowledge,[80] and considered the eye a productive site of both virtue and vice.[81] Contemporary scholarship, too, emphasizes the ideological and often dangerous nature of "the gaze."[82] Not only this, but in many ways, research about

---

[78] See William Baker's important work on speech ethics in James: *Personal Speech-Ethics in the Epistle of James* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995).

[79] In a similar vein, Helen Morales observes that in Musaeus' *Hero and Leander*, "Identity determines how a person speaks, and how a person speaks plays a part in determining his or her identity. Social identity and vocal order operate in dialectical relation; each informs the other." Helen Morales, "Musaeus' *Hero and Leander*," in *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity* (ed. Richard Miles; London: Routledge, 1999), 44.

[80] Stephen Moore declares that in Luke's Gospel (which he dubs "Gospel of the Look"), "Understanding is seen as vision." *Mark and Luke in Poststructuralist Perspective: Jesus Begins to Write* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 115. Similarly, see Dennis Hamm, "Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke," *Biblica* 67 (1986): 457-77.

[81] See Carlin Barton, *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans: The Gladiator and the Monster* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 92-98; Jean-Pierre Vernant, *La Mort dans les yeux, Figures de l'Autre dans la Grèce ancienne* (Paris: Hachette, 1985); Helen Morales, *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, Cambridge Classical Studies (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004); David Fredrick, ed., *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002); Shadi Bartsch, *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

[82] See especially Foucault's "Panopticism" chapter in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (trans. Alan Sheridan; New York: Vintage Books, 1977); "Seeing and Knowing," in *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception* (trans. Alan Sheridan; New York: Pantheon Books, 1973), 107-23; "The Eye of Power," in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 146-65. On Foucault on seeing, see Martin Jay, "In the Empire of the Gaze: Foucault and the Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought," in *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, 175-204; John Rajchman, "Foucault's Art of Seeing," *October* 44 (1988): 89-117.

the ancient world depends upon material availability: archaeological finds and even textual evidence that can be *seen*. Even among those materials we can see, attention to speech and silence is complicated by problematic numbers and qualities of texts, and by the fact that sources derive from a limited slice of the population (wealthy males, mostly). For all of these reasons, biblical scholars have had a persistent blind spot – a deaf ear, if you will – to the ways that vision-centeredness inflects our field.

Building on previous work on sound and silence in antiquity, this study implicitly challenges the assumptions, habits, and patterns that have led to the widespread neglect of silence in biblical scholarship. However, there is an additional factor that further complicates this endeavor: Luke's narrativity.[83]

PART II: A NARRATIVE-CRITICAL APPROACH AND DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

One of the most important contextual considerations when analyzing the silences in Luke's Gospel is what Andrew Laird dubs the "awkward fact"[84] that literary silences themselves are expressed in words.[85] These silences are inherently verbal; they can only

---

[83] Contemporary narrative theorists debate what constitutes a "narrative." Still, most agree that certain formative aspects of story are indispensable to an adequate definition; most typically, these elements include plot, point of view, setting, and characterization. Critical analysis of narrative features is hardly a new phenomenon: as early as Aristotle, we find a definition of narrative that privileges plot: "The most important of the six [building blocks of narrative] is the combination of the incidents of the story" – a view still commonly affirmed today. The six building blocks of narrative, according to Aristotle, are Spectacle, Character, Fable (which he equates with Plot), Diction, Melody, and Thought. See *Poetics* 6.I in Richard McKeon, ed., *The Basic Works of Aristotle* (New York: Random House, 1941).

[84] Andrew Laird, *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), xviii.

[85] Deconstructionist readings underscore the slippages, or silences, inherent in language. For a playful use of these insights, see Stephen Moore's chapter, "The So(u)n(d) of God," wherein he asserts that "the stony

be accessed through the medium of language. Not only this, but in narrative specifically, speech and silence are represented and mutually constituted in subtly intricate and inextricable ways. And yet, few narratologists have broadened their discussions to consider how silences function in traditional narratological categories like plot and character. I do so in this dissertation, in part by considering questions like these: How does a written text express silence? What narrative dynamics are at work in the language of Luke's Gospel to produce and/or undermine silence? How do a narrator's silences influence plot, characterization, and/or literary themes?

Promises and Perils of A Narrative Approach

Lukan scholars have largely shifted from viewing Luke[86] as an ancient historian, narrowly construed, toward considering him as a literary artist and/or theologian, though modern distinctions between these three are artificial and ought not be drawn too starkly.[87] Pioneers in the move toward literary approaches to the Bible include Hebrew Bible scholars Meier Sternberg,[88] Robert Alter,[89] and Shimon Bar-Afrat,[90] English-

---

silence of the tomb [in Luke] *is* shattered by speech." *Mark and Luke in Poststructuralist Perspective*, 93. Emphasis original.

[86] The historical author and the redaction and transmission of the gospel bearing the name "Luke" can be debated; to avoid cumbersome constructions, I use the name Luke as a device to identify the implied author/final redactor of the book that bears Luke's name. In addition, I assume that the Lukan narrator is virtually indistinguishable from the implied author; for this reason, I use the terms "narrator" and "Luke" interchangeably. This is in contrast to James Dawsey's widely dismissed proposal that the Lukan narrator and implied author are in conflict with one other. *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988).

[87] See Robert J. Karris, *Luke, Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), and I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1988).

[88] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).

[89] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981).

speaking New Testament scholars Alan Culpepper,[91] Charles Talbert,[92] Robert Tannehill,[93] and John Darr,[94] as well as French-speaking Jean-Noël Aletti,[95] Daniel Marguerat, Yvan Bourquin,[96] and Roland Meynet.[97]

Despite a growing body of narratological work on biblical texts, the usefulness of narratological theories for understanding speech and silence in the gospels remains under-developed. The reason for this may be that narratology has been so closely associated with structuralism and its attendant methodological pitfalls.[98] And yet, in the past twenty-five years, an array of "new literary approaches"[99] have led scholars like Stephen Moore to marvel at narratology's "makeover."[100] Indeed, Todorov's structuralist

---

[90] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*; Bible and Literature Series 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

[91] R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983).

[92] Charles Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Reading the New Testament Series; Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2002).

[93] Robert Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1986).

[94] Darr, *On Character Building.*

[95] Jean-Noël Aletti, *L'art de raconter Jesus-Christ. L'ecriture narrative de l'evangile de Luc* (Parole de Dieu; Paris: Seuil, 1989).

[96] Daniel Marguerat and Yvan Bourquin, *Pour lire les récits bibliques* (Paris: Cerf, 1998).

[97] Roland Meynet, *L'Evangile selon saint Luc. Analyse rhétorique*, 2 vols. (Paris: Cerf, 1988).

[98] It is telling that The Bible and Culture Collective's *The Postmodern Bible* treats structuralism and narratology in the same chapter: "Structuralist and Narratological Criticism," in *The Postmodern Bible* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 70-118.

[99] Petri Merenlahti, *Poetics for the Gospels? Rethinking Narrative Criticism. Study of the New Testament and Its World* (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 3.

[100] Stephen Moore, "Things Not Written in This Book," in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature* (ed. Tom Thatcher and Stephen Moore; Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 256.

paradigm[101] has evolved into more multi-disciplinary narratological approaches.[102] Contemporary narrative critics integrate the formal features of narrative with the far more variable factors of readerly activities, sociological situatedness, and ideological location. Recognizing that narrative fulfills a performative function, not only reflecting, but also creating reality, rhetorical narratologists[103] also discuss how narrators often strategically use expected readerly processes toward specific rhetorical ends.[104] Such rhetorically-motivated techniques, in turn, have important ethical consequences. This was widely recognized in antiquity. One thinks here of the admonition from the ancient historian Livy: "What chiefly makes the study of history wholesome and profitable is this, that you should . . . choose for yourself and for your own state what to imitate, from these mark for avoidance what is shameful in conception and shameful in result."[105]

Though there have been significant advancements, narratology's makeover is far from complete; at present, scholarly conversations about the future of narratology as a

---

[101] Tzvetan Todorov is widely regarded as having coined the term "narratology" in *Grammaire du Décaméron* (The Hague: Mouton, 1969). Many biblical scholars then took up the structuralist mantle. See, for instance, the collaboration of the Groupe d'Entrevernes in *Signes et paraboles: Sémiotique et texte évangélique* (Paris: Seuil, 1977).

[102] Of course, this proliferation of diverse approaches under the banner of "narratology" raises its own challenges, as discussed by Ansgar Nünning in, "Narratology or Narratologies? Taking Stock of Recent Developments, Critique and Modest Proposals for Future Usages of the Term," in *What is Narratology?: Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory* (ed. Tom Kindt and Hans-Harald Müller; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 239-276.

[103] A rhetorical approach to narrative theory conceives of narrative as "a purposive communicative act." James Phelan, building on the influential work of Wayne Booth, identifies this as the distinctive focus of rhetorical approaches to narrative (as opposed to structuralist or communication models). *The Nature of Narrative: The Fortieth Anniversary Edition* (ed. Robert E. Scholes, James Phelan, Robert Leland Kellogg; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 300. See also Michael S. Kearns, *Rhetorical Narratology* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).

[104] So Kearns consistently returns to the question, "How do the elements of narrative actually work on readers?" *Rhetorical Narratology*, 9.

[105] Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1919), 5-7.

discipline and its effective employment in biblical studies are ongoing.[106] With this dissertation, I demonstrate that a rhetorical, ethically oriented approach to narrative[107] is especially appropriate for the task of interpreting the multivalent, contextually-determined, and rhetorically powerful silences in Luke's Gospel. The work presented here takes silence seriously as a meaningful component of narrative and thereby also contributes to the body of scholarship that approaches Luke from a narrative critical standpoint.[108] I now want to lay out several key narratological concepts that will be operative in the rest of the dissertation.

Key Concepts

The Story and its Narration

In narratologist circles, Seymour Chatman's nomenclature, *story* and *discourse*, has become commonplace for the distinction between a story and its telling.[109] Chatman's

---

[106] For just one example, see Merenlahti, "The Future of Narrative Criticism: A Paradigm Shift," in *Poetics for the Gospels?* 115-30.

[107] Here, I am building on Leona Toker's "ethically oriented method of narratological analysis." *Eloquent Reticence*, as well as Wayne Booth, *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

[108] Because the Gospel of Luke and the canonical Acts of the Apostles often are viewed as one literary work, it is important to note that some scholars have read Acts with attention to the theme of silence. See Daniel Marguerat, "The End of Acts (28,16-31) and the Rhetoric of Silence," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht; JSNTSup, 90; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 74-89; Henning Hupe, *Lukas' Schweigen: dekonstruktive Relektüren der "Wir-Stücke" in Acta* (Wien: Passagen, 2008).

[109] Other possible terms for this distinction include the Russian formalist terms *fabula* (Chatman's "story") and *sjuzet* (Chatman's "discourse"), which were used first by Schlovsky, but popularized by Jurij Lotman in his influential chapter, "The Problem of Plot," in *The Structure of the Artistic Text* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1977), 231-39. One also finds the French structuralist terms *histoire* (the content or chain of events) and *discours* (the expression of the contents). See Tzvetan Todorov, "The Categories of Literary Narrative," trans. Joseph Kestner, *Papers on Language and Literature* (1980): 3-36; Todorov drew the terms from Benveniste (who used them differently): "The Correlations of Tense in the French Verb," in *Problems in General Linguistics* (ed. Émile Benveniste; Coral Gables: University of Miami, 1959), 205-15.

summary is paradigmatic: "Story is the *content* of the narrative expression, while discourse is the *form* of that expression."[110] However, I prefer not to use this terminology, since the word "discourse" carries different implications in narratologist/literary, philosophical, and sociological fields, and can refer to dialogues within a narrative or to the narrative itself.[111] The endless debates over the merits and problems of these divisions have mushroomed into elaborate taxonomies and long laundry lists of technical terminology that often differ from theorist to theorist. As such, narratology is plagued by a proliferation of jargon. What matters most for my purposes is the basic distinction between the events of the story and the manner in which the Lukan narrator makes them known to the reader.

For the sake of clarity, then, I will use terms such as *story*, *narrative*, *plot*, and *content* to refer to the material that is presented (e.g., the chain of events and the characters who enact them), and terms like *narration*, *presentation*, *the telling*, and *form* to refer to the narrator's literary representations of the story (e.g., sentence length, sequencing, and speech representation). I will use the terms "speech representation," or "dialogue," rather than "discourse," to discuss characters' conversations within the Lukan narrative, and I will reserve the qualified technical term "discourse" for the labeling of various types of speech presentation ("direct discourse," "indirect discourse," etc.).

Many scholars use Genette's three-tiered model "histoire/diégèse" (translated in the English as "story," i.e. the chronological order of events that must be inferred by the reader); "récit" (translated as "narrative," i.e. the story in the order that it is presented to the reader); and "narration" (translated as "narrating," i.e., the ways in which the story is told).

[110] Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 23.

[111] Perhaps the most famous thinker to explain "discourses" in social-scientific/philosophical terms is Michel Foucault. See *L'ordre du discours* (Paris: Gallimard, 1971). Literary critics often refer to Mikhail Bahktin's "Discourse in the Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (ed. Michael Holquist; trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982). Gérard Genette has also been extremely influential: *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (trans. Jane Lewin; Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983).

Several scholars have pushed back against a strict structuralist separation of a plot and its presentation. Barbara Herrnstein Smith argues that because every story is mediated by the storyteller's point of view, each retelling differs based on a teller's particular motives, conventions, and habits.[112] Reader-response critics add that the mental processes involved in reading – encountering new ideas sequentially, resolving textual ambiguities, anticipating future narrational events based on presupposed cultural norms – influence a reader's understanding of a story. Thus, the multiple potentialities in every narrative are instantiated differently based on readers' preconceived intertextual and extratextual repertoires, individual reading habits, and socially constructed interpretive frameworks.[113] From this perspective, the story/presentation model relies too heavily on an artificial isolation of narrative elements from their narration, when in practice, no reader can discern the story apart from the telling through which it is mediated.

I agree with the critiques outlined above, and yet I think they are most forceful when countering an absolute ontological distinction between a story and its narration, such as Chatman's claim that impermeable "membranes" separate story from discourse.[114] Additionally, such critiques usually fail to distinguish between different types of reading. John Darr's theoretical distinction between the "reader" and the "critic" adds a helpful nuance here. Whereas typical readers are not concerned with audiences of their own, nor with reading practices, the critic is "constantly mindful of his or her own

---

[112] Barbara Herrnstein Smith, "Narrative Versions, Narrative Theories," in *On Narrative* (ed. W.J.T. Mitchell; Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1981), esp. 211-214.

[113] Wolfgang Iser considers this a text's "potential multiplicity of connections." *The Implied Reader*: *Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), 278.

[114] Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 144.

audience," concerned with describing, ordering, and interpreting "the reader, the text and what happens between them."[115]

Fully accepting the philosophical caveat that in practice, a narrative plot and its presentation are co-instantiated in the process of reading, I still find a *theoretical distinction* between the story and its narration to be useful for critical literary analysis. Maintaining the story/narration distinction aids in the critical task because it allows one to consider the ways that the same instance of silence (and/or speech) can function differently on the story level and on the narration level; in effect, the story/narration distinction gives us the vocabulary for making explicit the otherwise implicit ways that story and narration levels are co-instantiated in the interpretive process.

Luke 2.21-39 provides a ready example of the differences between the narration level and the story level. When Mary and Joseph take Jesus to the temple to be consecrated, they meet the "righteous and devout" Simeon (2.25), who is led by the Holy Spirit (2.27). In direct discourse, Simeon is quoted blessing (εὐλογέω, 2.28) God and recounting an earlier prophecy by the Holy Spirit (the so-called Nunc Dimittis, 2.29-32). Simeon then blesses (εὐλογέω, 2.34)[116] the parents – again with direct speech – and looks forward, offering a prophecy about Jesus' future (2.34-35). Simeon speaks on *both* the level of the telling and the level of the story. Although the narrative could have ended here and seemed complete, the narrator goes on to tell of Anna the prophetess, who, like Simeon, identifies Jesus as God's redemption for Israel (2.36-38). Unlike Simeon,

---

[115] Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 21 n. 7, 29.
[116] Though the actions indicated by εὐλογέω are different (prayer of thanks in v. 28; blessing of parents in v. 34), the repetition of the verb creates aural symmetry in the two sections of Simeon's backward and forward-looking response.

however, Anna's prophecy is not recounted in direct discourse; it is merely mentioned.[117] Using indirect discourse, the narrator silences Anna *on the level of the telling*, since her words are not expressly cited for the reader.[118] However, Anna does speak *in the story world* (2.38). In Lk. 10.38-42, by contrast, Jesus' friend Mary sits silently at his feet; the narrator renders her completely voiceless on *both levels*.

Narrator as Character

The story/narration distinction raises another important theoretical issue: the relationship of the narrator to the story itself.[119] Though I will be using the traditional appellation "Luke" to refer to the Gospel's anonymous storyteller, it is important to note that the figure of the narrator is actually a creation of the (implied) author; the narrator is not to be equated with the author himself. Some narratologists consider the narrator to be "extradiegetic,"[120] or situated *outside* the story itself. However, as William Sanger Campbell argues, this is "a misconception of the narrator's role as storyteller and the complex of potential character traits attributable to such a character."[121] Campbell builds

---

[117] Robert Price thus dubs this "Anna's Silent Song." *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts: A Feminist-Critical Scrutiny* (SBLDS 155; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 47.

[118] The narrator's refusal to quote Anna may simply be due to the patriarchal *Sitz im Leben* of the text's origin. Despite raging scholarly debates over the Lukan portrayals of women, the reason for Anna's silence is peripheral to our work here. For more on this, see Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 176-79.

[119] My use of the term "storyteller" differs from Philip Ruge-Jones' use of the term. See his call for differentiating between the literary "narrator" and the contemporary "storyteller" (by which he means "performer") in "Omnipresent, Not Omniscient: How Literary Interpretation Confuses the Storyteller's Narrating," in *Between Author and Audience in Mark: Narration/Characterization/Interpretation* (ed. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 29-43. I agree with Malbon's critique of Ruge-Jones' distinction in *Mark As Story: Retrospect and Prospect*, 66.

[120] The term derives from the Greek διήγησις ("narrative"). By contrast, characters and events inside the story are dubbed "intradiegetic."

on the work of Darr, who describes the narrator as a "specialized character" whose voice as currently contained in the act of narration is itself part of the story.[122] In the Lukan narrative, this is especially prominent when the narrator "enters" the story in the famously enigmatic "we-passages" of Acts.[123] I argue that that the narrator's silences ought to be considered along with the silences of other characters.

At the same time, the narrator is "not just any old character";[124] as the story*teller*, the narrator recounts the story from a certain ideological point of view, evaluating events and characters in particular ways and inviting readers to do the same.[125] The nature of point of view in Luke's Gospel remains an open question. Traditionally, scholars have argued that the Lukan narrator promotes a single ideological point of view. At the same time, however, scholars have long grappled with Luke's apparently inconsistent perspectives on various themes like how to handle wealth, or the proper role of women.[126] Whether the Lukan narrator promotes a dominant worldview or celebrates coexisting distinct perspectives will be explored further in subsequent chapters. The points here are that the narrator's silences ought to be considered in discussions of Lukan

---

[121] William Sanger Campbell, *The "We" Passages in the Acts of the Apostles: The Narrator as Narrative Character* (SBL 14; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 23.

[122] John A. Darr, "Narrator as Character: Mapping a Reader-Oriented Approach to Narration in Luke-Acts," *Semeia* 63 (1993): 43-60; 43.

[123] On these passages and narration, see Campbell, *The "We" Passages*.

[124] Darr, "Narrator as Character," 43.

[125] Boris Uspensky's work is influential in biblical studies: he considers point of view in terms of how it is manifested on four different planes: *ideological* (evaluative norms and worldview), *phraseological* (speech characteristics of both narrator and characters), *spatial and temporal* (where and when events occur), and *psychological* (characters' thoughts and behaviors). Boris Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).

[126] See especially Raj Nadella's revised dissertation, *Dialogue Not Dogma: Many Voices in the Gospel of Luke* (New York: T & T Clark, 2011).

point of view, and that distinguishing between the story and its telling can help to explicate the differences between the narrator's silences and other characters' silences.

The Narrator's Silences and Readers

The narrator's silences differ from other characters' silences insofar as the narrator's silences have to do with the way the story is *told*: narrators can withhold or delay pertinent information, leave comparisons and allusions open-ended or ambiguous, refuse to answer questions raised by the story, keep characters anonymous, or cause characters to disappear altogether.[127] They can render characters silent through summary or indirect discourse, or through various forms of interruption.

As the one who represents – and sometimes interprets – characters' silences through the words of the narrative, the Lukan narrator is thus a crucial means by which the (implied) author of Luke communicates to the reader. Indeed, the narrator's silences can significantly impact a reader's experience of the story. In music, for example, the presence of a profound silence just before a crescendo can deepen the profundity of the crescendo. Similarly, storytellers often build silences into their stories to deepen the impact of what follows; in this "omniscient, omnipresent" role,[128] the narrator attempts to assert programmatic control. Wayne Booth maintains that the refusal to speak of some

---

[127] Genette alludes to this difference when he speaks of some characters' silences as "doubly silent": in certain cases, not only do the characters stop speaking, but simultaneously, "this interruption in the dialogue and the action suspends the voice of the novel itself and absorbs it, for a time, in a kind of mute interrogation." Here, Genette distinguishes between the narrator's silences (which he calls the suspension of the "voice of the novel itself"), and the characters' silences (which he describes as an "interruption in the dialogue"). Gérard Genette, "Flaubert's Silences," in *Figures of Literary Discourse* (trans. Alan Sheridan; New York: Columbia University Press, 1982; Original: "Silences de Flaubert," in *Figures I* [Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1966]).

[128] Darr, *On Character Building*, 50. See also the discussion in chapter 1 of this dissertation.

things allows a narrator to "achieve effects which would be difficult or impossible if he allowed himself…to speak directly and authoritatively to us."[129] For instance, by purposely omitting or delaying crucial information, a narrator can provoke reactions – like suspense or surprise – in readers. The narrator's silences often are designed rhetorically to evoke certain responses in readers.

Consideration of readerly activities raises the important question of which reader(s) I envision for the Gospel of Luke. Scholars debate whether the Gospel's stated addressee, the "most excellent Theophilus" (1.3), is an actual individual, or whether the name (which means "one who loves God," or "friend of God") simply represents all Christian believers.[130] Still, even if Theophilus was a real, historical individual, the Gospel clearly was intended to have a wider audience than just one person.[131] I consider Luke's earliest readers/audience to be comprised of both Gentiles and former Jews/God-fearers, in the late-first-century or early-second-century Mediterranean,[132] all of whom are assumed to know the Septuagint, but not necessarily other sources like Q or the Gospel of Mark. To divorce a text from its historical context can obscure the multiple schemas that the same word, silence, convention, or genre evokes in different times and

---

[129] Booth discusses "authorial silences," though he uses the term to refer to what I am calling "the narrator's silences." *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 273.

[130] On this debate, see among others R.R. Creech, "The Most Excellent Narratee: The Significance of Theophilus in Luke-Acts," in *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays on Acts in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders* (ed. N. Keathley; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 1990), 107-26.

[131] Most commentaries on Luke address this issue. See, e.g., Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 43-44.

[132] Though some scholars date Luke to the late second century C.E., I do not think that date is likely given Marcion's mid-second-century references to Luke.

places for different readers.[133] Thus, to the extent that it is possible, throughout the dissertation, I attend to the late-first-century extratextual repertoires encoded in the Gospel, not in order to postulate a particular social group behind the Lukan text, nor to argue for a univocal single "meaning" for the text, but rather, to consider how implied readers might have appropriated the Lukan text's narrative representations of speech and silence.[134]

Reader-response criticism offers useful conceptual tools for analyzing how readers read, and thus, how the narrator's silences can impact readers rhetorically. For example, reader-response critics routinely note that in order to create meaning, readers must fill in unwritten narratological "gaps," or silences in the text.[135] The psychological work of reading entails the simultaneous use of various lexical, semantic, and extratextual clues in order to disambiguate, contextualize, clarify, and ultimately, to come to understand a narrative.[136] Meaning-making is contingent on factors that are *both* fixed

---

[133] Gestalt psychology emphasizes that every word evokes schemas of potential meanings for readers, who must discern which aspects of those schemas are pertinent within a certain context. See D.E. Rumelhart, "Schemata: The Building Blocks of Cognition," in *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension* (ed. R. Spiro, B. Bruce, and W. Brewer; Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980), 33-58. Umberto Eco discusses the role of schemas in the reading process in his seminal text, *The Role of the Reader* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979).

[134] I affirm, with John Darr, that our reconstructions of the Lukan author and readers' extratextual repertoires ought to be both provisional and broadly conceived: "Because we lack definitive knowledge of the author, intended audience (narrowly defined) and precise date of writing for Luke-Acts, we are obliged to set rather broad perimeters for its original cultural context." *Herod the Fox*, 94.

[135] The foundational text is Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1978 [orig. German, *Der Akt des Lesens* (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1976)]). See also Zoltán Schwáb, "Mind the Gap: The Impact of Wolfgang Iser's Reader–Response Criticism on Biblical Studies—A Critical Assessment," *Literature and Theology* 17 (2003): 174.

[136] My conception of readerly work presupposes Jerry Camery-Hoggatt's work on the characteristics of language and the use of "bottom up" and "top down" reading constraints. See *Speaking of God: Reading and Preaching the Word of God* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995). I also draw from John Darr's pragmatic approach to reading (which is itself built on Booth and Iser). See Darr, "'Watch How You Listen.'"

(e.g., language, genre, etc.) *and* fluid (e.g., social location, subjective understanding, etc.). As such, the interpretive task itself is an event; when one constructs the reader-text relationship in the static, detached terms of an active subject and passive object,[137] one trivializes the transformative potential of the "subjective in-between"[138] that exists between a text and its reader.[139] Narratorial silences in particular facilitate a fluid, mutually constitutive relationship between text and reader; they create puzzlements that pique curiosity and keep readers reading.

Ricoeur calls the dynamic process of selection and integration that a reader undergoes in making sense of a literary plot "emplotment" (*mise-en-intrigue*), or "the joint work of the text and its reader."[140] Maxwell, too, considers the reader (or audience) to work jointly with a text:

> A gap, an unexpected hole in the presentation, impels the audience to do more than merely receive the story…The silence of intentional gaps invites the audience to speak, to engage the unfolding rhetoric, and to become part of the story themselves.[141]

For example, one way to read the ending of the story of Jesus' anointing in Luke 7 is that even as Jesus refuses to answer the onlookers' question, "Who is this who forgives sins?" (7.49), the narrator expects readers to correctly identify Jesus and judge his opponents accordingly.

---

[137] Stephen Moore rightly objects to the "reification of the text" that he identifies in modern typographic culture. *Literary Criticism*, 84. Indeed, many scholars conceive of reading as something an active subject (the reader) does to a passive object (the text).

[138] This is Hannah Arendt's term. See Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1958), 183.

[139] Although reader-response critics often employ the concept of intersubjectivity, this tends to be within the context of collaborative interpretive communities, not the intersubjective space between reader and text.

[140] Paul Ricoeur, "The Text as Dynamic Identity," in *The Identity of the Literary Text* (ed. Mario J. Valdes and Owen Miller; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 184.

[141] Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines*, 1.

Of course, readers respond to narratorial gaps in both expected and unexpected ways.[142] Attention to the uses of silence in Luke complexifies the rhetorical situation of the narrator and readers, since the narrator aims to influence readerly perceptions, but can never do so absolutely; the Lukan narrator's silences invite readers to attend to and interpret textual omissions as potentially meaningful, rather than as simple lacunae.[143] As Ming-Yu Tseng puts it, "Silence is significant not only as a response or strategy in conversations, but also as a narrative strategy that *empowers another level of dialogue between text and reader*."[144] Narrative silences play a crucial role in the dynamic interpretive process.

What exactly are readers of narrative interpreting? Narrative treatments of Luke's Gospel are replete with references to how readers build plot, characterization, and theme. Isolating these categories is an artificial heuristic move that helps us with analytical clarity, but we must always remember that they are irreducibly interrelated in the process of readerly meaning-making. As Patrick Spencer insists:

> [T]he four speeches of the Galilean ministry establish a foundation upon which the implied reader builds *plot* and *characterization* and sketches out narrative trajectories that result in the construction of *thematic motifs*.[145]

---

[142] Mark Allen Powell helpfully explicates "expected" and "unexpected" readings in "Expected and Unexpected Readings of Matthew: What the Reader Knows," *Asbury Theological Journal* 48 (1993): 41-51.

[143] It is important to recognize that not all silences are meaningful or intelligible. Meir Sternberg helpfully distinguishes between a *gap* (missing information that is important for narrative cohesion), and a *blank* (missing information that is unnecessary for comprehending the narrative). *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 235-59. Of course, the interpretation of what is deemed important for narrative cohesion lies with the reader. Reader-response critics rightly emphasize that readers will not fill literary gaps in the same way(s), nor should they necessarily.

[144] Ming-yu Tseng, "The Representation of Silence in Text: Examples from Two Selected Koans," *Dong Hwa Journal of Humanistic Studies* 2 (2000): 106. Emphasis added.

[145] Patrick Spencer, *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories of the Lukan Galilean Ministry Speeches: Hermeneutical Appropriation by Authorial Readers of Luke-Acts* (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 4. Emphasis added. Along similar lines, several scholars have explored how characters' public speeches in

Although Spencer focuses on the formal speeches in Jesus' Galilean ministry, his observation cited above is useful for considering speech and silence more broadly, whether they occur publicly or not. This is because from the perspective of the storyteller's art, readers "hear" character speech (and silence) just as readily as they "hear" formal public speeches and thus are influenced similarly in their subsequent building of the story elements. The next section offers some preliminary remarks about these three key narratological categories.

Plot

In later chapters, I will argue that speech and silence play a significant role in generating the Lukan plot. Before discussing plot in more detail, it is important to note that despite the focus of this section, I do not wish to subordinate speech to plot, as Aristotle did long ago,[146] and as formalists did not so long ago.[147] Many scholars have already delineated the drawbacks of such an approach.[148] As these critics show, plot and other narrative elements such as speech and characterization

---

the book of Acts establish and interpret theological themes for readers. Philip Satterthwaite articulates a common view: "[I]t is in the speeches that the important theological themes of Acts are stated at greatest length." "Acts Against the Background of Classical Rhetoric," 356. In chapter 2, I argue that Jesus' public speeches serve an interpretive function in the Gospel that is similar to their function in Acts. Though there are fewer public speeches in Luke (see 4:14-30; 6:17-49; 7:24-35; 8:4-18; 14:7-24; 15:1-32), they are crucial to the narrative and remain widely neglected. Spencer goes so far as to say that the speeches in Luke are, "more important to the narrative discourse" than those in Acts. *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories*, 4. Before Spencer, only Jeffrey Staley gave significant attention to the narrative functions of the speeches in the Gospel of Luke. See "Narrative Structure (Self Stricture) in Luke 4:14-9:62: The United States of Luke's Story World," *Semeia* 72 (1995): 173-213.

[146] *Poetics*, 1450a.15-23.

[147] See, e.g., Robert Tannehill's subordination of characterization, and speech as an element of characterization, to plot in *Unity of Luke-Acts*, 2 vols.

[148] For example, see Richard Seamon, "The Price of the Plot in Aristotle's Poetics," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 64 (2006): 251-258.

mutually inform one another.

Plot itself has been a thorny theoretical issue for centuries. Aristotle famously defined plot (*muthos*) as the "ordered arrangement of the incidents (*pragmatôn*)."[149] Narrative theorists today often describe plot by referring to the following pyramidal progression, known as Freytag's pyramid:[150] the stage is set (exposition), there is a rising action (conflict/complication), the events[151] reach a climax, and there is a falling action (denouement/resolution).[152] This bare-bones view of plot-as-skeleton[153] is still commonly affirmed today.[154]

For the past century and a half, theorists have added flesh to that skeletal definition. Three elements in particular have been added to Aristotle's basic

---

[149] Aristotle, *Poetics* 6.I, found in Richard McKeon, ed., *The Basic Works of Aristotle* (New York: Random House, 1941).

[150] See Gustav Freytag, *Freytag's Technique of the Drama: An Exposition of Dramatic Composition and Art* (trans. Elias J. MacEwan; Chicago: Griggs, 1894).

[151] Juri Lotman argued that a "revolutionary event" must occur for a series of events to be considered a plot. This definition is inherently cultural, since a revolutionary event transgresses boundaries in some way, and social boundaries are culturally constructed. For his analysis of plot, see, "The Problem of Plot," in *The Structure of the Artistic Text* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1977), 231-39. For a now-classic discussion of narrative "events" as either consequential ("kernels") or as inconsequential ("satellites") to the plotline, see Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 53-56.

[152] Semioticians developed a more abstract model for plot: 1) Manipulation (imbalance created); 2) Competence (the hero must prove his competence through facing tests and temptations); 3) Performance (the hero achieves or fails to achieve the desired goal); 4) Sanction (the hero is acknowledged and balance restored). The classic formulation is found in A.J. Greimas, *Maupassant: The Semiotics of Text* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1988). For a useful introduction to the semiotic approach to plot, see Daniel Patte, *Structural Exegesis for New Testament Critics* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1990).

[153] The description of plot as "skeleton" is found frequently in literary criticism. Kellogg and Scholes write that plot is "the articulation of the skeleton of narrative." *The Nature of Narrative*, 12; Chatman describes the function of "satellite" events as "that of filling in, elaborating, completing the kernel; they form the flesh on the skeleton." *Story and Discourse*, 54.

[154] Chatman agrees with Aristotle, asserting, "A narrative without a plot is a logical impossibility." *Story and Discourse*, 47. Kingsbury writes, "The plot of a story has to do with the way in which the author arranges the events." Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Fortress, 1991), 34.

equation: causal connections, temporal succession, and a teleological purpose.[155] E.M. Forster famously argued in 1927 that plot must have a causal dimension; to illustrate, Forster offered what is now a well-known distinction: "The king died and then the queen died" is a *story*, whereas, "The king died and then the queen died of grief" is a *plot*.[156] Causality implies a broader significance of events as they relate to one another in specific temporal succession.[157]

For Scholes and Kellogg, among many others, temporal succession itself is the crucial element of plot: "Plot can be defined as the dynamic, sequential element in narrative literature."[158] Static objects such as paintings and sculptures, in contrast, do not have a plot (although a plot can be implied by them or derived from them and (re)told in narrative form). Poststructuralist Peter Brooks gets at the temporal dimension of plot when he explains why he prefers the participle "plotting" to the noun "plot": "the participle best suggests the dynamic aspect of narrative…that which moves us forward as readers of the narrative."[159]

In addition to causality and temporality, narrative theorists also emphasize

---

[155] Frank Matera has made the fascinating observation that the literary critical emphases on causation, temporality, and teleology have a natural affinity with particular preoccupations of gospel scholars. As Matera puts it: "In contemporary literary criticism … NT scholars will recognize something akin to their concern for how the evangelists perceive time (salvation history), how they connect events (promise and fulfillment), and how the ending (passion and resurrection) influences the rest of the Gospel." "Plot of Matthew's Gospel," *CBQ* 49 (1987): 235.

[156] E.M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (London: Edward Arnold, 1927), 86.

[157] Of course, as all concepts change over time, so the notion of causality is historically and contextually determined. For one exploration of such shifts in the conception of causality as evidenced through literature, see Stephen Kern, *A Cultural History of Causality: Science, Murder Novels, and Systems of Thought* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004).

[158] Scholes and Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative*, 207.

[159] Peter Brooks, *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 34-35.

the concept of a unifying teleological purpose as an identifying feature of narrative plot. As Brooks insists, "Plots are not simply organizing structures, they are also intentional structures, goal-oriented and forward-moving."[160] All of these nuances are drawn together in the following general definition of plot, which Brian Richardson derived by identifying areas of agreement between such otherwise divergent theorists as Russian formalist Vladimir Propp and hermeneutic philosopher Paul Ricoeur:

> [Plot is] a teleological sequence of events linked by some principle of causation; that is, the events are bound together in a trajectory that typically leads to some form of resolution or convergence.[161]

By configuring coherent causal links between events and denoting their ultimate significance or purpose within unfolding narrative sequences, plot gives meaning to otherwise disparate, chaotic occurrences over the course of a narrative.

Some scholars argue that the above descriptions of plot are irrelevant to ancient narratives, which tend to be more episodic than unified.[162] In contrast to the climactic unified plot in which each narrative segment presupposes previous sections and foreshadows future events, episodic plots are constructed as individual, self-contained units. They tend to be organized less by explicit causal connections between events and more by theme, imagery, or continuity of character(s).

---

[160] Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 12.

[161] It is important to note that Richardson goes on to argue that this definition is inadequate for discussions of twentieth-century texts that purposely elude narrative unity. Still, his objection does not apply to the gospel text at hand. Brian Richardson, "Beyond the Poetics of Plot: Alternative Forms of Narrative Progression and the Multiple Trajectories of *Ulysses*," in *A Companion to Narrative Theory* (ed. James Phelan and Peter Rabinowitz; London: Blackwell, 2005), 167.

[162] Whitney Shiner emphasizes that many ancient texts show a "greater tolerance for and appreciation of an episodic narrative style." "Creating Plot in Episodic Narratives: The Life of Aesop and the Gospel of Mark," in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative* (ed. J.B. Chance, and J. Perkins; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 155.

Richardson's troubling of traditional concepts of emplotment (though geared toward twenty-first century postmodern works) provides a useful corrective to the common over-emphasis on causation when discussing ancient narratives' episodic plots. Richardson insists that instead of exhibiting the traditional, causally-related succession of events, some narrative texts are designed according to aesthetic concerns, such as a desire for symmetry, or the repetition of similar events toward the creation of a "collage effect." Scholars like Walter Ong and Albert Lord have shown a similar pattern[163] to be at work in narratives that were composed to be told orally, since, according to Ong, there is a "certain incompatibility between linear plot (Freytag's pyramid) and oral memory."[164] Memory is facilitated by alliteration, catchwords, and repetition, mnemonic techniques that Paul Borgman calls "hearing clues."[165]

Still, even episodic plots that are organized around aesthetic and/or mnemonic concerns need to carry some sequential storyline and some degree of plausible connections to function as a narrative, rather than simply a list of disparate occurrences. How, then, are these connections made in Luke?

The issue of the relative unity of the Lukan text has been a lightning rod in

---

[163] Despite the similarity, they are not exactly the same; Ong's point is salutary: "deplotted stories of the electronic age are not episodic narratives. They are impressionistic and imagistic variations on the plotted stories that preceded them." Walter Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York: Methuen, 1982), 148. See also the enormously influential Albert B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

[164] For application to New Testament studies, see Horsley, Draper, and Foley, eds., *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark: Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2006), and Werner Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (Bloomington, IN: University Press, 1997).

[165] Paul Borgman, *The Way According to Luke: Hearing the Whole Story of Luke-Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

this "storm center"[166] of scholarly debate, especially in narrative-critical circles.[167] Because narrative criticism became popular in biblical studies partly as a reaction against the atomizing tendencies of redaction critics, early narrative critics insisted on the internal coherence of the gospel texts.[168] Eventually, the pendulum of scholarly opinion swung so far that Parsons and Pervo declared in 1993: "[T]he presumed unity of Luke and Acts is axiomatic in current New Testament scholarship."[169] As often happens with the development of a new methodology, however, some pushed the point too far, often de-emphasizing or even denying the episodic nature of the gospel narratives. The question remains open: Is Luke best conceived as an episodic or a unified plot?

As later chapters demonstrate, attention to the uses of speech and silence can help to illuminate the ways that the Lukan plot functions as *both* episodic *and* unified. In particular, speech and silence often play crucial roles in setting the Lukan plot in motion,

---

[166] Van Unnik's moniker for Luke-Acts is still frequently invoked in Lukan scholarship, although often, the particular issue being debated is different than that to which van Unnik referred (whether or not the description "early Catholic" fits Luke-Acts). W. C. van Unnik, "Luke-Acts, a Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship," in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (ed. Keck and Martin; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), 15-32.

[167] Whitney Shiner, "Creating Plot," 155-76.

[168] The most cited example is Robert Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986-90), although Cadbury appears to be the first to hyphenate the two books to indicate their unity in *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: Macmillan, 1927). Other major contributions to this discussion include the papers presented at the 47th Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense (Leuven, 1998), compiled in Jozef Verheyden, ed., *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), and Robert O'Toole, *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1984). Recent contributions include: Patricia Walters, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence* (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium.* HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2008).

[169] Mikeal Carl Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 2.

regulating its rhythms, and creating unifying connections between the "beginning," "middle," and "end"[170] that constitute basic elements of plot.

Characterization

Characterization, the depiction of the active agents in a literary work, is yet another highly contested theoretical issue. There are three main views of biblical characterization in the theoretical literature.[171] The first makes use of E.M. Forster's traditional dichotomy between flat and round characters,[172] arguing that biblical characters are explicit and unambiguous;[173] from this perspective, ancient characters can be seen as representative of a certain category or stereotyped group of people. One character might act in a way that typifies the group as a whole,[174] or a character can be so linked to his plot function that he comes to embody that plot function, or theme.

---

[170] Aristotle defined plot as a "beginning, middle, and end." *Poetics*, 7.1.

[171] There is a large body of literature on biblical characterization. Representative works include P. Letourneau and M. Talbot, eds., *Et vous, qui dites-vous que je suis? La gestion des personnages dans les recits bibliques* (Paris: Mediaspaul, 2006); David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, eds., *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); David R. Beck, *The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Darr, *On Character Building*; E.S. Malbon and A. Berlin, eds., *Characterization in Biblical Literature*, *Semeia* 63 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993); M.A. Tolbert, "How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character," *Int* 47 (1993): 347-57.

[172] In most current studies, the designations *flat* and *static* are used synonymously, as are the terms *round* and *dynamic*. E.M. Forster first used the terms *flat* and *round* in *Aspects of the Novel*, 93-95. Flat characters, often called *types*, are those who do not change over the course of a narrative; they are predictable, simple, and often have only one central trait. Round characters change over the course of a narrative; they are unpredictable, complex, and multi-dimensional. A third common category is the *stock* character, or *functionary*, who has no personality but merely moves the plot along.

[173] According to Rhoads and Michie, ancient authors "tended to portray stylized characters who…were not developed psychologically and showed little inclination to introspection." David Rhoads and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: an Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 100.

Other scholars contend that this is an outdated oversimplification of biblical characterization. Take, for example, Robert Alter's treatment of Hebrew narrative; though he acknowledges the relative silence of biblical texts when compared with modern characterization, Alter argues that this "art of reticence" is evidence of the biblical writers' literary prowess. They have, he posits, developed a "set of new and surprisingly supple techniques for the imaginative representation of human individuality" by being "selectively silent in a purposeful way."[175] In this analysis, biblical writers strategically include only the most necessary information, and leave certain details ambiguous in order to reflect the paradoxical nature of the human person.

The third view is a combination of the first and second, emphasizing that characters can be either flat or round, depending on the literary time and place. Petri Merenlahti likens biblical characters to living organisms that mutate in order to adapt to their environments. Building on the insights of Erich Auerbach, Merenlahti argues that characters who contest the dominant narrative ideology are silenced and made into "simple agents"; in contrast, those characters who agree with the dominant ideology become increasingly subtle and complex as readers fill in the gaps left by the narrator.[176] Fred Burnett sums up this perspective: "[Scholars'] focus should be on the degree of characterization rather than on characterization as primarily typical."[177]

---

[174] Rhoads and Michie identify this as a "type-character" because the character exhibits a "typical" response. Rhoads and Michie, *Mark as Story*, 100. Peter is a prime example, since he often functions as representative of all the disciples.

[175] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 115.

[176] Petri Merenlahti, "Characters in the Making: Individuality and Ideology in the Gospels," in *Characterization in the Gospels*, 49.

[177] Fred Burnett, "Characterization and Reader Construction of Characters in the Gospels," *Semeia* 63 (1993): 15.

Despite these debates over the best way to describe biblical characterization, narratologists tend to agree on two key topics: methods of depicting characters, and the ideological nature of characterization. Most biblical scholars acknowledge that narrators achieve characterization through various literary tools, including physical description,[178] action,[179] proper names,[180] a character's profession,[181] comparison with other characters (i.e. parallelism and literary foils), and overt ascription of personality traits, inner thoughts, motives, feelings, or reactions by the narrator and by other characters.[182] Ronald Thiemann's account of narrative identification describes how, based on these narrative details, readers attribute patterns of behavior to specific persons in the biblical

---

[178] As Mikeal Parsons notes, "The use of physical features to draw moral conclusions was a common rhetorical strategy in the ancient Mediterranean world." Mikeal C. Parsons, *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 28. Still, although physical description is frequently cited as a method of characterization, biblical critics often ignore the narratological implications of physical description. James Resseguie, for example, omits physical appearance altogether from his list of methods of characterization. *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 121-22. This lacuna is odd, considering the thematic prominence of the body in the biblical texts themselves. As Elaine Scarry notes, flesh and word "are not categories read into the text but the categories in which the text announces itself directly." Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 182.

[179] Fred Burnett asserts that in ancient narrative in particular, "one's character (ethos) is revealed through one's action (praxis)." "Characterization and Reader Construction," 11.

[180] Often in biblical narrative, God (re)assigns names to people to reflect their new spiritual identity. For example, Abram becomes Abraham (Gen. 17:5), Sarai becomes Sarah (17:15), Jacob becomes Israel (35:10), God names Solomon (1 Chron. 22:9), John (Lk. 1:13), and Jesus (Mt. 1:23), Simon becomes Peter (Mk. 3:16), James and John are called the "Sons of Thunder" (3:17), and Saul becomes Paul (Acts 13:9).

[181] For instance, the character Zacchaeus' occupation as a tax collector plays an important role in the pericope of Lk. 19:1-10. By naming Zacchaeus' occupation immediately, Luke evokes his readers' preconceived cultural profile of a tax collector.

[182] John Darr points out that characters often characterize one another other through a "web of interrelationships." *On Character Building*, 41. One clear example is Jesus' denunciation of the Pharisees in Lk. 11:42-52.

story; when these patterns persist over time, readers consider them to be "characteristic" and thus reflective of particular identifiable character traits.[183]

Narratologists also agree that these narrative techniques function together to create particular, ideologically-informed depictions of characters.[184] As Jerry Camery-Hoggatt reminds us, ancient "characterization was not morally neutral."[185] Rather, the implicit and explicit methods a narrator uses to portray characters reflect specific theological perspectives and rhetorical aims. For this reason, Clifton Black urges biblical critics to "attend carefully to characterization" in an effort to discern a narrator's "persuasive appeals to [his] readers."[186]

Speech has taken center stage in debates over the functions of internal and external focalization expressed through dialogue,[187] as well as the relative merits of direct discourse (explicitly quoted speech)[188] versus indirect discourse (speech reported in a

---

[183] Ronald Thiemann, *Revelation and Theology: The Gospel as Narrated Promise* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985), 112. Thiemann's work is predicated upon – but also critiques – Hans Frei's use of the intention-action model in theology. See Hans Frei, *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).

[184] See Darr, *On Character Building* (esp. 75-78 on Jesus' Galilean speech in 7:24-35 as characterization of John the Baptist); Daniel Marguerat, "Luc, Metteur en Scène Des Personnages," in *Analyse narrative et Bible: Deuxième colloque international du PRENAB* (ed. C. Focant et A. Wènin; BEThL 196 ; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 281-295.

[185] Jerry Camery-Hoggatt, *Irony in Mark's Gospel: Text and subtext* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 51-52.
[186] C. Clifton Black, *The Rhetoric of the Gospel: Theological Artistry in the Gospels and Acts* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2001), 23-24. Black himself explores "the degree to which [the Gospel of Matthew's] characters are crafted in the service of theological convictions." *The Rhetoric of the Gospel*, 32-33.

[187] For a recent treatment of these literary strategies in the Pentateuch, see Françoise Mirguet, *La Représentation du divin dans les récits du Pentateuque: Médiations syntaxiques et narratives*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 123 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

[188] The public speeches in Acts have garnered considerable attention, especially among German scholars. These studies differ from my project in that they generally analyze the speeches in terms of classical rhetoric, whereas I foreground the speeches' narrative functions. Key works in the ocean of secondary literature on this include: H. J. Cadbury, "The Speeches in Acts," in *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake; 5 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1920-33); Martin Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed. H.

subordinate construction).[189] The outcomes of such debates directly impact our understanding of Lukan characters and thus, Lukan narrative claims to truth and authority.[190] The work presented in subsequent chapters of this dissertation participates in such debates while adding another layer of nuance and complexity by foregrounding the narrator's *and* characters' silences as effective means of narrative characterization.

Theological Themes

The final literary concept I want to highlight is that of a narrative's predominant theme(s). In his landmark work *Narrative as Theme*, Gerald Prince outlines the bewildering conglomeration of concepts to which theorists refer when they discuss "theme."[191] Following Prince, Joel Green distils these concepts down to a basic definition of theme as "that which unifies other textual elements within the

---

Greeven; London: SCM Press, 1956), 138-85; U. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961); Eduard Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. Keck and Martyn; Nashville/New York, 1966); G. Schneider, "Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte," in *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HTKNT 5/1-2; Freiburg: Herder, 1980-82), 1:95-103; William Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts," *CBQ* 42 (1980): 171-95; George Kennedy, "The Speeches in Acts," in *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1984), 114-40; Philip Satterthwaite, "Acts Against the Background of Classical Rhetoric," in *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting* (ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

[189] In Greek, the distinction is less clear than in English since indirect discourse often retains the tense used in the (supposed) original utterance. Perhaps because of this potential ambiguity, scholars disagree on the amount of indirect speech in the Gospel of Luke. For a key text on this, see Henry Cadbury, "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts IV: On Direct Quotation, With Some Uses of *hoti* and *ei*," *JBL* 48 (1929): 412-25. Cadbury made the redaction-critical argument that the Lukan author tended to change direct discourse into indirect discourse. *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 171. In contrast, Stephen Moore claims that there is a "dearth of indirect-speech reporting in Luke-Acts." *Mark and Luke in Poststructuralist Perspective*, 134.

[190] David Aune articulates one common view: "Indirect discourse is a *more accurate* way of reporting speeches, while direct discourse is a more vivid and potentially dramatic medium." *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (vol. 8; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), 127. Emphasis added.

[191] Gerald Prince, *Narrative as Theme: Studies in French Fiction* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, (1992), 1-8.

narrative."[192] As noted previously, repeated concepts and motifs often create a sense of continuity across otherwise episodic trajectories of the gospel narratives, and this is the case with Luke's Gospel.

Scholars have consistently emphasized one dominant theological theme[193] in Luke's gospel: salvation to the ends of the earth.[194] Indeed, although Conzelmann's once ground-breaking proposal to divide Lukan salvation history into three periods[195] has been widely critiqued,[196] the centrality of universal salvation to the Lukan agenda remains almost universally acknowledged.[197]

---

[192] Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 22.

[193] Thematic elements of a narrative can certainly be literary without being theological; for example, in contrast to the majority, Joseph Tyson considers a Lukan theme in literary rather than theological terms. See Joseph B. Tyson, "Conflict as a Literary Theme in the Gospel of Luke," in W.R. Farmer, ed., *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983). Still, since Luke's narrative is fundamentally and inextricably shaped by theological concerns, I mainly consider "theological themes." I agree with Joel Green, who writes, "[Luke's] mode of persuasion is perhaps more subtle [than Paul's letters], but it is no less theological." Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 3.

[194] As Spencer writes, "Luke-Acts establishes a single threaded plotline – in this case the extension of the narrative theme of 'salvation to the ends of the earth' – surrounded by supporting topoi and characterization." *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories*, 133.

[195] Hans Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1954); ET: *The Theology of St. Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

[196] See, for example, the discussion of Conzelmann and subsequent research in Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950-2005)* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1-77; for direct critiques, see (among many others): Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982); Howard I. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1988), 77-88; H. Douglas Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology* (SNTMS 89; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); W.G. Kümmel, *Einleitung in das neue Testament* (13th ed.; Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1964), 114.

[197] Luke Timothy Johnson's statement exemplifies the common scholarly view: "Luke emphasizes the salvific aspect of the Good News more than any of the other Gospels." *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 23. See Lk. 1.69, 71, 77; 2.11, 30-32; 3.6; 13.23; 18.26; 19.9. Most commentaries note that only in Luke does the quotation from Isaiah in 3.6 include the line, "all flesh will see the salvation of God." The search for distinctly Lukan themes has occupied scholars for decades, and thus, the body of work on this topic is quite large. Some recent examples include: Daniel J. Harrington, "Major Lukan Themes," in *The Synoptic Gospels Set Free: Preaching Without Anti-Judaism* (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 2009), 154-157. (Harrington lists Holy Spirit, Salvation History, Jesus the Prophet, The Twelve Apostles, Prayer, Rich and Poor, Meals/Banquets, Women, Jerusalem, Eschatology, Parallel

Still, despite this widespread agreement on the thematic importance of universal salvation, Bultmann goes too far when he states that in Gospel literature, "the stories are all constructed out of *one* theme."[198] Other themes commonly identified in Luke include: hospitality, caring for the poor and marginalized,[199] fulfillment of prophecy,[200] the divine will and human response, hearing versus doing, discipleship as a journey, the role of the Holy Spirit,[201] and the innocence and lordship of Christ.[202] Throughout the dissertation, I argue that attention to silence and speech advances and simultaneously complicates key theological themes in the Gospel of Luke.

PART III: SILENCES IN LUKE'S GOSPEL

Explicit References to Silence

Lives); Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke–Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*, JSNTSup 110 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); John T. Carroll, "The God of Israel and Salvation of the Nations: The Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles," in *The Forgotten God* (ed. A.A. Das and F.J. Matera; Louisville: John Knox Press, 2002), 91-106.

[198] Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 307. Emphasis added.

[199] D.P. Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts* (Linz: A. Fuchs, 1982); V. Petracca, *Gott oder das Geld. Die Besitzethik des Lukas* (Tübingen: Francke, 2003); Luke T. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (SBL Dissertation Series 39; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977); CM Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics: A Study in Their Coherence and Character* (WUNT 2. Reihe 275; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

[200] R. I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (London: Sheffield Academic, 1997).

[201] James B. Shelton, *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (1991); William H. Shepherd Jr., *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS, 147; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994); Matthias Wenk, *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (2000); Ju Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (2001).

[202] Thus Lampe: "Through death to the heavenly throne. This is the picture of Christ's work which Luke is most concerned to show us." G. W. H. Lampe, "The Lucan Portrait of Christ," *NTS* 2 (1956): 160-175; 167. Manfred Korn, *Die Geschichte Jesu in Veranderter Zeit: Studien zur bleibendend Bedeutung Jesu im lukanischen Doppelwerk* (WUNT 2/51; Tübingen: Mohr, 1993).

The most obvious references to silence in Luke's Gospel are those places where the narrator explicitly uses words like σιγάω (to be silent),[203] σιωπάω (to be silent),[204] φιμόω (to put to silence),[205] or ἡσυχάζω (to be calm, to remain silent).[206] In addition to overt "silence words," the Lukan narrator also utilizes phrases negating speech, as when characters "told no one" (οὐδεν ἀπήγγειλαν),[207] or when Jesus commands other characters to "tell no one" (μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν).[208]

It is important to recognize that in Greek, "silence" has a wider semantic range than it does in English. The ancient Greek words for silence noted above denote varying modulations of audibility; at times, "silence" can refer to "total silence," whereas other instances refer to "a low voice." Perhaps "quietly" is a better translation in some places. Thus, the modern reader ought to understand the Greek phrases and words denoting silence to be located at various points along a communication continuum, rather than assuming that they all refer to the absence of sound.

The Lukan Narrator's Silences

---

[203] Lk. 9.36; 18.39; 20.26.

[204] Lk. 1.20; 19.40.

[205] The only instance of this verb in Luke is when Jesus rebukes the demon in 4.35.

[206] Lk. 14.4. The first meaning for this verb is "to be calm, to be at rest," as in the Sabbath rest of 23.56.

[207] Lk. 9.36.

[208] Much has been made of the so-called "Messianic secret," in Mark, in which Jesus repeatedly tells others to keep silent about his identity. See the classic work by Wilhelm Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901). In Luke, Jesus also explicitly commands secrecy (4.35, 41; 5.14; 8.56; 9.21), though Luke's "secrecy motif" is not as consistent as Mark's. The Lukan Jesus' command for silence is complicated by passages in which he wants others to understand his teaching; scholars have explained these complications in various ways. For example, James Dawsey ascribes these tensions to different perspectives of the Lukan narrator and the Lukan Jesus. *The Lukan Voice*, esp. 90-94. For more on this, see chapter 2 of this dissertation.

As is always the case, a phenomenon might be present without any technical terminology. Silvia Montiglio recognizes this as one of the inherent challenges involved in studying the silences of an ancient culture; instead of limiting her work to specific references to silence found in treatises such as Plutarch's *Concerning Talkativeness* and Pollux's *Onomasticon*, Montiglio "trie[s] to interpret what the Greeks did – and did not do – with [silence]."[209] Similarly, my treatment of Luke includes both explicit references to silence *and* an attempt to interpret what the Lukan narrator "did – and did not do – with it."

Many times in Luke's Gospel, explicit mentions of silence are left ambiguous, in need of interpretation; in these cases, the Lukan narrator remains silent. For instance, when Jesus refuses to answer Herod in Luke 23.9 (αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ), this may be a *silence of defiance*. It may instead – or also – be a *silence of deference* indicating Jesus' acceptance of his coming fate.[210] When the disciples are silent after witnessing Jesus' transfiguration in 9.36 (αὐτοὶ ἐσίγησαν καὶ οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν), this may be a *silence of awe*, a recognition of the revelatory nature of what they have seen, or it may be a *silence of simple incomprehension*. The narrator does not say.

We can illustrate narratorial silence further by turning to those instances in which Lukan characters think, consider, ponder (συμβάλλω, δοκέω, κατανοέω), or marvel (θαυμάζω, ἐκπλήσσω, γίνομαι θάμβος). On the one hand, there are places where the

---

[209] Montiglio, *Silence in the Land of Logos*, 6.
[210] There are a variety of different interpretations of Jesus' silence before Herod, many of which draw on the silence of the suffering servant in Isaiah 53.7. See chapter 4 of this dissertation for a longer discussion. For a summary of the interpretive possibilities, see M. Soards, "The Silence of Jesus before Herod: An Interpretive Suggestion," *Australian Biblical Review* 33 (1985): 41-45.

Lukan narrator cites these characters' unspoken words using the literary technique of internal monologue. [211] Elsewhere, however, the narrator describes characters as thinking or marveling, but does not quote their unspoken thoughts.[212] Here, we must bear in mind that thought – unspoken speech – was not necessarily considered "silence" in antiquity.[213] The familiar Platonic formulation is that thought is speech without sound: "a talk which the soul has with itself about the objects under its consideration."[214] Luke's implied readers, drawing on this common ancient conception of thought as self-talk, most likely would not have considered either of these cases – quoted or unquoted thought – to be characters' silences on the *story* level. On the level of the *narration*, though, a distinction can be made: when characters' thoughts *are* quoted through internal monologue, the narrator is *not* silent, since he tells readers what the characters are thinking. In contrast, when characters' thoughts are *not* quoted, these can be considered narratorial silences – silences in the telling of the tale – since the narrator does not tell the reader what they are "pondering" or "keeping in their hearts."[215]

---

[211] Many of the Lukan instances of internal monologue occur in parables, an area in which Bernhard Heininger and Philip Sellew have done groundbreaking work; these will be discussed further in chapter 3.

[212] Throughout the scholarship, one finds various iterations of Gérard Genette's three basic modes for portraying consciousness: "narratized speech" (the narrator's direct analysis of a character's thoughts); "transposed speech" (monologue told by the narrator in the form of indirect discourse); "reported speech" (literal quotation of a character's thoughts as verbalized internally). For the classic formulation, see Genette, *Nouveau discours du récit* (Paris, 1983), 58.

[213] This is not to say that silent thought was a totally foreign concept in the ancient world. Mortley discusses the Stoic recognition of silent thinking in *From Word to Silence*, 32-33.

[214] *Theaetetus* 189e (ed. Bernard Williams; trans. M. J. Levett; Indianapolis: Hackett, 1992), 65. This raises the issue of terminology: internal/interior/inner monologue, internal/interior/inner dialogue, and soliloquy are all interchangeable terms in literary theory. In one respect, internal dialogue is a more apt description, since the cases we are considering are more than simple reflection; they are dialogues, just with the same speaker and recipient. However, because internal/interior/inner monologue are the more common terms in literary theory, I will use them.

PART IV: THE DESIGN OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation offers an initial – not an exhaustive – exploration of the narratological functions of silence and speech in Luke's narrative. My goal is not to treat every instance of speech or silence in the third Gospel, but rather to present selected illustrative examples of how various narrative formulations of silence and speech are rhetorically deployed by the Lukan narrator. Furthermore, in light of the significant literary and theological connections between Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, the project would lend itself well to a consideration of similar issues in Acts. Still, doing so is beyond the scope of the present work; references to Acts will be limited to important parallels and/or scholarly insights that are particularly relevant for silence and speech in Luke's Gospel.

The dissertation is divided into five chapters, following the traditional divisions of Luke's Gospel itself:

Chapter 1: Preface (1.1-4) and Narrative Beginnings (1.5-4.13)[216]

Chapter 2: Jesus' Galilean Ministry (4.14-9.50)

---

[215] For example, those who hear the testimony about Zechariah are said to keep (τίθημι) these things "in their hearts" (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν, 1.66), and so too does Mary ponder (συμβάλλω) what she hears from the shepherds "in her heart" (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς, 2.19).

[216] Although many Lukan scholars separate chapters 1-2 from the rest of the narrative (beginning in 3.1), I treat the Preface and Narrative Beginnings together in one chapter because, as Charles Talbert argues, Luke's implied readers likely would have viewed this entire section as one unit that foreshadows and prepares for the public career of the biographical hero (which begins, according to Talbert, in 4.16). Charles H. Talbert, "Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5-4:15," in *The Divine Helmsman*, 129-41. See also Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 16-18. François Bovon also asserts that, "until 4.13, we are still in the preparatory stages." Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke (1:1-9:50)* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 2. Similarly, F. O'Fearghail considers Luke 1-4 together to be the first main section of Luke-Acts. *The Introduction to Luke-Acts. A Study of the Role of Lk 1,1-4 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work* (Analecta Biblica 126; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991).

Chapter 3: The Central Section: Travel from Galilee to Jerusalem (9.51-19.27)

Chapter 4: Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem, passion, and resurrection (19.28-24.53)

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Each chapter identifies and describes the rhetorical effects of silence and speech in its respective section of Luke, focusing especially on the contributions that silence and speech make to the narrative's plot, characterization, and theological themes. Each chapter concludes with an extended explication of one key illustrative passage from that section of Luke.[217]

Specifically, Chapter 1 explores the contributions of speech and silence to the functions of Luke's narrative beginnings, including establishing the ideal narrator-reader relationship and raising readerly expectations about the tale to come. It introduces the rhetorical characterization of Jesus, which is based on reliable characters' speech and, concomitantly, the relative silence of Jesus himself. Using the story of the silencing of Zechariah in 1.5-23, the chapter argues that speech regulation both showcases and complexifies Luke's thematic focus on divine activity and the human response.

Chapter 2 calls attention to the ways that the narrator's uses of speech and silence establish a particular rhetoric of causality, set the plot in motion, and regulate the narrative pace. This chapter explicates the Lukan introduction to the disciples and religious authorities, considers the related theological themes of hearing and doing the divine word and salvation to the ends of the earth, and explores Jesus' ethical concerns about speech. An extended analysis of Jesus' interaction with Simon the Pharisee in 7.36-50 demonstrates how Jesus' authoritative control over others' words (both spoken and

[217] The criteria I used for choosing these illustrative passages are as follows: they are widely dispersed throughout gospel; they represent various types of stories (parables, controversy stories, miracles, etc.); and they exhibit different kinds of speech-silence interactions.

unspoken) furthers the narrative rhetoric of characterization and implicates the reader in judging characters' responses to Jesus.

The third chapter proposes that focusing on speech and silence illuminates the old question of which structural or organizational principles govern the so-called Travel Narrative in Luke. It asks how Jesus' speech-related teachings relate to the theme of discipleship, and explores how Jesus employs speech and silence when he tells parables. This chapter also identifies significant shifts in the disciples' and religious leaders' speech practices and investigates the various implications of those shifts for the narrative's rhetoric of characterization. The Pharisees' silence before Jesus in 14.1-6 is discussed as a particularly telling example of how the narrator's uses of speech and silence elucidate their realignment of identity in the central section of the Gospel.

Turning to the Lukan passion and post-resurrection scenes, chapter 4 analyzes the contributions that speech and silence make to Luke's narrative ending. First, the interplay between direct speech and narratorial summation regulates the rhythm leading up to and during the Lukan climax; second, shifts in all the main characters' uses of speech and silence – particularly Jesus' unexplained silence before Herod in 23.6-12 – both deepen and complicate previous characterizations and concomitantly instantiate the Lukan themes of Jesus' innocence and unjust rejection. The implicit silences of bodily and metaphorical absences also play operative roles in these crucial final scenes. Lastly, the chapter argues that speech and silence together contribute to a sense of closure at the end of the Gospel, while paradoxically keeping several narrative trajectories unresolved. The fifth and final chapter concludes the dissertation by bringing together key observations from the body chapters and proposing avenues for future research.

CHAPTER ONE
PROLOGUE AND NARRATIVE BEGINNINGS (LUKE 1.1-4.13)

INTRODUCTION

Following an extremely brief introductory prologue (Luke 1.1-4), the Lukan narrator launches into the annunciation and infancy narratives of John the Baptist and Jesus (Luke 1-2), then shifts abruptly to John's call for repentance (Luke 3) and preparations for Jesus' public ministry (Luke 4). In this chapter, I consider how a focus on speech and silence can contribute to our understanding of the narrative functions of Luke's diverse beginning materials. I begin by highlighting several observations literary critics have made about the functions of narrative beginnings.

Narrative Beginnings in Theory

Narrative beginnings inaugurate the dynamic conversation between text and reader that constitutes interpretation.[218] Elizabeth Struthers Malbon describes this role of narrative beginnings as "interactional," establishing the relationship between the narrator and the reader.[219] Indeed, narrative beginnings can be seen as an open door through which the reader enters the world represented by the text and (at least preliminarily) agrees to what

[218] A classic example is Peter J. Rabinowitz, *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987). See, also, Francis M. Dunn and Thomas Cole, eds., *Beginnings in Classical Literature* (Yale Classical Studies; Cambridge: Yale University, 1992). For a complex discussion of "beginnings" as an abstract concept, see Edward Said's classic work, *Beginnings: Intention and Method* (New York: Basic Books, 1975).

[219] Based on her reading of the theoretical literature, Elizabeth Struthers Malbon proposes three different classes of functions: *interactional* (beginnings inaugurate the relationship between reader and text), *intertextual* (beginnings attest to the intertextual contexts in which readers should situate the ensuing narrative), and *intratextual* (beginnings convey the "narrative worlds" – settings, characters, plots, etc. – of the text at hand). Although the terms themselves are helpful, Malbon draws too strict a distinction between them. In reality, the *interactional* function depends upon discernment of the *intertextual* and *intratextual* roles of narrative beginnings. Perhaps it would be better to consider the intertextual and intratextual functions as subcategories of the interactional role of a narrative's beginning. See Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "Ending at the Beginning: A Response," *Semeia* 52 (1991): 175-84.

Coleridge famously called the "willing suspension of disbelief"[220] – the willingness to transition into and engage with the narrative world she or he encounters. In the case of Luke's gospel, this entails an implicit recognition that – contra James Dawsey's provocative thesis that the Lukan narrator is unreliable[221] – the Lukan narrator is meant to be an authoritative and reliable storyteller, one who, as John Darr puts it, marshals a "tightly controlled artifice of authoritative voices" even from the first early reference to "those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" (1.2).[222]

The start of a story represents a unique opportunity for the storyteller, since as Aristotle recognized, "Attention slackens everywhere else *rather than at the beginning*" (*Rhet.* 3.14).[223] As a narrative proceeds, a storyteller must work harder to keep a reader's attention. Initially, however, the reader is already engaged. This makes the start an ideal time to present the orienting materials necessary for a reader to make sense of the story. Meir Sternberg popularized the term "exposition" for these kinds of explanatory details.[224] Expositional evidence presented at the start of a narrative tends to consist of details like the time, place, and main character(s) of the narrative world.[225]

---

[220] Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria* (ed. George Watson; London: Dent, 1965), 169.

[221] Dawsey argues that the narrator does not understand what Jesus says and does, and that as a result, the narrator should not be seen as a trustworthy source. James Dawsey, *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1986). For a strong critique of Dawsey and a compelling counter-argument, see John A. Darr, "Narrator as Character."

[222] Darr, "Narrator as Character," 56.

[223] Emphasis added.

[224] Though note that Sternberg points out that not all expositional information will be found at the beginning of a narrative; at times, it is distributed throughout a story, with various narratological effects. For his seminal work on expositional modes in narrative, see Meir Sternberg, "What is Exposition? An Essay in Temporal Delimitation," in *The Theory of the Novel: New Essays* (ed. John Halperin; New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 25-70 and idem, *Expositional Modes and Temporal Ordering in Fiction* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).

[225] Sternberg, *Expositional Modes*, 98-99.

Stated in this way, the expositional function of narrative beginnings coheres with Joseph Tyson's suggestion that the birth and infancy accounts in Luke (1.5-2.52) ought to be seen as analogous to Greek dramatic prologues.[226] From Tyson's perspective, chapters 1-2 create the dramatic situation that will lead the reader into the main events of the narrative itself. Though Tyson makes a compelling case, he does not address the fact that the Greek dramatic prologues to which he refers conventionally introduce the main players who will enact the drama to come. Luke's beginning only does so to a limited degree; it introduces the two major figures of Jesus and John the Baptist, as well as a host of others who appear elsewhere in the narrative (e.g., Mary, God, Gabriel, etc.), but two major character groups (Jesus' disciples and his opponents) are not mentioned until the second section of the Gospel (4.14-9.50). In this chapter, I call special attention to the ways that Luke's chapters 1-4 introduce the central figure of the story – Jesus.

A narrative's beginning also raises expectations and prepares readers for the narrative as a whole.[227] The Russian formalist Boris Uspensky, who is perhaps the most cited theorist in the scholarly literature on this topic, writes that, "The narrative often begins with hints about the denouement of the plot which has not yet begun."[228] Relatedly, in biblical studies, Hebrew Bible scholars Meir Sternberg, Menakhem Perry,

---

[226] Tyson, "Birth Narratives."

[227] As Loveday Alexander puts it, "It is the job of a preface to arouse readers' expectations and to give them certain clues, implicit or explicit, as to what is to come." Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel*, 200. See also Morna D. Hooker, *Beginnings: Keys that Open the Gospels* (London: SCM, 1997).

[228] Interestingly, Uspensky, who is not a biblical scholar, cites the Gospel of Luke as his example of a narrative that begins "from a retrospective position" and provides hints about what is to come. *A Poetics of Composition*, 149.

and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan have popularized the concept of the "primacy effect"[229] – the notion that early details shape a reader's experience of subsequent events.[230] Narrative themes and perspectives indicated early on inevitably impact the reader's expectations as she or he proceeds through the story; in fact, much of the work of reading entails modifying, reinforcing, or questioning those expectations in light of what occurs later in the text. These general functions of narrative beginnings undergird this chapter's discussion of the uses of speech and silence in Luke's preface and narrative introduction (Lk. 1.1-4.14).

SPEECH AND SILENCE IN THE LUKAN PROLOGUE (1.1-4) AND NARRATIVE BEGINNINGS (1.5-4.14)

Luke begins as no other gospel does:[231] with a formal Hellenistic prologue (1.1-4).[232] Using first person narration[233] and second person direct address, the narrator succinctly introduces: (1) *his purpose* ("to compile a narrative (διήγησις) about the events that

---

[229] Tannehill describes the "primacy effect" this way: "The perspectives established at the beginning, when we are seeking to orient ourselves in this new narrative world, will continue to operate until they are decisively challenged." Tannehill, "Beginning to Study 'How Gospels Begin,'" *Semeia* 52 (1991): 188.

[230] S. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 121. See also the programmatic article by Menakhem Perry, "Literary Dynamics: How the Order of a Text Creates its Meanings [With an Analysis of Faulkner's 'A Rose for Emily'],'' *Poetics Today* 1 (1979): 41. For an application of this concept to the infancy narratives in particular, see Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative*, 28.

[231] Matthew begins with a genealogy, Mark begins *in medias res* (with John and Jesus already as adults), and John begins with an abstract theological preface. The very fact that each of the gospels begins differently is a reminder that the gospel writers had their own unique agendas and rhetorical reasons for writing the gospel story in the particular ways that they did.

[232] For the classic treatment of this passage, see Henry J. Cadbury, "Commentary on the Preface of Luke," *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ed. J.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; London: Macmillan, 1922-33), 489-510.

[233] Some doubt that the first person speaker of the Gospel prologue is the same as the narrator of the "we" passages in Acts. On this, see Kurz, "Narrative Approaches to Luke-Acts," 210 and Parsons, *Rethinking the Unity*, 66; for a more detailed treatment of the question, see Campbell, *The "We" Passages in the Acts of the Apostles.*

have been fulfilled among us…so that you [Theophilus] may know the truth (ἀσφάλειαν)," 1.1, 4);[234] (2) *his subject matter* ("the events that have been fulfilled among us," and "the things about which you have been taught," 1.1, 4); and (3) *his method* ("after investigating everything carefully from the beginning, to write to you in an orderly way," 1.3). After this initial prefatory statement, the narrative proper begins with accounts of John the Baptist's and Jesus' birth stories, each of which has its own characteristics of a narrative beginning.[235]

Any consideration of Luke's beginnings must consider: where does Luke's beginning end? Scholars have long divided chapters 1-2 from the rest of the narrative beginning in 3.1,[236] and many redaction critics have considered 3.1 to be the original beginning of Luke's Gospel.[237] One reason for such a division is that the narrative jumps suddenly from a story of Jesus at the age of twelve (2.41-52) to the account of John being called into the wilderness as an adult (3.1-6). Despite the consistent refutation of Conzelmann's well-known theory that chapters 1 and 2 were later additions to Luke's

---

[234] Several scholars note that the position of ἀσφάλειαν in the sentence may afford it special prominence. See Martin Culy, Mikeal Parsons, and Joshua Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010), 5.

[235] Joseph Tyson distinguishes between three different beginnings to Luke: the conventional preface (1.1-4), a dramatic prologue at 1.5, and a scenic beginning at 3.1-2. "Birth Narratives," 116.

[236] As I noted in the introductory chapter, Charles Talbert is a notable exception to this tendency, viewing 1.1-4.15 as one unit. Charles H. Talbert, "Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5-4:15," *The Divine Helmsman*, 129-41.

[237] See Joseph Tyson's summary of the various proposals for the original beginning of Luke. He writes, "A case can be made for taking the beginning of Luke's gospel as 1:1; 1:5; 3:1; 3:23; 4:1; or 4:14." "Birth Narratives," 107. One of the most prominent proposals is that set forth by Burnett Streeter and Vincent Taylor, who argued for the existence of a Proto-Luke, the beginning of which was 3.1. See Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1924), and Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926). Joseph Fitzmyer, although he did not ascribe to the Proto-Luke hypothesis, believed it was "highly likely that [Luke and Acts] existed at one time in an earlier form, to which Luke later added not only the infancy narrative and prologue, but even the secondary prologue of Acts 1.1-2 and the ending in Lk 24.50-53." "The Ascension," 419.

Gospel,[238] this chronological gap in the story still prompts exegetes to divide chapters 1 and 2 structurally from chapters 3 and following. As I explained in the introduction, this chapter treats Luke 1-4 together. Doing so facilitates consideration of the strange chronological gap between 2.52 and 3.1, the presence and functions of which remain underexplored. This gap is an implicit narratorial silence that will be treated more fully below.

In general, studies that appeared before the 1980s approached questions about Luke's beginning through the related topics of form, genre, and original source(s).[239] More recently, scholars have explored Luke's introductory materials as fodder for the ongoing scholarly debate over the unity of Luke and Acts.[240] These approaches interpret the beginning of Luke in redactional, historical, and/or theological terms. They do not, however, account for every narratival feature or function of the early materials in Luke.

---

[238] See, e.g., Paul S. Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), 111-30.

[239] The following key works compare Luke 1.1-4 with prefaces of Greco-Roman and Jewish historiographies: D. Earl, "Prologue-form in Ancient Historiography," *ANRW* 1 (1972): 842-56; W.C. van Unnik, "Once More St. Luke's Prologue," *Neot* 7 (1973): 7-26; R.J. Dillon, "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1.1-4)," *CBQ* 43 (1981): 205-27; T. Callen, "The Preface of Luke-Acts and Historiography," *NTS* 31 (1985): 576-81; Darryl D. Schmidt, "Rhetorical Influences and Genre: Luke's Preface and the Rhetoric of Hellenistic Historiography," *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* (ed. David Moessner; Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1999), 27-60; Vernon Robbins, "The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Prefaces to Luke and Acts in Light of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Strategies," *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* (ed. David Moessner; Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1999), 63-83. Contrast these with the view set forth by Loveday Alexander, who argues that the Lukan preface matches the genre of a scientific treatise. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel.*

[240] Such treatments often center upon identifying thematic and/or structural parallels between either: a). the first few chapters of Luke and the end of the Gospel, or b). the early chapters of Luke and the beginning of Acts. This is not surprising, since beginnings and endings are often discussed in tandem in the theoretical literature; they are often conceived together as the "frame" that marks the boundaries of the narrative. Joseph Tyson, for instance, points out parallels with the end of Luke's Gospel, and characterizes Luke 1-3 as "a particularly effective frame for the gospel, containing phenomena of circularity and parallelism." "The Birth Narratives and the Beginning of Luke's Gospel," *Semeia* 52 (1991): 116.

Gospel scholars have begun to draw on insights from the world of critical literary theory to investigate the functions of Luke's beginning(s), though these discussions are not yet well developed.[241] Most tend to agree that Luke's beginning(s) characterize Jesus as the story's main protagonist, raise readerly expectations, and introduce crucial theological themes. Still, very little work has been done on how speech and silence function to establish these characteristics of the first sections of Luke's gospel. In this chapter, I discuss the ways that speech and silence contribute to Luke's narrative beginnings on the level of the telling (i.e., the narrator's methods of portraying the story) *and* on the level of the story itself (i.e., the events and the characters who enact them). Specifically, I argue that:

1). On the level of the telling, the narrator's uses of speech and silence introduce the ideal relationship between narrator and reader by orienting the reader and raising readerly expectations, while simultaneously creating tensions that problematize this ideal;

2) On the level of the story, the narrative rhetoric of characterization introduces Jesus (while postponing the narrative debut of other major *dramatis personae*), and establishes Jesus' unique identity more through others' reliable speech than through his own.

3) The regulation of certain characters' speech juxtaposes the theological theme of the necessity of the divine plan with the variability of human response.

Between the Narrator and the Reader

[241] See the overview in Mikeal Parsons, "Reading a Beginning/Beginning a Reading: Tracing Literary Theory on Narrative Openings," *Semeia* 52 (1991): 11-31. This entire issue of *Semeia* is devoted to the theme of gospel beginnings. See also Brian Richardson, *Narrative Beginnings: Theories and Practices* (Lincoln, NE and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).

As discussed above, narrative beginnings introduce the relationship between the narrator and the reader and provide cues that shape the reader's subsequent understanding of the story; in the earliest sections of the Gospel, the narrator essentially orients the reader. These observations are not new. However, what scholars less commonly acknowledge is that particular speech acts and narratorial silences in the early sections of Luke are a crucial means by which the Lukan narrator accomplishes the work of his narrative beginning.

The Lukan prologue (1.1-4) is written in the first-person, from a point of view that is external to the narrative itself. Setting aside the questions of the historical identities of both the implied author (the "I" of Luke 1.3) and the addressee ("Theophilus"),[242] we might consider instead how the first person functions in establishing the relationship between the narrator and his readers.

As a temporally separate starting point, the first-person prologue, with its references to the "things that have been fulfilled among us" (1.1) orients the reader by situating the narrative that is to come within two broader contexts: that of the story of God and Israel as related in the Hebrew Bible (with which Luke clearly assumes "Theophilus" will be familiar), and that of the "real" (extratextual, non-narrated) world to which Luke and his readers belong. The inclusion of a preliminary dedication that references both "fulfillment" (πληροφορέω, 1.1) and the fact that Theophilus has already been taught (1.4) establishes from the outset that this is not simply a story into which the implied reader must enter, but it is a story that has already begun, and in which

[242] For a narratological approach to the question of Theophilus' identity, see R.R. Creech, "The Most Excellent Narratee: The Significance of Theophilus in Luke-Acts," 107-26.

the reader is already involved.[243] Strictly speaking, then, the beginning of Luke's Gospel is not truly a beginning – at least, not in the way that Aristotle defined beginnings ("that which does not itself follow anything by causal necessity, but after which something naturally is or comes to be").[244] In a broad sense, Luke begins *in medias res*, as his prologue has both analeptic and proleptic[245] overtones.

The first person prologue also conditions the reader to adopt a certain textual response toward what follows - sympathy toward the narrator's point of view - creating what Daniel Marguerat calls a "reading community" by positioning the implied reader with the addressee, as though they already share the same point of view.[246] This effect is furthered by the repeated use of the plural pronoun "us" (ἡμῖν) in verses 1-2, which functions rhetorically to create a reading community to which both narrator and reader belong. Though not every concrete reader will match this description, the language of the text nevertheless assumes that the implied reader (represented by Theophilus) has – at least to some extent – adopted the values and worldviews expressed in the narrative.

Many scholars comment on the Lukan prologue's unabashed claim to authoritative reliability regarding the "things that have been fulfilled among us" (1.1).[247]

---

[243] My point here is similar to that made by Boring about Mark's Gospel in "Mark 1:1-15 and the Beginning of the Gospel," *Semeia* 52 (1991): 64-65.

[244] Aristotle, *Poetics* 7.3.

[245] *Analepsis* is defined as, "A form of anachrony by which some of the events of a story are related at a point in the narrative after later story-events have already been recounted. Commonly referred to as retrospection or flashback." *Prolepsis* is its opposite. See Chris Baldick, ed., *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 13, 271-272.

[246] Marguerat says this rhetorical move is "without parallel in Graeco-Roman historiography" and thus demonstrates Luke's "remarkable originality." Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the "Acts of the Apostles"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 24.

And yet, this claim differs from the rest of the Gospel narrative, which is related in the third-person by an omniscient narrator. The latter resembles the vast majority of biblical narratives, which are also related in the third person by anonymous, omniscient narrators. As Sternberg discusses at length, the common refusal of biblical narrators to identify themselves functions as a form of self-distancing and thus, suggests the "objectivity and authority of the disembodied voice mediating between God and his people."[248] In contrast, at first, Luke does not distance himself at all, but rather connects himself personally to the story he is about to tell.

I suggest that Luke is "doubling up" on his efforts to persuade his readers by claiming to be trustworthy in two different ways. The opening frame of the prologue asserts reliability by claiming a place of perspectival privilege; many researchers have shown that oral cultures tend to accept more readily what they hear from a known and trusted source.[249] Using the first person, Luke identifies himself as the knowable, trustworthy source of all that follows. On the other hand, using third person narration for the story proper, the narrator also claims reliability implicitly by employing the conventional scriptural mode of third person narration, and thereby aligning his work stylistically with the narrative portions of the Hebrew Scriptures (among other literary authorities).

In addition to the ways the narrator uses speech to claim a position of power vis-à-vis his reader, he also uses silences to prompt readerly engagement; unanswered

---

[247] Terrance Callan, "The Preface of Luke-Acts and Historiography," *NTS* 31 (1985): 576-581. Callan specifically counters Talbert's suggestion that Luke-Acts ought to be read as a biography, arguing instead that it matches ancient historiographical qualities. This is an ongoing debate.

[248] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 123.

[249] See, e.g., the discussion of sources of validity in J.E. Tiles, *Moral Measures: An Introduction to Ethics West and East* (London: Routledge, 2000) 48-69.

questions are one noteworthy example of such silences, since they leave tensions unresolved and solicit readers to (at least attempt to) provide their own answers. For example, as Tom Thatcher convincingly demonstrates, in the four canonical Gospels, Jesus repeatedly utilizes "controlled ambiguity" to engage his audience's attention.[250] Often, this occurs through the means of purposeful riddles that leave it "to the audience to guess which answer is the right one."[251] In fact, Jesus' first appearance as a speaking subject in Luke's narrative – one of the few times Jesus speaks at all in Luke's beginning section[252] – includes just such a riddle.

In Luke 2.42-51, while his parents remain unaware of his location, the twelve-year-old Jesus is in the Jerusalem temple, impressing all who hear him with his teaching – including the διδάσκαλοι,[253] whose very job it is to teach.[254] Those who hear him wonder (ἐξίστημι) at the answers of the young Jesus, which are marked by "understanding" (σύνεσις, 2.47).[255] After three days of searching, Jesus' parents finally find him; while Joseph stands silently by, Mary demands an explanation: "Child,[256] why

---

[250] See Tom Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler: The Power of Ambiguity in the Gospels* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 1.

[251] See Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, 1.

[252] In the first four chapters of Luke, Jesus only speaks here (2.49) and in the desert with the devil, where he only speaks in order to cite Scripture (4.4, 8, 12).

[253] This is the only time in Luke that διδάσκαλος describes someone other than Jesus. See 3.12; 6.40 (where διδάσκαλος does not refer directly to Jesus, but the identification is implied); 7.40; 8.49; 9.38; 10.25; 11.45; 12.13; 18.18; 19.39; 20.21, 28, 39; 21.7; 22.11. On this, see J. Kilgallen, "Luke 2.41-50: Foreshadowing of Jesus, Teacher," *Biblica* 66 (1985): 553-59.

[254] This scene prefigures Jesus' later role as authoritative teacher.

[255] In contrast to the admiring wonder (ἐξίστημι, 2.47) of the crowd at hearing (ἀκούω) him, Jesus' parents are amazed (ἐκπλήσσω, 2.48) at seeing him (ὁράω, 2.48). They are not impressed by his words or his wisdom.

[256] For a discussion of the significance of Jesus' age of twelve and its role in this pericope, see Henk J. de Jonge, "Sonship, Wisdom, Infancy: Luke II.41-51a," *NTS* 24 (1978): 317-324.

have you treated us like this? Look, your father and I have been looking for you anxiously" (2.48). Jesus answers with his own oblique questions: "Why were you searching for me? Did you not know that I must be in my father's house/about my father's business?" (2.49)[257] Though he has been the subject of much talk thus far, this is the first instance in which Jesus' own speech is related through direct discourse. Mark Coleridge identifies a pivotal narrative shift here: now, Jesus will "not only embody God's salvation but interpret its surprising ways; that is, interpret himself…At [this] point, Jesus is born in the narrative as prime interpreter."[258]

What Coleridge neglects to mention in his discussion of Jesus as interpreter is that Jesus' response to Mary is itself enigmatic, in need of interpretation. His question is a purposeful riddle.[259] The narrator's description of Jesus' parents demonstrates as much: "They did not understand the statement he made to them" (οὐ συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς, 2.50).[260] No explicit answer to Jesus' cryptic question occurs in the narrative at all; Jesus does not explain himself, and the narrator is silent on this count, as well, leaving interpretation to the reader.

One of the most basic effects of narrative ambiguity is to stir readerly curiosity; occurring as it does so early in the narrative – and as Jesus' first spoken utterance – this specific instance of ambiguity raises curiosity about: (1) *What exactly Jesus means* (Why

---

[257] For several prominent interpretations of this verse, see Laurentin, *Jésus au temple* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1966), 38-72 and Bovon, *Luke 1*, 114.

[258] Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative*, 222-23.

[259] For a defense of this view, see de Jonge, who discusses the various interpretive possibilities and concludes: "Luke deliberately chose an enigmatic expression in order to profit from its ambivalence." "Sonship," 333.

[260] The depiction of Jesus' parents as ignorant frames the entire pericope (οὐκ ἔγνωσαν in 2.43, οὐ συνῆκαν in 2.50). At the same time, despite her incomprehension, Mary treasures (διατηρέω) these words in her heart (2.51), just as earlier, she had preserved (συντηρέω) the words of the shepherds in her heart (2.19).

does he assume they would know he should be about his father's business? Does he mean he is to be about his father's business, or in his father's house? What does it mean to be either one of those things?); (2) *Who Jesus is* (Is he an exceptionally wise teacher? Is he claiming to be God's son?); and (3) *What his relationship with his parents will entail as the story progresses* (Will they remain uncomprehending? Will he distance himself from them? Is he rejecting them as his parents?). Unanswered questions such as Jesus' riddle involve the reader in the interpretive process, stimulate readerly curiosity, and ultimately prompt the reader to keep reading.

Narratorial silences can also direct readerly attention in subtle but effective ways. Take, for example, the previously mentioned chronological gap that occurs between Luke 2.52 (which simply states that Jesus grew in wisdom and stature), and 3.1 (where John the Baptist appears as a grown man). With the one exception of Jesus' boyhood appearance in the Temple (2.41-52), the narrator skips Jesus' and John's childhoods altogether, a particular oddity when one considers that contemporary Greco-Roman biographies often included these crucial years in a hero's training.[261]

What is the narrative effect of this chronological gap?[262] The vast majority of publications on Luke 1-2 note that through their infancy stories, John the Baptist and

---

[261] For a consideration of childhood in classical literature, see Christopher Pelling, "Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography," in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (ed. C. Pelling; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 213-44.

[262] Is this simply an instance of what Sternberg would call a "blank" – an omission that is inconsequential for the plot, but "in which some reader or approach takes undue interest"? Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 240. Of course, it may be the case that Luke simply considered these events to be irrelevant to the story; or perhaps he knew of no pertinent stories except the teenage Jesus in the Temple scene, and chose not to fabricate them. The originating reason for the chronological breach is beside the point. My concern here is with its narrative effect. Joseph Tyson proposes that, like the scene shifts in several of Euripides' dramatic prologues, the disjunction between 2.52 and 3.1 points to the birth narrative's function as a framing device. Tyson, "Birth Narratives," 115-16.

Jesus are presented symmetrically, in clear parallel to one another.[263] Most also observe that despite the symmetry, the two are not meant to be seen as equals; though John the Baptist is described as "great" before the Lord (1.15), he is clearly inferior to Jesus. John is portrayed as Jesus' precursor.[264] I suggest that one effect of the temporal leap from Jesus as a twelve-year-old to John as an adult is to substantiate even further the prophecies about John's role as first related by Gabriel to John's father, Zechariah, and then later reiterated by Zechariah himself:

> Gabriel: And he will turn many of the people of Israel to the Lord their God. And he will go before him [the Lord] in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers back to their children and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready for the Lord a people prepared for him. (1.16-17)
> …
>
> Zechariah: And you, child, will be called a prophet of the Most High. For you will go before the Lord[265] to prepare his ways, to give his people knowledge of salvation through the forgiveness of their sins. (1.76-77)

The absence of any childhood stories of the Baptist focuses the reader immediately on the narrative fulfillment of the prophetic picture painted before his birth. In 3.2, John appears just as the prophecies predicted: "preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (3.3). By collapsing the timeline of some thirty years into the space between two verses, the narrator makes Gabriel's and Zechariah's prophecies about John the Baptist appear to be fulfilled instantaneously; the text thereby subtly reinforces the Lukan theme of divine fulfillment.

---

[263] For an especially clear comparison in table form, see Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 313-14.

[264] Historical-critical scholarly debates that separate chapters 1-2 from the body of Luke can distort the picture of John the Baptist as presented in the Lukan narrative. Darr says such studies "have often committed the hermeneutical equivalent of Herod's egregious act"; thus, Darr hopes to "recapitate" John through a narrative analysis in chapter 3 of *On Building Character*.

[265] Many manuscripts (A C D L Θ Ψ 0130 *f*1, 13 33 𝔐 sy) have "before the face of the Lord" (πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου), but "before the Lord" (ἐνώπιον κυρίου) is supported by earlier and better quality manuscripts (𝔓[4] ℵ B W 0177 *pc*).

The switch in narratorial voice, unanswered questions, and the chronological gap between 2.52 and 3.1 in Luke's beginning materials all function to exert narratorial reliability, orient the reader, and stimulate readerly curiosity. At the same time, however, Luke complicates the narrator-reader relationship even as he tries to establish it. To return to the issue of first-person versus third-person narration, one might ask: What are the narrative effects of Luke not simply adopting third person omniscience for the entire story, as his canonical counterparts do? For some readers, the shift from first person to third person narration weakens the narrator's assertion of trustworthiness;[266] Sternberg critiques Luke for this very move:

> [H]is practice flatly contradicts his empirical undertaking and terms of reference. The angel's apparition to Zechariah, the interior monologues of various characters, Jesus' prayer on the Mount of Olives while the disciples are asleep: all these form events accessible only by the privilege of omniscience which Luke virtually disclaims.[267]

The two different voices used in the beginning of the Gospel (first person and third person) represent the narrator's attempts to guide the reader, but the relative success of this effort depends on the reader.

The narrator's place of privilege vis-à-vis the reader is further destabilized by the open-endedness of the prologue. Perhaps it sounds paradoxical to consider open endings in the context of narrative beginnings.[268] And yet, this is precisely what we find with

---

[266] Consider Moore's assertion that, despite Luke's admission that he was not an eyewitness to the Gospel events (1.3), he nevertheless tells the story as "a private eye for whom no scene is too private." *Mark and Luke in Poststructuralist Perspective*, 132.

[267] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 86. Darr agrees that "Luke's first person narrator actually undermines his ensuing practice of (so-called) omniscient third person narration…" John Darr, "The Holy Spirit as Structural Element in Luke's Story World," unpublished paper, 9.

[268] Loveday Alexander calls the preface to Acts "open-ended," and she directly contrasts this with the preface to Luke's Gospel. Loveday Alexander, *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2005), 28. However, Alexander's criteria for

Luke's Gospel: the preface is open-ended insofar as the named addressee, Theophilus, never appears again in the Gospel. Neither do we have any concluding second-person farewell address at the end of the Gospel (or Acts), as we find in the epistolary genre.[269]

One rhetorical effect of the prologue's open-endedness is that it implicitly situates the concrete reader in Theophilus' position. Kathy Maxwell has fruitfully demonstrated how ancient rhetors often considered open-endedness to be an effective tool for prompting an audience's engagement.[270] Cicero, for example, advised, "[O]ften it is better not to formulate expressly…what the formulation would have been" (*De Or.* 2.41.177).[271] Or consider Plutarch, who called each member of an audience "a fellow-worker with the speaker" (*Mor.* 1.45E).[272] As a form of narratorial silence, the Lukan prologue's open-endedness means that ultimately, it is up to the reader – unconstrained by any particular recorded account about what has happened to the text – to decide what ought to be done with the Lukan narrative.

The Narrative Rhetoric of Characterization through Speech and Silence

As I summarized briefly in the introductory chapter, speech and silence are key aspects of the Lukan rhetoric of characterization. Let me insist again here that in practice, narrative

---

"open-endedness" are grammatical, syntactical, and stylistic, rather than rhetorical or narrative-critical; she is asking specifically where the preface ends and the narrative proper begins (and she rightly points out that this is clearer in the Gospel than in Acts). I consider Luke's Gospel preface to be open-ended in a different sense (see above).

[269] Cf. Rom. 16.21-7; 1 Cor. 16.19-24; Phil. 4.20-23; Col. 4.7-18; Eph. 6.23-24.

[270] Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines*, 27-78.

[271] Cicero, *De Oratore* (trans. H. Rackham; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942).

[272] Plutarch, *Moralia* (trans. Frank Cole Babbitt; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956-69).

categories are irreducibly interrelated. Various persons in the narrative are depicted "in terms of each other," within "a web of relationships."[273] Even within one pericope, multiple characters are being crafted in various ways vis-à-vis one another; isolating the characterization of one person (such as Jesus) is an artificial heuristic move that helps us with analytical clarity, but one should bear the caveat in mind that there is always more going on than we can treat at one time.

I also noted that due to the primacy effect (the notion that early details shape a reader's experience of subsequent events), contextual precursors color each subsequent depiction of characters. Still, first impressions can be challenged. In Luke, certain characters' speech practices shift over the course of the narrative, and consequently, attentive readers' perceptions of those characters will shift, as well.[274] This will become clearer as the dissertation progresses. Here, we consider the initial characterization of the main protagonist: Jesus.

Jesus

It is commonplace to recognize that Jesus is characterized as the "absolute authority"[275] in Luke's Gospel – a sympathetic protagonist with prophetic abilities, chosen and sent by God.[276] Throughout Luke, the narrator achieves this characterization both explicitly[277]

---

[273] Darr, *On Character Building*, 41.

[274] This is why Darr emphasizes that "character is cumulative," and thus, we must attend to "the degree to which a character or a character group has been constructed *at each point along the text continuum*." Darr, *On Character Building*, 42.

[275] Gowler, "Characterization in Luke," 55.

[276] A few scholars do challenge this general consensus, but their views have not gained widespread acceptance. Mark Ledbetter, for instance, critiques David Gowler for taking the narrative's claims that Jesus is authoritative at "face value." In Ledbetter's estimation, the character Jesus is indistinguishable

and implicitly,[278] calling Jesus by Christological titles[279] and showing him as he predicts events that consistently come to pass,[280] exorcises demons,[281] heals the sick and raises the dead,[282] forgives sins,[283] and even interprets himself to others.[284] Scholars have explored these elements of the text already; there is no reason to duplicate their work here. However, many of these previous studies focus on later sections of the Gospel, when Jesus is shown speaking. In the earliest chapters of Luke, Jesus is characterized more by others' reliable speech about him than by his own speech. In these sections, Jesus himself speaks only rarely. In the discussion that follows, I build on previous explorations by

---

from the Evil One (Βεελζεβούλ) at multiple points in the Lukan narrative. However, Ledbetter's reading is predicated upon a *strictly* episodic approach; he considers only a discrete narrative event without considering the sequential nature of narrative development over the course of the gospel as a whole. Ledbetter, "Telling the Other Story: A Literary Response to Socio-Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament," *Semeia* 64 (1993): 292.

[277] The second half of chapter four explicitly mentions Jesus' authority for the first time in the Lukan narrative. As Jesus begins teaching in Capernaum, the people are amazed because he speaks "with authority" (ἐξουσίᾳ, 4.32). The literary device of *inclusio*, evident in the Greek, emphasizes the importance of Jesus' *authoritative word* in this pericope: 4.32b and 36b mirror one another: ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ (4.32b) and τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ (4.36b).

[278] For an enlightening discussion of implicit narratorial commentary in Luke-Acts, see Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 135-58.

[279] Bovon rightly cautions that Christological titles should not be "the principal manner of getting at the Lucan Christ." *Luke the Theologian*, 177. Still, proper names, or titles, can serve an important characterizing role; it is telling that the narrator refers to Jesus as "Lord" (κύριος) more than in any other gospel. Lk. 7.13, 19; 10.1, 41; 11.39; 13.15; 17.5. On this, see Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*.

[280] Lk. 9.22; 22.34, 57, 61.

[281] Lk. 4.33-36; 7.21-22; 8.27-34; 9.42; 11.14; 13.32.

[282] Lk. 7.21-22; 8.42-56; 13.32; 18.35-43.

[283] Lk. 5.20-26; 7.47-49; [23.24].

[284] See, e.g., 2.49; 4.20-21; 9.22; 17.25; 24.27, 45. Recall Coleridge's comment, cited above. In a discussion of Christological characterization in Mark's Gospel, Elizabeth Struthers Malbon calls what Jesus says about himself and God "refracted Christology." "The Christology of Mark's Gospel: Narrative Christology and the Markan Jesus," in *Who Do You Say That I Am? Essays on Christology* (ed. Jack Dean Kingsbury, David Bauer, Mark Allen Powell; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 135-58, 137.

considering how other characters' spoken words introduce Jesus as the ultimate authority early on in the Lukan narrative.

Jesus In Others' Words

From the very outset of the gospel, voices of authority present positive portrayals of Jesus and thereby "add greater specificity and richness to the ideas introduced in the third person narration"[285] – reliable characters' speech and the narrator's claims are mutually reinforcing. According to Gowler, this is a deliberate rhetorical strategy by which Luke invites his readers to evaluate Lukan characters "upon scales of descending reliability":[286] a Lukan character's reliability is directly proportional to her or his estimation of Jesus. Building upon the sociological observation that members of a social group often label individuals who act outside cultural norms as *deviants* – those who are different in a *negative* way – or as *prominents* – those who are different in a *positive* way, Gowler observes that those characters who identify Jesus as a prominent are portrayed as more reliable, and those who label him a deviant are less reliable.[287] These perceptions are communicated to the reader specifically through characters' speech.

Luke front-loads the narrative with a barrage of reliable characters whose speech establishes Jesus' unique connection to God the Father and the Holy Spirit. In the infancy narrative of chapter 1, the angel Gabriel, a messenger from God (1.19, 26), announces Jesus' miraculous birth through the Holy Spirit (1.35). In the second chapter, angels

---

[285] Kuhn identifies "four dimensions of the world view expressed" in Gabriel's announcement: 1) God Reigns and Brings These Things to Pass; 2) A Time of Eschatological Fulfillment; 3) Restoration of Israel; 4) Faithful Response: Believing and Rejoicing in the Good News. Kuhn, *In Their Own Words*, 71-81.

[286] Gowler, "Characterization in Luke," 55.

[287] Gowler, "Hospitality and Characterization in Luke 11.37-54," 214.

announce to a group of shepherds, "Your Savior is born in the city of David. He is Christ the Lord" (2.11). Luke further emphasizes Jesus' relation to God by including the account of the "righteous" and "devout" Simeon, who identifies Jesus as the "Christ of the Lord" (τὸν χριστὸν κυρίου, 2.25-26); the reader is told three times in three verses that Simeon is led by the Holy Spirit (2.25, 26, 27).

As a reliable witness to Jesus' authoritative identity, the figure of John the Baptist is an intriguing case. At the start of chapter 3, the adult John the Baptist appears and attests vocally and publicly to the coming of one who is, as John says, "more powerful than I" (ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου), and whose sandals he is "not worthy to untie" (3.16). And yet, despite the nearly ubiquitous view (discussed above) that in Luke 1-2, John and Jesus are portrayed in parallel and that Jesus is superior to John, few scholars have paused to consider the oddity that the two never actually speak directly to one other.[288] In what may seem anticlimactic, the moment that the adult Jesus appears on the scene in 3.21, John the Baptist is effectively silenced in the text until 7.18-24, and even then, he speaks only through his disciples.[289]

In my view, John's sudden disappearance from the story in 3.21 functions to focus the reader completely on the true hero of the Lukan narrative: Jesus. In this way, the telling of the narrative confirms John's assertion that, "One more powerful than I is coming" (3.16).[290] The narrator does not even allow John to speak in Jesus' presence. Thus, I agree with Karl Kuhn, who argues that the primary function of the step-

[288] Conzelmann holds that Jesus is deliberately separated from John in the narrative in order to represent the distinction between the old era (represented by John) and the new era ushered in by Jesus. *Theology of St. Luke*, 18-27.

[289] Additionally, the relationship between John's and Jesus' respective baptisms is not explicitly discussed in the Lukan narrative until Acts 19.1-6.

[290] This is true even if John was referring not to the Messiah, but to God.

parallelism in chapters 1-2 is not apologetic, as Raymond Brown avers – meant to counter those who believed that John, not Jesus, was the Messiah[291] – but is rather "to present Jesus as one whose advent is seen to be Yahweh's awaited event, and whose person is to be seen in very close relationship to God."[292]

The rapid repetition of reliable attestations to Jesus' unique nature in the beginning of the narrative creates a kind of crescendo, situating the reader with those characters in the story who identify Jesus as the authoritative "Christ of the Lord." This cumulative effect finds its climax in 3.21-22, at the scene of Jesus' baptism. There, a "voice from heaven" (φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) speaks directly to Jesus, calling him, "my beloved Son" (ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός) with whom "I am well-pleased" (εὐδόκησα, 3.22).[293] The text does not say whether others hear the voice; neither does it much matter at this point in the narrative. Nor is Jesus' baptism itself the main focus, occurring as it does in a brief subordinate clause (3.21). Instead, the main focus is the divine voice, which confirms for the reader Jesus' identity as God's son.[294] And this voice is not alone; it is accompanied by the authenticating presence of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove

---

[291] Brown, *Birth*, 283-284. For variations of this theory, see the earlier work by Rene Laurentin, *Structure et theologie de Luc I-II* (EtB; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, Gabalda, 1957), 111-16 and Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1968), 60-72. Tellingly, Wink treats John in the Lukan infancy narrative (58-82) separately from John in the rest of Luke's Gospel (42-58).

[292] Kuhn insists that establishing John's inferiority vis-à-vis Jesus in apologetic fashion is not the main point of this section – rather, the main point is that both John and Jesus serve the larger plan of God: "Christology, not apologetics, is Luke's chief concern." Karl A. Kuhn, "The Point of the Step-Parallelism in Luke 1–2," *NTS* 47 (2001): 38-49, 40.

[293] There is a discrepancy between the text of Nestle-Aland and the Western text, which reads, "You are my son. Today I have begotten you" (Ps. 2.7). Metzger agrees with the Nestle-Aland, which lists *D it Ju (Cl): Meth Hil Aug*. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 136. See, also, three reasons Bovon prefers the Nestle Aland in *Luke 1*, 129. Augustin George, on the other hand, prefers the Western text: "Jésus Fils de Dieu dans l'Évangile selon Saint Luc," *RB* 72 (1965): 185-209.

[294] The only other instance in which Luke employs the divine voice occurs during the Transfiguration; a voice comes from a cloud, but this time, the voice speaks directly to the disciples, not to Jesus: "This is my Son, my Chosen One. Listen to him!" (9.35).

(3.22).[295] Jesus does not verbally claim to be God's son himself. Rather, other reliable characters, in cooperation with the narrator, establish his unique identity through their speech.

Why is Jesus, the protagonist of the story, not given a larger speaking role in the first few chapters of Luke?[296] Darr notes that the narrator must "appeal to structures of authority that are already recognized by his intended readers."[297] This is precisely what we find in the early materials of Luke's Gospel: the Lukan narrator introduces his protagonist using the voices of several reliable characters that intended readers would already have recognized as authoritative: divine messengers (1.19, 26, 35; 2.11); Simeon, who was "led by the Holy Spirit" (2.25-27); John the Baptist, a prophet foretold in the Hebrew Bible (1.17, 76; 3.4-6; Isaiah 40.3-5); and God, the ultimate authority (3.21-22).

Joel Green proffers another possible explanation for Jesus' relative silence; he explains what he calls the "delay of Jesus' public appearance" with reference to Jesus' need to be prepared for his divine vocation.[298] Although I agree with Green that Jesus must first be prepared, I would also add that the very fact that characters *other* than Jesus vocally attest to his identity as the Son of God subtly anticipates a theme that will prove important toward the end of the Gospel: as we will see in chapter 4 of the dissertation,

---

[295] With this descriptive detail, Luke shows Jesus fulfilling Isaiah 11.2, which says "The Lord's spirit will rest on him." In the LXX, Isaiah 11.2 says this spirit is "a spirit of wisdom and understanding," using the same word for the latter (σύνεσις) as is used of the young Jesus in the temple in 2.47.

[296] Though it is the exception rather than the rule, there are other ancient narratives in which the protagonist is initially silent or absent altogether; for instance, the protagonist is not introduced until halfway through the Book of Judith (8:1-8). On this, see Lawrence Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 133-134.

[297] Darr, "Narrator as Character," 55.

[298] Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 184.

Jesus' silences and final ascension leave open the possibility that his followers will speak out on his behalf.[299]

If, as we said at the outset of this chapter, narrative beginnings initiate the relationship between text and reader by setting forth expository materials and raising readerly expectations, then the functions of speech and silence described in the foregoing sections should be evident in the earliest sections of Luke's narrative. As we will see in the following analysis, the silencing of Zechariah serves as a powerful vehicle for establishing these narrative functions and instantiating the key Lukan theological themes of divine activity and human response.

Illustrative Pericope: Speech and Silence in the Silencing of Zechariah (1.5-23, 57-65)

Speech and silence are highlighted as early as the first narrative episode of the Gospel. The curtain opens on Zechariah and Elizabeth, an elderly couple who walk blamelessly before the Lord. Zechariah, a priest, has been chosen by lot to offer incense in the temple. At the time of the offering, an angel of the Lord named Gabriel suddenly appears to Zechariah, and though Zechariah is frightened even before a word is spoken, the angel comforts him and announces that his wife Elizabeth will bear a son (1.13). Zechariah expresses his uncertainty, asking, "How will I know (γνώσομαι) this?" (1.18). His hesitation is understandable from a human perspective, since Zechariah and Elizabeth are old (πρεσβύτης, προβεβηκυῖα) and Elizabeth is barren (στεῖρα, 1.7). Even so, Zechariah is promptly silenced by the angel due to his unbelief: "Because you did not

[299] This is explored further in chapter 4.

believe my words, which will be fulfilled in their time, you will be silent, unable to speak, until the day these things take place" (1.20).

The Silencing of Zechariah: Previous Proposals

As I noted previously, silence can signify many different things. The polyvalence of silence means that its presence in narratives tends to give rise to a multitude of possible interpretations, and this is certainly the case with Zechariah's silencing. Typical assessments of this pericope can be categorized into those that address Zechariah's silencing *on the level of the story* and those that ask about the work it does *on the level of the telling*. Instances of the former category generally take one or more of the following forms:

1) *The silencing of Zechariah is punitive*.[300] Several elements of the text commend this view. For instance, in the beginning of the story, Zechariah is initially described as being "righteous in the sight of God, following all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blamelessly" (1.6). This description, coupled with his role as a priest, suggests that Zechariah *ought* to have been one of the most likely to believe Gabriel's divine message. As such, silencing would be a particularly appropriate punishment: because he does not believe Gabriel's speech, his own ability to create speech is rescinded.[301] Presumably, if Zechariah had believed Gabriel, he would have

[300] See the classic Brown, *Birth of the Messiah*, 280 and R. Laurentin, *Les Évangiles de l'Enfance: vérité de Noël au-delà des Mythes* (Paris: Desclee, 1982), 182. Other scholars take Mary's question to be motivated by innocent curiosity, whereas Zechariah's question is motivated by unbelief. See Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 89.

[301] Close attention to the narrative reveals that he actually is cut off entirely from the world of spoken language, since 1.62-63 indicate that he cannot hear either. See JG Anderson, "A New Translation of Luke 1:20," *BT* 20 (1969): 21-24. Although Gabriel's prophecy only explicitly mentions muteness in 1.20, the word κωφός in 1.22 (usually translated with a phrase like "unable to speak") is ambiguous and could also

retained his ability to speak and thus, would have had the honor of speaking publicly about this miraculous occurrence and thereby also publicly aligning himself with the great Jewish father Abraham.[302] Instead, his punishment means that his position as a respected religious authority is threatened and nearly undermined.

2) *Zechariah's silencing is a sign meant to increase his faith*.[303] Zechariah asks for a sign, and indeed, he is given one: his silence is itself a sign.[304] In Luke's Gospel, prophecy – God's trustworthy communication with humanity[305] – is often verified by "signs" (τὸ σημεῖον, 2.12, 34).[306] Zechariah's immediate silencing corroborates that Gabriel's long-term prophecy (the birth of John) is, in fact, reliable, since his short-term prophecy (that Zechariah will be mute) immediately comes true. In this Gospel, silence

---

indicate deafness. On this Greek word, see Lennard J. Davis, who writes that in ancient Greece, "deafness went hand-in-hand with muteness." *The Disability Studies Reader* (ed. Lennard Davis; New York: Routledge, 2006), 18. Kindalee Pfremmer De Long makes much of this detail, drawing a connection between God's healing of Zechariah's deafness and the prophecy in Isaiah 35.5-6, "the ears of the deaf will hear." *Surprised by God: Praise Responses in the Narrative of Luke-Acts* (BZNW 166; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 176.

[302] See Gen. 18.9-15.

[303] A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), 17; H. Schurmann, *Das Lukasevangelium Erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1.1-9.50* (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 37; C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (London: SCM Press and Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 152.

[304] So Joel Green writes: "Zechariah's silence must be seen above all as a 'sign' – that is, as the proof he requested…[although] it is also punishment for his unbelief." *The Gospel of Luke*, 79.

[305] In Luke, see 1.67; 2.23; 3.2, 4; 4.4, 8, 10-12, 21, 25-27; 5.1; 8.11, 21; 9.35; 11.28, 51; 13.31-35; 16.17; 22.37, 61. The secondary literature on this and related themes is vast. See, for example, Christopher Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and Its Hellenistic Environment* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995); Laura Nasrallah, *An Ecstasy of Folly: Prophecy and Authority in Early Christianity* (Harvard Theological Studies; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Divinity School, 2003).

[306] The concept of the sign appears repeatedly as a significant concept in the Lukan narrative. The term also occurs in 11.16, 29, 30; 21.7, 11, 25; 23.8.

and speech often signify that a miracle has occurred.[307] Still, signs, though they can be nonverbal, require verbal interpretation. A sign can be construed as negative or positive: if Zechariah's silence is meant to increase his faith, it could be viewed as a positive sign. On the other hand, Zechariah's imposed silence could be seen as a negative sign that he has not believed the divine messenger.

3) *Zechariah's silence builds suspense for the crowd* who at first wait outside, wondering why he is delayed (1.21), and then must draw their own conclusions about why he emerges unable to speak (1.22).[308]

Other scholars emphasize the role of Zechariah's silencing *in the telling* of the Gospel narrative; in other words, they ask how the silencing might impact the reader's experience of the story. Scholarly suggestions include the following:

4) *Luke portrays Zechariah as a proleptic representative of the Jewish tradition/Israel.* This argument generally takes one of two forms, depending on the scholar's view of the fate of the Jewish people in Luke. One iteration is that, as Steven Harmon argues,[309] Zechariah's move from unbelief to obedience and praise (1.59-63, 67-79) seeks to "move the implied reader, the Godfearer, beyond the unbelieving community [of Israel] and toward the believing community [of Christianity]."[310] Even in the third

---

[307] Zechariah's renewed ability to speak signifies that something miraculous has taken place (1.65). See also the speaking of the previously mute man in 11.14 and the silencing of demons in 4.33-37; 8.26-39; 9.37-43.

[308] The crowd perceptively discerns that he has seen a vision. Marshall, *Gospel*, 61 and Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 328.

[309] Harmon builds upon Joseph Tyson's article of 1995, which argues that Luke is "an evangelistic text addressed to Godfearers." Joseph B. Tyson, "Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts: Reading as a Godfearer," *NTS* 41 (1995): 19-38; Steven R. Harmon, "Zechariah's Unbelief and Early Jewish-Christian Relations: The Form and Structure of Luke 1:5–25 as a Clue to the Narrative Agenda of the Gospel of Luke," *BTB* 31 (2001): 10–16.

century C.E., Origen preached that Zechariah's silence was "the silence of prophets in the people of Israel. God no longer speaks to them…What Isaiah wrote was fulfilled: 'The daughter of Zion will be deserted.'"[311]

Kindalee Pfremmer De Long also draws a comparison between Zechariah and the Jewish people, though she comes to a different conclusion vis-à-vis their ultimate fate. She insists that Zechariah's restoration to hearing and speech anticipates the promised restoration of Israel.[312] Zechariah's own inspired prophecy at the end of chapter 1 (usually called the "Benedictus") appears to support this view: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, because he has come to help and has accomplished redemption (ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν) for his people…Because of our God's tender mercy the dawn will break upon us from on high…" (1.67, 78).

And yet, such restoration is never actually portrayed in the Gospel narrative. Rather, there is a disjunction between the original, joyful language employed at the beginning of the narrative, and the fact that, as Miller points out, "Israel's eschatological redemption and salvation from its enemies…do not come to fruition in the course of Luke's story."[313] Tannehill, too, considers Zechariah's proclamation to be a device that – due to the primacy effect – "sets us up for later disappointment."[314] This proposal, though suggestive, fails to satisfy.

5) *Gabriel's silencing of Zechariah shifts the reader's view away from Zechariah*

---

[310] Harmon, "Zechariah's Unbelief," 14. Harmon does not address the possible anti-Semitic implications of this interpretation, though he does appear to consider his view to be an alternative to anti-Semitism.
[311] Origen, *Homily on the Gospel of Luke*, 5.1, 4.

[312] De Long, *Surprised by God*, 177-178.

[313] Miller, *Convinced That God Had Called Us*, 123.

[314] Tannehill, "Beginning to Study 'How Gospels Begin,'" *Semeia* 52 (1991): 188.

as a commendable protagonist[315] and toward the absolute authority and inevitability of God's words and work.[316] Mark Coleridge, for instance, writes:

> The silence is…a sign ensuring that the initiative does not pass to Zechariah, but remains firmly with heaven. Were Zechariah to sally forth from the sanctuary armed with both the assured knowledge he has sought and a voice, the danger would be that he would rival heaven in the implementation and proclamation of the divine plan…his wordlessness testifies to the power of the heavenly word.[317]

From this early moment in the narrative, the reader is primed to expect God to intervene actively in human affairs, and to judge negatively those characters who do not immediately respond to pronouncements of that divine initiative by believing that they will be fulfilled.[318] Not only does God intervene, but divine intervention "has its own dynamic of necessity," and cannot be thwarted by human failure; Coleridge writes that although God "seeks human acceptance of his plan, [God] does not depend upon it."[319]

This view is bolstered by the apparently unnecessary repetition in 1.20, where the angel pronounces that Zechariah will be "silent" (σιωπῶν) *and* "unable to speak" (μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι). This repetition is mirrored by a similar construction near the end of the episode; when the people outside finally see Zechariah emerge from the temple, the narrator repeats in quick succession that he is "not able to speak to them" (οὐκ

---

[315] Zechariah and Elizabeth disappear from the narrative completely by the second chapter.

[316] For a useful outline of previous scholarship on this issue, as well as an analysis of Luke 1.5-2.52, see John T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, 3-14, 27-32. As Squires insists throughout his book, the Lukan emphasis on foreordination and the divine providence is not quite the theology of grace that many scholars identify in Luke and other early Christian works like the Pauline epistles. Luke still insists on the importance of the human response to God's divine initiative.

[317] Mark Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative*, 444.

[318] See C.H. Talbert, "Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5–4:15," in *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou Silberman* (ed. James L. Crenshaw and Samuel Sandmel; New York: Ktav, 1980).

[319] Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative*, 49. Miller agrees in *Convinced that God Had Called Us*, 146.

ἐδύνατο λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς) *and* that he remains "mute" (κωφός) (1.22). The fact that Luke gives us this information not once, but four times, accentuates the involuntary nature of Zechariah's silence; he is unable to speak because God (and thus, the divine will) – not Zechariah (and thus, not human initiative) – determines the course of events.

The Silencing of Zechariah: Nuancing the Typical Interpretations

Here, I want to illustrate how attention to speech *and* silence in the crucial opening scene of the Gospel can highlight several additional elements of Luke's story that have gone unnoticed by previous scholars. These aspects of Zechariah's silencing can help us nuance prior scholarly proposals. Broadly, speech and silence together create a complex picture of the dynamic interplay between divine causation and human response that reverberates into the rest of the Lukan narrative.

A close reading of the story of Zechariah's silencing reveals the theological theme that God's words (and God's messengers) are reliable, pointing toward the necessity of God's will. At the same time, humans are called to respond to God's messages in certain ways. Zechariah, Elizabeth, and Mary each demonstrate a possible response to God; employing speech and silence in multiple ways, the narrator suggests an interpretive framework by which readers can judge each of these three characters.

To begin with, Gabriel's speech in this scene connects the first person prologue to the third person narration and moves a major emphasis of the prologue forward into the narrative itself: the reliability of God's messages. Gabriel tells Zechariah that he is silenced precisely because he did not believe that the angel's *words* (τοῖς λόγοις) would be fulfilled (1.20). The phrase τοῖς λόγοις hearkens back to v. 4 of the prologue, where

the narrator asserts that he is writing "so that" Theophilus will "know," or "discern" (ἐπιγινώσκω) the certainty "of the words" (λόγων) about which he was informed (1.4). As François Bovon notes, these "words" might refer to "various rumors, or also the proclaimed word of God as a whole (cf. Luke 1:2), or even Jesus' concrete sayings."[320] No matter what their specific referent, the pertinent point here is that "the words" recounted in the Gospel of Luke are reliable (ἀσφάλειαν), worthy of belief. What follows the prologue is an account of "the things that have been fulfilled among us" (τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, 1.1), and the angel Gabriel's words to Zechariah are the first concrete narrative example of this early narratorial claim.

A related detail is present here in the Greek, the real import of which can only be discerned in retrospect. When Gabriel tells Zechariah the punishment for his unbelief, he prefaces the prophecy with the interjection καὶ ἰδού ("and behold"), which often is translated as "listen," or not translated at all (1.20).[321] In the Gospel of Luke, nearly every time a prophetic pronouncement is made, it is prefaced by καὶ ἰδού.[322] This authoritative injunction effectively silences the recipient by directing her or him – along with the reader – to pay attention to what is about to occur.

Not only are the words of a divine message reliable, but the messenger can also be trusted. Notably, God does not speak to Zechariah through a burning bush or with a

---

[320] Bovon, *Luke 1*, 24.

[321] Most commentators consider ἰδού to be simply a "sign of popular story-telling" (Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 208), or "part of Luke's diction" (Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 158), without considering its function(s) in specific literary contexts.

[322] 1.20, 31, 36, 48; 2.10, 34; 7.27; 10.19; 18.31; 22.10; 23.29. The preface to the prophecy in 8.18 uses different language to the same effect: Βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε.

disembodied voice.[323] Instead, God sends a spokesman, the angel Gabriel, who declares that God sent him for the express purpose of speaking good news: "I am Gabriel, who stands in the presence of God, and I was sent to speak (λαλῆσαι) to you and to bring you this good news" (1.19). This is the first of several messenger scenes in which Luke records certain characters' voices despite their literal absence from a scene through the medium of a messenger.[324] In such scenes, the speaker uses the sender's very words to render him present to the recipient of the message. We have here no false messages or anxiety over a messenger's reliability as we find elsewhere in ancient literature.[325] Rather, for Luke, the emissary effectively speaks *as* the original messenger, and thus, he ought to be considered truthful. This also means that Zechariah's incredulity toward the angel is tantamount to an act of distrust toward God. Furthermore, by extension, the narrator subtly implies that in telling the story that follows (the τοῖς λόγοις of the prologue), he too is God's messenger, sent to impart reliable, authentic words (τοῖς λόγοις) by which the reader ought to be convinced.[326]

Zechariah's silence speaks volumes to the attentive reader. What it demonstrates is that Gabriel's words will indeed *be fulfilled in their time.* The fact that Gabriel's pronouncement that Zechariah will be mute is *immediately* fulfilled provides evidence

---

[323] Cf. Exod. 2.2-6; 3.2-4; 1 Kings 19.12. In the Quran, the Lord speaks to Zechariah directly, without sending an emissary at all (Q 19:7).

[324] Discussing the Gospel of Mark, Augustine Stock points out that Hellenistic authors commonly used messenger scenes in the beginning and ending of a narrative. "The Structure of Mark," *Bible Today* 23 (1985): 293-294.

[325] See, for example, Zeus' warning to Iris to not be a false messenger in *Iliad* 15.158-159. On the difference between a "literary messenger" who is "swift, reliable, and always tells all," and a "tragic" or "unreliable messenger" in Greek tragedy, see James Barrett, *Staged narrative: Poetics and the messenger in Greek tragedy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

[326] As Darr puts it, "The narrator's view and that of the divine are thus to be seen as a pair of mutually reinforcing, highly reliable, and highly privileged perspectives serving as fully authoritative guides for the reader." "Narrator as Character," 56.

that God's promise of a miraculous child can be trusted, and that the one who speaks that promise is reliable. Sternberg's description of the Hebrew Bible's dynamic interplay between the natural and supernatural spheres applies here:

> [T]he premise [that God is omniscient and omnipotent] lays the ground for the demonstration and the demonstration vindicates and inculcates the premise – which sounds poor logic but makes excellent rhetoric in the telling.[327]

The annunciation and infancy narratives in Luke's first chapter clearly portray God intervening miraculously in human affairs; they narratively depict the inexorability of God's plan.

Some scholars have gone so far as to argue that Luke's is a theology of divine determinism.[328] However, in comparison to many other ancient narratives,[329] Luke's Gospel showcases a more nuanced view of divine action in the human realm. In Luke, human belief and action are necessary to enact the divine plan. As Bovon puts it, "There is a salvation history because men and women under the action of the word of God provoke a history and live in it."[330] Put another way, according to Luke's Gospel, humans are called to respond in specific ways in order to participate in God's work in the world.

Squires is right when he writes that, "An explicit philosophical discussion relating divine necessity to human free-will is avoided by Luke."[331] Still, the Lukan narrator does

---

[327] Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 135.

[328] See, e.g., Siegfried Schulz, "Gottes Vorsehung bei Lukas," *ZNW* 54 (1963): 104-16. For an argument against Schulz, see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 21.

[329] The ancient Greek novels often appeal to the plan of a god/gods to explain events. See, e.g., Aphrodite's role in Chariton, *Callirhoe* 8.1. Bryan Reardon, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 110. On this topic, see especially Shiner's discussion of the common use of divine causation in ancient narratives like the *Life of Aesop*. "Creating Plot," 167-169.

[330] Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 85.

[331] Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, 185. For an in-depth treatment of the philosophic views of Fate and free will in the first few centuries C.E., see Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, 155-185.

stake a claim, indicating by the shape of the narrative that human response to God's plan is not eclipsed, but rather, is crucially important.[332] I suggest that attention to speech and silence helps to illuminate the Lukan narrative's subtle balancing of divine necessity and human responsibility. Throughout Luke's Gospel, various human responses to the divine plan are depicted through struggles over speech regulation. The story of Zechariah's silencing illustrates in microcosm a tension we find throughout the macronarrative: On the one hand, God's plan is authoritative. One way this is depicted in the story of Zechariah's silencing is that Gabriel, God's emissary, miraculously controls Zechariah's ability to speak. On the other hand, human belief and participation in the divine plan is the ideal, but not the inevitable, response to God's messages. Zechariah's reaction shows that God does not manipulate humans' responses. Zechariah's request for a corroborating sign ("How will I know this?") bespeaks his lack of trust in the divine revelation he has received and signals a posture of incredulity toward God.[333] That the angel immediately takes away Zechariah's ability to speak demonstrates that from the narrator's point of view, unbelief is an inappropriate response to the reception of words from God.

This is not the end of Zechariah's story; he is eventually restored to speech. Still, Luke delays the resolution of Zechariah's predicament until almost the end of the chapter (1.67-79) by sandwiching Mary's annunciation pericope (1.26-55) between the two sections of Zechariah's story (1.5-25, 56-64). Even more important than the building of suspense for the crowds waiting outside the temple (proposal #3 above) is the fact that

---

[332] J.W. Taeger points especially toward the Lukan emphasis on humans' responsibility for repenting and choosing to have faith. *Der Mensch und sein Heil: Studien zum Bild des Menschen und zur Sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1982).

[333] Though note that, as Marshall points out, in the Hebrew Bible, others ask for signs without any rebuke or punishment (Jdg. 6.36ff; 1 Sa. 10.2; 2 Ki. 20.8). *The Gospel of Luke*, 60.

Zechariah's muteness builds suspense for readers, who must wait to see whether he will be restored to speech.[334] By inserting one episode into the middle of another, Luke lengthens the time of the telling, places Zechariah's fate on hold, and thereby increases narrative tension for the reader.

Just as Gabriel has foretold, it is nine months later that Zechariah's mouth (τὸ στόμα) and tongue (ἡ γλῶσσα) are released (ἀνοίγω),[335] and this only when he publicly corroborates Elizabeth's naming of the child (1.63-64). Zechariah writes on a tablet that the boy should be named John, suggesting that he has now capitulated to God's will and chooses to participate in God's plan. It is fitting that Zechariah's request for a corroborating sign leads to his being miraculously silenced, while his writing of the boy's name is a sign that corroborates Elizabeth's announcement and thus leads to the miraculous restoration of his voice. The wonder of this moment is emphasized by the fact that the people are "amazed" (ἐθαύμασαν, 1.63) and that "fear came over" them all (ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος, 1.65). Notably, they are amazed *not* because Elizabeth has inexplicably conceived a child, but because Zechariah has confirmed Elizabeth's surprising choice of name (1.63) and because he immediately then begins to speak (1.65).

In contrast to his earlier skeptical response to Gabriel's message, Zechariah now responds to the miraculous release of his mouth and tongue by immediately "speaking, praising God" (ἐλάλει εὐλογῶν τὸν θεόν, 1.64). Zechariah's return to speech thus shifts him into the role he should rightly have taken before: that of religious authority,

---

[334] Shiner draws attention to intercalation as a common technique for weaving episodic units into a larger narrative unit. Shiner, "Creating Plot," 169.

[335] The mention of both mouth and tongue here is an instance of a figure of speech called *zeugma* (Gr.: "yoke"), in which two parts of a sentence are yoked together using a common verb (here, ἀνοίγω). The construction emphasizes that just as Zechariah's punishment had forced him instantly into a world of silence, the judgment is lifted entirely and he returns instantly to the world of speech.

using his voice to prophesy and to praise God. At this point in the narrative, Zechariah has learned his lesson about the reliability of God's words. As Mary does in response to Elizabeth's words of affirmation (1.46-55), Zechariah offers a hymn of praise in which he too emphasizes that God "remembers" (μιμνῄσκομαι, 1.72) what "he spoke" (ἐλάλησεν, 1.70).

Unlike Mary, however, Zechariah adds that the words of God's covenant with their ancestors were spoken "through the mouth of his holy prophets" (διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων…προφητῶν αὐτοῦ, 1.70). Zechariah's voice is taken away because he doubts the words *of God's messenger*, but the affirmation in 1.70-72 suggests that he has a newfound understanding that God's words are reliable, and the messengers who speak those words are trustworthy. They speak on God's behalf. This small detail is particularly apropos here because Zechariah goes on to prophesy that his son, John the Baptist, will in fact be one of those divinely appointed spokesmen. This child will be called a "prophet of the Most High" (προφήτης ὑψίστου, 1.76). Zechariah's rehabilitation is confirmed when he voices anew the prophecy declared to him by God's reliable messenger, Gabriel.[336]

Proposals #1 (that Zechariah's silencing is punitive) and #2 (that the silencing is a sign to increase his faith) frame the situation too starkly in either/or terms. It is better to consider Zechariah's silencing as both punitive and positive. To put it another way, Zechariah's miraculous silencing is both proof of God's omnipotence and reproof for not

[336] Specifically, Gabriel had told him that John would "be great before [the] Lord" (ἔσται γὰρ μέγας ἐνώπιον [τοῦ] κυρίου, 1.15) and "go before [the Lord] in the power and spirit of Elijah" (αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἠλίου, 1.17).

believing in God's omnipotence. Bovon puts it succinctly: "The muteness has more than one significance; it is both a punishment and a sign that reverses Zechariah's unbelief."[337]

The fact that the narrator emphasizes Zechariah's imposed silence as his educative punishment, and restored speech as a sign of his restoration establishes two key principles at the very beginning of Luke's Gospel that will be operative in the ensuing portrayal of events: first, a character's voice is a significant interpretive key for the Lukan narrative. This is not to say that it is the only interpretive key, but rather that a character's uses of speech (or inability to speak) is one of the means by which the narrator prompts readerly judgment of that character. Second, the narrator depicts the power of God and God's messengers through their control of others' speech; it is the divine prerogative to either impose silence or bestow the gift of speech.[338] This point will take on even more significance later in the story, as Jesus too wields authoritative power over who can and cannot speak.

Characters' responses to the divine agenda, in turn, are portrayed on a scale of commendability for the benefit of the reader. Squires rightly recognizes that the language of inevitability and divine foreordination "functions apologetically" in Luke-Acts, inviting readers to "co-operate with the plan of God";[339] he cites Luke 1.5-2.52 as an especially explicit demonstration of "God's providential control."[340] Oddly, however, Squires highlights Zechariah's final praise without acknowledging Zechariah's initial response and subsequent silencing at all. For example, he cites Zechariah's Spirit-

---

[337] Bovon, *Luke 1*, 38.

[338] This was already a crucial part of Jewish tradition. Exodus 4.11 reads, "Who gives man speech? Is it not I, the Lord?"

[339] Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, 184.

[340] Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, 28.

inspired "prophetic outburst" (1.67) as evidence of the theme of divine guidance, and considers Zechariah and Mary to be completely comparable to one another: "Mary blossoms into song…and Zechariah likewise blesses God for his saving deeds."[341] However, Zechariah's silencing plays a crucial role in the story, and should not be eclipsed by his eventually positive prophetic speech. Indeed, his silencing could be read as a strong cautionary tale for Luke's readers: those who do not perceive God's words correctly, and trust them completely, cannot be God's spokespersons.

Most interpreters contrast Zechariah's unbelieving response to Mary's faithful response.[342] There are obvious similarities between the two characters, of course: Zechariah and Mary are both shocked by the appearance of this heavenly visitor, and both receive the unexpected and bewildering news that they will miraculously receive a son. In 1.29, Mary is described as being "perplexed/troubled" (διαταράσσω), a compound of the same verb used in 1.12 to describe Zechariah (ταράσσω). In both cases, the angel's *words* figure prominently; in both cases, Gabriel comforts the frightened human *with his words*, saying "Do not be afraid" (μὴ φοβοῦ, 1.13, 30).[343] Just as Gabriel explicitly rebukes Zechariah for not believing his "words" (τοῖς λόγοις, 1.20), the narrator specifically says that Mary's confusion also is caused "by his word" (ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ, 1.29).[344]

---

[341] Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, 28.

[342] Bovon, *Luke 1*, 51; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 17; James Dunn, ed., *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1109; Ben Witherington, *The New Testament Story* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 191; Martin Manser, et. al. "Luke," *Critical Companion to the Bible: A Literary Reference* (New York: Facts on File, Inc., 2009), 247.

[343] Other examples of this construction in Luke include 2.10, 5.10, and 8.50.

And yet, as Legrand insists, "Le parallélisme de composition n'est que superficiel. Les structures narratives sont différentes."[345] The reader receives a clue that Mary might be different from Zechariah when Gabriel calls her the "favored one" (κεχαριτωμένη, 1.28) and again reassures her that she has "found favor (χάρις) with God" (1.30). The previously similar pericopes truly diverge at the moment of Mary's actual response to the angel's proclamation. Rather than doubting the reliability of what he says, Mary specifically expresses belief in Gabriel's words: "let it be to me according to your word" (γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου, 1.38).[346] Here, their conversation ends abruptly; with the phrase, "according to your word," the narrator quite literally gives Mary the last word in the dialogue. This small narrative detail is itself an implicit commentary, establishing that according to the narrator, Mary's response is positive: she believes God's words even before she has a concrete sign of their reliability. For the reader, her statement simultaneously reinforces what has gone before and what will follow in the narrative. Mary's final phrase, "according to your word," reverberates into the next scene, carrying with it the implication that just as Gabriel's words to Zechariah came true, so too will the words spoken to Mary.[347]

---

[344] There is a textual variant that re-directs Mary's concern from the angel's words to his appearance. Most MSS (A C Θ 0130 *f*13 𝔐 lat sy) add ἰδοῦσα. However, the shorter reading is supported, as well (א B D L W Ψ *f*1 565 579 1241 sa), and generally considered authentic.

[345] Lucien Legrand, *L'annonce a Marie [Lc 1,26-38]: Une apocalypse aux origins de l'Evangile* (Paris: Cerf, 1981), 75.

[346] Bovon notes that for Luke, ῥῆμα carries the same meaning as the Hebrew דָּבָר, which is "the word carried along by God's will, which can and shall realize his plan of salvation in the life of his people." Bovon, *Luke 1*, 53 n. 95.

[347] This is yet another instance of the primacy effect. As we have seen, the primacy effect encourages readers to interpret events in light of what has gone before. On the primacy effect, see Menakhem Perry, "Literary Dynamics: How the Order of a Text Creates its Meanings [With an Analysis of Faulkner's 'A Rose for Emily'],'' *Poetics Today* 1 (1979): 57.

It is worth pointing out that Zechariah's and Mary's respective responses would have surprised many of Luke's earliest readers, who would have expected a priest – and an older one at that – to respond appropriately to a divine messenger. This is especially the case if one assumes that Zechariah was familiar with the Hebrew Bible traditions in which barren women are blessed with miraculous pregnancies.[348] David Landry builds on this when he argues that the reason Zechariah is punished and Mary is not (despite their similar questions) is that Zechariah's case has precedents he should have known, but Mary's (virginal conception) does not.[349] This is yet another way that Zechariah effectively rejects a divine message – that which is revealed in Scripture. Conversely, many early readers would not have expected a young maiden 1) to respond at once, positively, to such a dangerous, disquieting message, or 2) to be able to quote Scripture in her response.

Though many scholars have considered Zechariah's and Mary's responses as literary foils, few consider that Elizabeth represents a third type of human response to a divine message. She responds with faithful interpretation *after* the miracle has occurred:

> After these days, his wife Elizabeth became pregnant, and for five months she kept herself in seclusion, saying, "This is what the Lord has done for me in the days when he has looked favorably upon me to take away my disgrace among people." (1.25-26)

Elizabeth, a woman of no special religious training, perceives God's divine intervention correctly. Accordingly, she is given the authority to speak, while her husband Zechariah, the religious authority figure whose job it is to perceive and communicate spiritual truth,

---

[348] Many scholars understand Zechariah's question as a direct allusion to Gen. 15.8 (LXX), in which Abram asks, "How will I know that I will inherit it?" See, among many others, John Miller, *Convinced That God Had Called Us: Dreams, Visions and the Perception of God's Will in Luke-Acts* (Biblical Interpretation Series 85; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 63, 115.

[349] David Landry, "Narrative Logic in the Annunciation to Mary (Lk 1.26–38)," *JBL* 114 (1995): 65–79.

is rendered voiceless by his inability to rightly receive God's word. One way to read this, therefore, is as a narrative instantiation of the well-known Lukan theme of reversal: the most likely spokesperson for God's good news is silenced, while an unlikely candidate is given a public voice to announce the will of God.

At this point, it is intriguing to note that there is no recounting of Zechariah telling Elizabeth about his encounter with Gabriel, and we have no account of Elizabeth's reaction to Zechariah's muteness. Neither do we ever hear Elizabeth's prayers or laments over her childlessness, in contrast to the Hebrew Bible type-scenes to which this story clearly alludes.[350] Additionally, as we have seen, Elizabeth's first spoken words in the narrative indicate that, unlike her husband, she interprets the miraculous event correctly: "This, the Lord has done for me" (ὅτι οὕτως μοι πεποίηκεν κύριος, 1.25). And yet, the narrator does not commend her for responding appropriately to God's unexpected blessing.[351] Instead, he simply states that Elizabeth becomes pregnant and secludes herself (περιέκρυβεν)[352] for five months (1.24). This seclusion itself is odd. Some Jewish sources mention the seclusion of young, unmarried women, but there do not

[350] Commentators regularly refer to similarities between Luke 1 and the barren mothers Sarah (Gen. 18), Rebekah (Gen. 25), and Rachel (Gen. 30). Robert Alter popularized the moniker of the "type-scene" for this repeated story type in the Hebrew Bible. "How Convention Helps Us Read: The Case of the Bible's Annunciation Type-Scene," *Prooftexts* 3 (1983): 115-30. Cf. Esther Fuch's critique of Alter's interpretations in Fuchs, Esther. "The Literary Characterization of Mothers and Sexual Politics in the Hebrew Bible," in *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship* (ed. Adela Yarbro Collins; Chico: Scholars, 1985), 117-136; on this theme, see also Williams, J.G. "The Beautiful and the Barren: Conventions in Biblical Type-Scenes," *JSOT* 17 (1980): 107-119; Tammi Schneider, *Mothers of Promise: Women in the Book of Genesis* (Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2008).

[351] Several ancient commentators attributed Elizabeth's seclusion to her modesty. See, e.g., Ambrose, *Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 1.43, 46. Quintilian's comment relates: "Are there not in speech some details to be concealed…[that] cannot be expressed for the sake of dignity?" *Institutio oratoria* 2.13.12-13.

[352] περιέκρυβεν (from περικρύπτω) is a neologism, found nowhere else in the New Testament or in the LXX.

appear to be comparable restrictions on women during pregnancy.[353] If this does not refer to a common social practice, then why does the narrator send Elizabeth away? What is the effect of her absence?

The reader must wait for an answer to this question. The plot marches relentlessly on, shifting abruptly from the now-pregnant Elizabeth to her relative, the "virgin" (παρθένος) Mary. Here, we find another strange narratorial omission: unlike with Elizabeth (1.24, 36), after Gabriel visits Mary, the reader is not explicitly told that Mary has become pregnant.[354] Instead, the reader learns that this is the case through Elizabeth's proclamation: "Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the child in your womb!" (1.42) The narrator skips over the actual moment of Jesus' conception completely. What might this narratorial silence signify? What difference does it make that the narrator does not explicitly state that Mary has become pregnant (as he does *twice* about Elizabeth)? Kavin Rowe offers one way to interpret this literary gap:

> As the shade of the Holy Spirit is thrown over the mother-to-be, Luke covers the scene of the conception with silence. Thus we may say that the character of the gap at this point in the narrative is ultimately not that of vacancy but of silence

---

[353] Philo refers to young girls who "must not venture further than the door of the gynaeceum." *On the Special Laws* 3.169. In *Against Flaccus* 89, he laments women and girls being dragged out of seclusion in the Alexandrian riots. On Philo, see Dorothy Sly, *Philo's Perception of Women* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990). See, also, 2 Macc. 3.19, 3 Macc. 1.18, *Asenath* 2.1. Note, however, that seclusion of women was by no means ubiquitous practice; we also have evidence of women operating in the public sphere. On this, see Bernadette Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscription Evidence and Background Issues* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982); Judith Romney Wegner, *Chattel or Person: The Status of Woman in the Mishnah* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); Amy-Jill Levine, ed., *"Women Like This": New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World* (SBL Early Judaism and its Literature 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); Tal Ilan, *Integrating Women into Second Temple History* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

[354] This fact has given rise to various scholarly proposals about the exact timing of Jesus' conception. Michael Wolter, for instance, suggests that Mary became pregnant in the time period between 1.80 and 2.1, rather than prior to her visit to Elizabeth. "'Wann wurde Maria schwanger?' Eine vernachlässigte Frage und ihre Bedeutung für das Verständnis der lukanischen Vorgeschichte (Lk 1-2)," in *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien* (BZNW 93; ed. R. Hoppe and U. Busse; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), 405-22. Although Wolter's thesis is plausible, I find it to be ultimately unconvincing because Elizabeth's statement in 1.42-43 implies that Mary is already pregnant.

constituted by unspeakable Presence.[355]

Although I agree with Rowe's assessment that the narrator's delay in recounting the fact that Mary has conceived ought not be seen as a vacancy, I would not necessarily use the adjective "unspeakable" to refer to the Holy Spirit's presence. Elsewhere in Luke, speech is directly associated with both God's presence and the Holy Spirit's presence. Despite his unfortunate word choice, Rowe's description of the scene highlights how one effect of the narratorial silence may be to keep this moment of divine creation a secret – an ineffable mystery.[356] Even the narrator does not attempt to articulate it.[357]

The mysterious nature of Mary's pregnancy is underscored by the fact that Elizabeth is the one who verbally verifies Gabriel's prophecy to Mary. Let us revisit the question of why, after becoming pregnant, Elizabeth secludes herself for five months (1.24). We are now in a better place to see that, as Jean-Noël Aletti insists, Elizabeth's seclusion has "des conséquences importantes au niveau de la véridiction."[358] One such consequence is that when Elizabeth and Mary meet, the reader can assume that Elizabeth's knowledge of Mary's pregnancy is the result of divine revelation; presumably, Elizabeth's seclusion isolates her from the news shared between friends and family. In this way, the five-month seclusion enables Elizabeth – "filled with the Holy

---

[355] Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 39.

[356] Silence and secrecy are not synonymous, but they are integrally related. For a related discussion concerning *The Apocryphon of John*, see Karen King, "Mystery and Secrecy in *The Apocryphon of John*," in *Mystery and Secrecy in the Nag Hammadi Collection and Other Ancient Literature: Ideas and Practices* (ed. John Turner, Ismo Dunderberg, Christian H. Bull and Liv Ingeborg Lied; Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2011), 81.

[357] Note that Luke uses the verb ἐπισκιάσει to describe the Spirit's "overshadowing" of Mary (1.35); this verb evokes God's mysterious overshadowing presence. See Exod. 40.34-35 and Ps 91.4.

[358] Aletti, *L'art de raconter Jésus Christ*, 34-35.

Spirit" (ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου, 1.41) – to attest to the fulfillment of Gabriel's prophecy to Mary:

> And who am I that the mother of my Lord should come and visit me? For behold, when the sound of your greeting reached my ears, the baby in my womb leaped for joy.[359] And blessed is she who believed that what was spoken to her by the Lord would be fulfilled. (1.41-45)

Thus, to understand Elizabeth's separation from society during her pregnancy, we need only turn to the theme the narrator has already begun to develop: the reliability of God's words. Aletti's conclusion makes sense: "Ces cinq mois sont donc essentiels au propos du narrateur: grâce à ce long silence, les voies par lesquelles la bonne nouvelle se transmet n'en apparaîtront que plus merveilleuses et variées."[360]

This is not the only instance in which Elizabeth's speech demonstrates her revelatory knowledge. Here, we return to the previously mentioned point that Zechariah never recounts his conversation with Gabriel to Elizabeth. One consequence of this narratorial silence is that it is surprising when Elizabeth names the baby John in 1.60 – against social custom and *before* Zechariah writes the name "John" on a tablet (1.63). Exactly how Elizabeth knows to name the baby John is an intriguing gap in the narration, since she could not have been privy to Gabriel's instructions in the temple (1.13). We might assume that she has received her own heavenly revelation, though the narrator does not say this explicitly. What matters most is that Elizabeth's seclusion fulfills a crucial narrative function; the narrator portrays Elizabeth as a positive figure who interprets God's interventions correctly and enacts prophetic fulfillment through her speech.

---

[359] This fulfills the prophecy of 1.14: "Many will rejoice because of his birth."

[360] Aletti, *L'art de raconter Jésus Christ*, 34-35; Mark Coleridge agrees in *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative*, 48.

As we have seen, various different silences are at work in this narrative: the silence imposed on Zechariah within the story world functions differently from the narrator's use of silence to shroud Jesus' conception in mystery, which itself functions differently from the delay in recounting Zechariah's restoration to speech. In contrast to Zechariah, Elizabeth's seclusion and subsequent prophetic speech reveal the miraculous fulfillment of the divine messages to both Mary and Zechariah.

As a series of three distinct human reactions to a divine message, the portrayals of Zechariah, Elizabeth, and Mary depict a progression from the negative to the positive to the ideal: Zechariah's response is judged negatively by the narrator, Elizabeth's response is judged positively but only occurs as a correct interpretation of the miracle *after* it has occurred, and Mary's response stands as the ideal of the positive response to the divine word, since she responds in faith before the event even happens. The narrative dynamics of speech and silence in the portrayals of these three characters prime readers to expect that, as Coleridge puts it, the complex interplay of divine necessity and human response "will remain decisive throughout both the infancy narrative and the Lukan narrative as a whole."[361]

IN SUM: SPEECH AND SILENCE IN LUKE'S PROLOGUE AND INTRODUCTION

Luke's prologue and narrative introduction inaugurate the narrator-reader relationship in several ways: (1) The narrator attempts to assert reliability through a first-person assertion of perspectival privilege, an appeal to shared values, and through distanced, omniscient third-person narration; and (2) The narrator provides limited expository

[361] Mark Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative*, 49.

details, simultaneously orienting the reader and raising readerly expectations vis-à-vis the tale to come. At the same time, these very features of the narrator's speech, in conjunction with narratorial silences like the prologue's open-endedness, leave open the possibility that the ideal narrator-reader relationship will not actually develop. Considering narratorial silences to have significant rhetorical effects illuminates how the chronological gap between 2.52 and 3.1 corroborates prior prophecies about John the Baptist and thereby foregrounds the theological theme of divine fulfillment.

Luke's beginning materials also employ speech and silence as rhetorical strategies useful for characterization. Though Jesus himself speaks only rarely in the first section of the Gospel, this relative silence creates the narrative space for other reliable characters to introduce and reinforce Jesus' unique identity through their speech. Additionally, as demonstrated through a close reading of Gabriel's silencing of Zechariah (1.5-23, 57-65), the narrator's uses of speech and silence introduce the key theological theme of the necessity of the plan of God, while simultaneously holding it in tension with humans' varied responses to God's work in the world.

The tension between divine providential guidance and human response subtly mirrors on the story level a tension that also occurs on the level of the narration: the narrator, situated in a position of programmatic influence, effectively aligns himself with God, who is depicted as the reliable authority directing events within the story. And yet, the narrator can never control the reader absolutely; just as within the story, human characters like Zechariah, Elizabeth, and Mary "have the freedom to co-operate with the plan of God, or to dissociate themselves from it,"[362] so too will human readers interpret and respond to Luke's story in various ways. At the same time, this interpretive freedom

[362] Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, 184.

is reigned in by the narrative rhetoric – it is a liberty within limits. The narrator's specific uses of speech and silence portray certain responses to God's messages as preferable to others, and thus suggest that readers should judge Mary, Elizabeth, and Zechariah on a continuum; from the narrator's perspective, Mary's faithful response to God's message is ideal, Elizabeth's correct interpretation of God's work is portrayed positively, and Zechariah's initial response of unbelief is unacceptable, and thus results in divine judgment.

CHAPTER TWO
JESUS' GALILEAN MINISTRY (LUKE 4.14-9.50)

INTRODUCTION

At Luke 4.14, the narrative moves into the first section of Jesus' public career (4.14-9.50) – typically labeled the Galilean ministry.[363] In this stage, the reader begins to witness Jesus acting as a Spirit-anointed prophet, healer, exorcist, and powerful preacher. Up to this point, the narrative has bounced speedily from Jesus' infancy, to his appearance as a twelve-year-old in the Temple, to his baptism and temptation as an adult. The narrator has highlighted major events, skipping over years – even decades – entirely. When Jesus returns to Galilee in the power of the Spirit at 4.14, however, the pace decelerates and the narrator focuses in on several key aspects of Jesus' ministry. Beginning with a programmatic sermon in his hometown synagogue (4.16-30), Jesus' purpose as God's chosen one starts to take shape.

In general, previous studies have highlighted two main functions of the Galilean ministry section of Luke. First, most students of the Lukan narrative recognize that chapters 4-9 depict Jesus as the authoritative, divinely anointed protagonist and concomitantly introduce the religious authorities, who eventually become Jesus' main opponents.[364] Second, the majority of scholars note that this section reveals the prominent

---

[363] This is widely explained with reference to the statement in 4.14 that Jesus returned to Galilee, and to subsequent mentions of geographical locations in the Galilean region such as Capernaum (4.23, 31; 7.12) and Bethsaida (9.10). However, note that 4.44 poses a particular problem for exegetes, since it refers to Palestine. Scholars like Theobald and Volkel argue that the Galilean ministry really only occurs in 4.14-44, and that in 5.1, Jesus' ministry expands to the rest of the Jewish people. See M. Völkel, "Der Anfang Jesu in Galiläa: Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch and zur Funktion Galiläas in den lukanischen Schriften," *ZNW* 64 (1973): 222-232 and M. Theobald, "Die Anfänge der Kirche: Zur Struktur von Lk. 5.1-6.19," *NTS* 30 (1984): 91-92.

[364] As Grangaard observes, chapters five and six in particular depict "a series of vignettes in which the leaders of the people criticize Jesus for numerous offenses, and, in turn, Jesus responds as one who

Lukan theme of salvation "to the ends of the earth" (Acts 1.8).[365] Talbert brings these two elements together when he writes that the Galilean ministry exhibits a "dominant emphasis" on Jesus' power, and a "subordinate theme" of the ministry of Jesus (and later, the church as depicted in Acts) to all people, not just to Israel.[366]

Two other central themes appear for the first time in Luke 4.14-9.50: Luke's unique preoccupation with "the word of God" (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ),[367] and the importance of doing vis-à-vis hearing.[368] Many studies of "the word of God" focus on the frequent instances of ῥῆμα and λόγος in the Greek text. As Juhwan Joseph Kim notes,

---

possesses higher authority." Blake R. Grangaard, *Conflict and Authority in Luke 19:47-21:4* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), 30.

[365] Tannehill, for instance, views Jesus' first public sermon in Lk. 4.16-30 as programmatic for the Lukan plot, which he summarizes as the inevitable unfolding of God's divine purposes and Israel's tragic rejection of them. See Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts," *JBL* (1985): 69-85; idem, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 69-71. On this passage as an introduction to the mission to non-Jews, see also Michael Bird, *Jesus and the Origins of the Gentile Mission* (New York: T&T Clark, 2007); Jeffrey Siker, "'First to the Gentiles:' A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30," *JBL* 111 (1992): 69-86; Dawsey, *The Lukan Voice*, 69; Philip Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lukan Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); R.B. Sloan, *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubilary Theology in the Gospel of Luke* (Austin, Tex.: Schola Press, 1977). More generally on this theme, see Stephen Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (SNTS 23; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

[366] Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 55.

[367] Chun Yung Lak's dissertation demonstrates how "in the Lukan writings [this phrase] is used extensively and consistently in reference to the Christian proclamation." '*The Word of God' in Luke-Acts: A Study in Lukan Theology* (Phd. Diss., Atlanta: Emory University, 1995), 1. Additionally, several scholars have considered the theme of "the word" in conjunction with other prominent themes in Luke-Acts, often concluding that "the word" takes precedence over the other theme(s). Leo O'Reilly, for instance, argues that a "word/sign" duality is central to Luke's theological program, though "the word is the primary and inclusive reality; the signs and wonders are fundamentally at the service of the word." Leo O'Reilly, *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles. A Study in Lucan Theology* (AnGr 82; Rome: Editrice Pontifica Universita Gregorians, 1987), 217. Similarly, Kim's monograph on the "Spirit-accompanied word" treats the dual Lukan themes of word and Spirit. Juhwan Joseph Kim, *"What is this Word?": An Early Christian Narrative of the Universal Spread of the Spirit-Accompanied Word* (Phd. Diss.: Harvard University, 2009). Kim insists that Jesus' "signs and wonders" are not entirely distinct from the word; especially in Luke, "Jesus' performance of various miracles, healings and exorcisms is portrayed consistently as an execution of the powerful and authoritative word" (85). Still, Kim concludes that "Luke accords the word an overarching narrative role" (37).

[368] The tension between hearing and doing the word is a constant refrain in Luke's Gospel; see, e.g., 6.47; 8.15, 21; 11.28. For an argument that Luke's Jesus facilitates an unfinalizable, dialogic relationship between doing and hearing in Luke 10.25-37 and 10.38-42, see Nadella, *Dialogue Not Dogma*, 65-87.

Luke uses these word-groups "more than any other early Christian writer."[369] Interpreters also recognize that using a complex of both ὁράω- and ἀκούω-related words,[370] Luke consistently underscores the importance of listening well, of paying attention – what King-Kok Cheung dubs "attentive silence."[371] These two major Lukan themes clearly are related to speech and silence, and yet, few scholars have considered how speech and silence function together in the narrative rhetoric of this section of the gospel.[372]

SPEECH AND SILENCE IN JESUS' GALILEAN MINISTRY

As the first major section of Luke in which Jesus is shown actively healing and preaching as an adult, the Galilean ministry plays an important role in readers' processing of what happens to him as a result. In this chapter, I consider the ways that:

1) On the level of the telling, the narrator's uses of speech reveal a particular rhetoric of causality, create unity across discrete episodes, set the plot in motion, and escalate the narrative's forward movement; at the same time, the narrator's silences

---

[369] Kim, *"What is this Word?"* 5. For example, compare with Luke's canonical counterparts, who only employ the phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ once each (Matt. 15.6; Mk. 7.13; Jn. 10.36).

[370] The Nazareth episode in Luke 4.16-30 is a pertinent example. After Jesus reads from the scroll of Isaiah in the synagogue, he rolls up the scroll and sits down. The narrator says that "the eyes of all" (πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοί) are fixed on him (4.20). In this moment, the narrative seems to pause. Time stops, as everyone, the reader included, watches Jesus and waits. They listen expectantly, riveted in rapt attention. Will Jesus speak? If so, what will he say? The anticipatory tension breaks when Jesus declares, "Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing" (lit. "in your ears," ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν, 4.21). This pericope is just one of many places where Luke suggests that true attention involves both focused vision and focused hearing. On this language in Luke-Acts, see John Darr, "'Watch How You Listen,' 87-107.

[371] Cheung, *Articulate Silences*, 126-67.

[372] Patrick Spencer is a notable exception to the general scholarly inattention to speech in the Galilean ministry section of Luke, though he does not consider silence. Patrick Spencer, *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories*. Spencer cites Jeffrey Staley as the only real predecessor for his work. See Staley, "Narrative Structure (Self Stricture) in Luke 4:14-9:62: The United States of Luke's Story World," *Semeia* 72 (1995): 173-213.

stimulate readerly curiosity and implicate readers in the task of correctly identifying Jesus;

2) Within the story itself, the narrative rhetoric of characterization introduces two main character groups (the disciples and religious authorities) through their uses of speech and silence,[373] and further develops Jesus' characterization through his own speech and his control of others' speech;

3) This section of Luke's Gospel uses speech and silence to engender the prominent Lukan themes of salvation to the ends of the earth, hearing vis-à-vis doing, and the word of God. Jesus' Galilean ministry also establishes speech and silence as important theological themes in their own right.

Between the Narrator and the Reader

As I noted in the introductory chapter, the Gospel of Luke is best conceived as a unified-episodic plot. A unified-episodic plot has discrete, separable episodes, and yet causal chains link sequential events and thereby create a loose unity across the narrative.[374] As Whitney Shiner recognizes: "One limitation of episodic narrative is that the relative independence of the episodes is not well suited for developing causal connections that build plausibility into the narrative."[375] How, then, does the Lukan narrator create such

[373] This point builds upon (and goes beyond) Jack Dean Kingsbury's observation that interpersonal interactions characterize both Jesus and his opponents: "Since the religious authorities are the antagonists and Jesus is the protagonist, the primary way the authorities disclose the character traits they possess is through their interaction with Jesus [and] how they interact with other characters." Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke*, 22.

[374] In contrast to the climactic unified plot in which each narrative segment necessarily presupposes previous segments and foreshadows future events, episodic plots are constructed as individual, self-contained units.

causal links?

Shiner notes that one common solution in ancient episodic narratives is to use divine necessity as an effective means of generating causation.[376] This is certainly the case with Luke's Gospel;[377] Henry Cadbury was one of the first to recognize "the evidence of divine guidance and control that pervades [Luke's work]…There is a necessity about the course which Luke's story takes, a 'must,' to use Luke's own favorite auxiliary, rather than a mere predicative 'shall.'"[378] Furthermore, one of the main ways that Luke establishes divine providence is through the authorizing character of the Holy Spirit, whom John Darr describes as "a means of building and maintaining coherence and continuity in a story that is potentially disjunctive."[379] As we saw in the previous chapter, Luke also uses specific instances of speech and silence to depict divine providence.

However, few scholars attend to the ways that speech itself generates causality in Luke's Gospel. This is somewhat suprising, given the common scholarly recognition that characters' speeches in Acts reflect Luke's literary artistry.[380] In this, Luke is similar to Roman historians, who – as classicists observe –

> …manipulate the various forms of speech available to them, both direct and indirect, to shape their narrative and to drive it forward. This includes speeches,

---

[375] Shiner discusses causation and narrative plausibility in the Gospel of Mark, but the point applies to the Gospel of Luke, as well. "Creating Plot," 167.
[376] Shiner, "Creating Plot," 167.

[377] On divine causation as a key programmatic theme throughout Luke's two-volume work, see John Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). See also the extensive discussion and bibliography in Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 1-90.

[378] Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 303-305. See also Charles Cosgrove, "The Divine Δεῖ in Luke-Acts," *NovT* 26 (1984): 168-90.

[379] John Darr, "The Holy Spirit as Structural Element in Luke's Story World," unpublished paper.

[380] This insight is one of the lasting legacies of Martin Dibelius' landmark study, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed. H. Greeven; London: SCM Press, 1956), 138-85.

> dialogue, single statements, and even silence.[381]

Biblical scholars also have shown how speeches influence the overall plot in Acts.[382] Robert Tannehill, for example, describes Peter's formal speeches this way:

> It is illuminating to think of each of the speeches as an action in the unfolding narrative plot. In speaking, Peter acts to influence a particular audience at a particular point in the plot. This action and the hearers' decision about how to respond will determine the direction in which the plot develops.[383]

I contend that these descriptions also apply to Luke's Gospel, and that we can extend these observations beyond formal public speeches to include dialogues and spoken utterances more broadly.[384] The following pages detail how the narrator uses characters' speech to establish causation, create narrative unity, escalate the conflicts that set the plot in motion, and increase narrative momentum.

The early chapters of Luke's Gospel are replete with instances where speech causes a character's actions. Herod puts John the Baptist in jail because John had "rebuked" (ἐλεγχόμενος) him (3.19-20). Those in the Galilean synagogue speak well of Jesus at first, being amazed "*at the gracious words* (τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος) coming out of his mouth" (4.22), but then they are filled with rage *at his words* ("hearing these

---

[381] D.H. Berry and Andrew Erskine, eds., *Form and Function in Roman Oratory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 13.

[382] I agree with Kuhn, who speculates, "It is likely because the form and setting of direct discourse in the gospel do not conform to the stereotypical 'speech' that interpreters have not…attempted to illuminate their function [or] entertained the notion that the direct speech of the gospel might share a common function with the speeches in Acts." *In Their Own Words*, 2-3.

[383] Tannehill, *The Shape of Luke's Story: Essays on Luke-Acts*, 170.

[384] Much has been written already about specific formal categories of Lukan speech such as prophetic utterances, Scriptural allusions, and public speeches. Representative works include Martin Rese, *Altetestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrick-Wilhelms-Univ., 1965); David Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); Spencer, *Narrative Trajectories*; Charles Talbert, "Prophecy and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 91-103; D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson, eds., *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Karl Kuhn, *In Their Own Words: Character Speech in the Gospel of Luke* (Ph.D. diss.; Marquette University, 1999); Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*.

things," ἀκούοντες ταῦτα) and ultimately drive him out of town because of them (4.28-29). The people of Capernaum are "amazed" (ἐξεπλήσσοντο) precisely "because" (ὅτι) he teaches with authority (4.32). Jesus himself is "amazed" (ἐθαύμασεν) when he hears the centurion's faithful words ("having heard these things," ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα), and immediately performs a miracle in response (7.9-10).[385] As news about Jesus spreads, Herod wants to see him *because* he is perplexed *at what people are saying* ("he was perplexed because it was said by some…," διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπό τινων, 9.7-9).

One specific form of speech-related causation particularly exemplifies my claims about causal connections in Luke. Not only does speech cause characters' actions, as instanced in the previous paragraph, but speech also begets more speech: "news" (ἦχος),[386] or "spoken reports" (λόγος,[387] φήμη[388]) about Jesus turn out to be a common reaction to Jesus' ministry and thus a constant refrain throughout Luke's Gospel.[389] Following Jesus' temptation in the desert, the narrator tells us, "a report about him spread throughout the whole surrounding countryside" (4.14). This is just the first of many mentions of reports that result from Jesus' ministry: his fame increases as talk about him spreads into all areas of the region (4.37), to Capernaum (7.1), throughout Judea and all

---

[385] By this point in Luke's gospel, other characters' amazement at Jesus' spoken words has become a common trope. However, this is the first time in the Lukan narrative that Jesus himself is the subject of θαυμάζω. As a brief moment of internal focalization in an otherwise externally-focused pericope, Luke 7.9 highlights that even *Jesus* – whose great powers of perception have already been established – finds the message surprising and admirable.

[386] Lk. 4.37.

[387] Lk. 5.15; 7.17.

[388] Lk. 4.14.

[389] Malina and Rohrbaugh point out that modern readers "usually pass over such notices without a second glance." Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 325.

the surrounding country (7.17). As the narrative progresses, Jesus-news reaches "large crowds" (5.15, 29; 7.11; 8.19, 40; 9.37; 14.25) who come "from one town after another" (8.4), and "press upon" Jesus and each another (8.42, 45). In fact, these crowds "increase" (11.29) to "many thousands" who are so packed together that they actually trample on one other (12.1).

Literary theorist Patricia Meyer Spacks writes that passing on spoken reports "involves groups mulling over information or pseudo-information that has already passed through many ears, many mouths, *acquiring authority and heightening in the process*." She therefore calls it "an activity of obvious value for plot construction."[390] Spoken reports about Jesus specifically contribute to the conflicts that propel the plot, instantiate the Lukan theme of salvation to the ends of the earth, create narrative unity, and speed up the pace of the narrative's forward movement.

As news about Jesus spreads, so too does the curiosity of those who are potentially threatened by that popularity. In Luke 5.17, the narrator specifies that Pharisees and teachers of the law "had come from every village of Galilee and Judea and from Jerusalem"; presumably they have heard the spoken reports about Jesus. This note begins a series of controversy stories in which Jesus goes head to head publicly with the Pharisees and teachers of the law, answering their questions, refuting their assumptions, and citing Scripture to prove them wrong (5.17-6.11).[391] Jesus' conflicts with the religious leaders play a crucial narrative role, ultimately propelling the plot forward

---

[390] Patricia Meyer Spacks, *Gossip* (New York: Random House, 1985), 7; emphasis added.

[391] These "challenge-riposte" exchanges have been explored recently from a social-scientific perspective that highlights the concept of honor as a limited good; on this, see especially Bruce Malina and Jerome Neyrey, "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models of Interpretation* (ed. J.H. Neyrey; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 25-65.

toward the climax of the cross.

Jesus' conflicts with the authorities revolve around the question of authority;[392] indeed, such conflicts are at the center of most (perhaps all) narratives.[393] The salient feature I want to highlight here is that, with the obvious exception of the crucifixion itself, the hostility between Jesus and the religious authorities is portrayed throughout Luke's Gospel as conversational combat.[394] Luke portrays a war over authority in which the weapons wielded are words.

The spread of news about Jesus also subtly introduces a different kind of narrative conflict into the Lukan plot. In addition to face-to-face verbal confrontations with other characters (e.g., the demons, or the religious authorities), another problem faces Luke's protagonist: Despite Jesus' repeated injunctions not to tell anyone about who he is or what he has done (what Danker dubs a "silence motif"),[395] the news nevertheless continues to spread.[396] In these cases, we know that the narrator is not pinpointing

---

[392] For Grangaard, "the central issue in the conflict is the question of authority." *Conflict and Authority*, 31.

[393] H. Porter Abbott emphasizes the importance of conflicts over power, "[I]n almost every narrative of any interest, there is a conflict in which power is at stake." Abbott, *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*, 55.

[394] Schulz likens Jesus' controversies with the religious authorities to rabbinic debate. *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 206-208. This mode of representing antagonism is not to be taken for granted, however. In the pervasive vocabulary of violence found in the ancient Greek novels, interpersonal conflict leads to all kinds of hostile action: characters (especially women) are kidnapped, attacked, mutilated, beheaded. BP Reardon, ed., *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

[395] Frederick W. Danker, *Luke* (Philadelphia: Proclamation Commentaries, 1987), 90-92.

[396] Since the classic work of Wilhelm Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901), Jesus' commands to silence have been discussed mostly with respect to the Gospel of Mark, in which the theme is much more developed than in Luke. See also Ulrich Luz and Heikki Räisänen, who distinguish between two types of commands to silence: those focused on Jesus' miracles (most of which are not obeyed), and those focused on Jesus' identity (all of which are kept). Luz, "The Secrecy Motif and Marcan Christology," in *The Messianic Secret* (ed. Christopher Tuckett; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 75-96; Heikki Räisänen,

specific opponents of Jesus because the subject of the spreader of the news so often remains ambiguous.

Take Luke 5.12-16 as an example. Jesus heals a leper and then immediately orders the healed man to tell no one; rather, the healed man is to show himself to the priest and make an offering (5.14).[397] Jesus' injunction to silence is directly contrasted with the narrator's account immediately following: "But (δὲ) the news about him spread even more" (5.15).[398] Herein lies a tension that attention to speech and silence throws into sharp relief: some characters disobey Jesus' commands to be silent and spread the news anyway. Although all the demons (4.35, 41) immediately obey Jesus, in 5.12-16 for the first time, his authoritative power over words is put into question.

One way to understand the inexorable march of the spreading news about Jesus *despite* Jesus' commands (which elsewhere are so ineluctably effective) is that it gives rise to a new dramatic possibility: Jesus, unable to curb the runaway rumors, may not always be in control of narrative events. This is hardly surprising from a narrative-critical perspective. Narrative critics have long recognized that equilibrium must be disrupted in some way in order to propel a narrative plot forward.[399] What is significant here is that in addition to using verbal confrontations as a means of expressing conflict, the narrator also

---

The 'Messianic Secret' in Mark (trans. Christopher Tuckett; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990); and "Messianic Secret," in *ABD*, 4.797-800.

[397] It is unclear whether Jesus means this silence to be indefinite, or simply to last until after the man makes his offering. The same is true of 8.56, where Jesus raises Jairus' daughter from the dead, but orders the parents to tell no one; so, too, in 9.21 does Jesus demand that his disciples tell no one about Peter's confession that Jesus is "the Christ of God" (τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, 9.20).

[398] Presumably, the man disobeys Jesus' order, though onlookers could have spread the news.

[399] As Abbott points out, one need only consider that the technical terms "prot*agon*ist" and "ant*agon*ist" contain the Greek word ἀγών, or "contest." Similarly, Tyson says with respect to Luke's Gospel, "It is difficult to imagine a story without a plot line that operates around some kind of opposition." J.B. Tyson, *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond* (ed. W. Farmer; Macon, GA: Mercer, 1983), 313.

presents speech control itself as a contested issue and in this way, propels the plot forward.

Nevertheless, the fact that plot exigencies demand that the narrative hero face some type of challenge does not fully account for why others' spoken reports about Jesus often render his own commands for silence ineffectual. I suggest that considering the narrator's silences can further illuminate these puzzling pericopes. The narrator leaves two questions in particular unanswered: 1) Why does Jesus command silence in the first place? and 2) If Jesus is meant to be seen as the powerful, authoritative agent of the inevitable divine plan, and if (as I will discuss later) he is in absolute command of when *some* characters speak, then why is it that he cannot control what certain characters say about him?[400]

Due to the absence of narratorial interpretive guidance regarding these two questions, these passages have long puzzled interpreters; the narrator's silences have led to scholarly speculation in a number of different directions.[401] Many redaction critics, noting that the "silence motif" is not as developed in Luke as it is in Mark's Gospel, conclude that Luke's mentions of the "Messianic secret" are simply vestiges of his Markan source. Others are more attentive to the Lukan story itself. For instance, scholars often refer to Luke 4.41 to explain all of Jesus' other commands to silence. In 4.41, the demons attest to Jesus' identity, crying out (κραυγάζω) as they leave, "You are the Son of God!" Despite the truthfulness of their cries, Jesus nevertheless rebukes (ἐπιτιμάω)

[400] James Dawsey, for one, sees this as evidence of an inconsistency between the Lukan narrator and the Lukan Jesus. However, Dawsey's thesis is implausible for many reasons. *The Lukan Voice*, esp. 90-94. Knight, following Dawsey, sums up this view: "The narrator…shows that he does not understand what Jesus is saying." Jonathan Knight, *Luke's Gospel*, 102.

[401] Bovon lists five possible reasons that are commonly proposed. See *Luke 1*, 176 n.22.

them and sends them away. In this passage, unlike elsewhere, the narrator singles out a specific reason for the command to silence: Jesus "would not allow them to speak *because they knew that he was the Christ*" (οὐκ εἴα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν[402] αὐτὸν εἶναι, 4.41). Note that this is the first time the reader is given privileged access to Jesus' motivation, and the narrator uses this special narrative moment to highlight the complicated question of Jesus' identity.

Because the demons know that Jesus is the Christ, by extension one might assume that Jesus silences them in order to control *when* his identity will be publicly revealed; effectively, Jesus becomes a secret hidden in plain sight.[403] This explanation coheres with Conzelmann's proposal that secrecy ensures Jesus will fulfill his divine purpose; if the people knew that Jesus was the Messiah, they would actively save him from the cross and thereby interrupt the divine plan.[404] This view would account for why, as Delbert Burkett observes, in Luke, "Jesus' identity as the Messiah is openly known in the birth narrative, a well kept secret during Jesus' public ministry, but once again openly known in the passion narrative."[405]

Despite the appeal of this solution, the ὅτι of verse 41 ("*because* they knew that he was the Christ") belies a clear reason for Jesus' silencing of the demons. In 4.35, the demon has *already* addressed Jesus as the "Holy One of God"; presumably, the onlookers

---

[402] The presence of the article indicates that this is a title. See John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20* (Dallas: Word, 1989), 214.

[403] Cf. Luke 12:2, "Nothing is covered up that will not be uncovered, and nothing secret that will not become known."

[404] Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 76-77. Georg Simmel makes the related sociological observation that "with publicity many sorts of purposes could never arrive at realization." "The Sociology of Secrecy and of Secret Societies," *American Journal of Sociology* 11 (1906): 462.

[405] Delbert Burkett, *The Blackwell Companion to Jesus* (ed. Delbert Burkett; Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 56.

have heard this appellation. Perhaps Jesus' command to silence implies a tacit agreement that he is the "Holy One of God."[406] Perhaps not. The ambiguity remains. In reality, the reader is never told explicitly *why* Jesus would be concerned that the demons "know" that he is the Christ; the narrator remains silent about Jesus' underlying concerns. Not only this, but referring to 4.41 does not address the second unanswered question: why the news continues to spread against Jesus' wishes.

I propose that the two unanswered questions referenced above serve both revealing and concealing functions for the reader. On the one hand, the juxtaposition of Jesus' commands to silence with voiced testimonies about him paradoxically highlights for readers what Jesus himself tries to obscure; his identity is so important that it cannot be hidden.[407] As Joel Marcus puts it, the rhetorical effect of such juxtapositions is that "the silencings serve the purpose of revelation."[408]

On the other hand, leaving Jesus' reasons for commanding silence unsaid sustains readerly interest by raising a question the reader cannot yet answer. This silence, woven into the fabric of the narration, engages the reader more fully by stimulating curiosity and raising the expectation that the reason(s) for Jesus' secrecy will be revealed eventually. As Kathy Maxwell puts it, "Unsettling, unsatisfying and unclear endings encourage

---

[406] So Lee: "These statements by the demons elicit the same pattern of response from Jesus – silence, which can be construed as acquiescence." David Lee, *Luke's Stories of Jesus: Theological Reading of Gospel Narrative and the Legacy of Hans Frei* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 327.

[407] Hans Ebeling argued this regarding Mark's Messianic secret in *Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Marcus-Evangelisten* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939).

[408] Joel Marcus, "Identity and Ambiguity in Markan Christology," in *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage* (ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard Hays; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 136.

audience participation as the hearers seek closure for the account they have just heard."[409] Delaying resolution – even indefinitely – is part of the rhetorical impact of the story.

This indeterminacy, or delay in interpretive closure, relates to a scholarly suggestion about Jesus' "secrecy motif" that I have not yet mentioned: Jesus discourages reports about his miracles because miracles are meant to communicate deeper spiritual realities. In other words, Jesus knows that if people focus too much on the miracle itself *qua* miracle, they will miss its deeper meaning.[410] This theory is analogous to my view of the narrator's lack of interpretive guidance in the way he tells the tale: the open-endedness itself allows readers to linger over the implications of Jesus' authority and commands to secrecy. In modern psychological terms, we might describe the operative dynamic here as an incidence of the Zeigarnik Effect, which refers to the principle that what remains unfinished is better remembered. Laurence Perrine notes that in the case of a conclusive ending, a reader "ceases to think about the story searchingly," whereas indeterminacies "may cause him to…go over the story in his mind, and thus by searching out its implications get more from it."[411]

In light of the foregoing discussion, we can consider Jesus' silencing of the demons in Luke 4.41 from a new perspective. There is in this passage a subtle parallel between the characters and the readers: on the one hand, just as the demons know Jesus' identity as the Christ, so too by this point in the narrative, the reader should know Jesus' identity as the Holy One of God. On the other hand, the demons are prevented from

---

[409] Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines*, 89-90.

[410] Bock, *Luke*, 86.

[411] Laurence Perrine, *Story and Structure* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovonovich, 1959), 66. See Jerry Camery-Hoggatt's application of this insight to the ending of the Gospel of Mark. *Irony in Mark's Gospel*, 11.

speaking about this knowledge; similarly, the reader is impeded from drawing prematurely definitive conclusions about the implications of such knowledge.

In addition to prompting plot development and readerly involvement, the Jesus-news motif also engenders the theological theme of proclaiming salvation to the "ends of the earth." The beginning of Luke's story depicts Jesus first as a relatively obscure hometown figure, and then as a powerful preacher and healer whose fame spreads quite rapidly into a wide range of social circles. Not only does informal information exchange about Jesus reach greater numbers of people – Jews and Gentiles alike – but it also reaches all socioeconomic levels of society, from social outcasts to elite rulers. The shepherds relate to Mary and Joseph what the angels proclaimed to them in the fields (2.17-18), and John the Baptist's disciples inform him about Jesus while he is in prison (7.18). Tax collectors and sinners "come to hear him" (15.1). Higher up on the social pyramid, a centurion hears about Jesus and asks for his help (7.3ff), and news about Jesus even reaches the royal court, as Herod hears "about it all" (9.7-9). Finally, the narrative reaches a point where everyone is expected to know about Jesus.[412]

Additionally, Jesus-talk creates narrative coherence and a sense of development across the discrete episodes of the Gospel. As word about Jesus circulates, a sense of collective curiosity accrues on the story level and people increasingly gather around him. It is important that these mentions of reports about Jesus are not cases of the simple repetition that one often finds in strictly episodic narratives; rather, we see here a precipitate evolution from reports shared within a small circumscribed community to

[412] The disciple on the road to Emmaus asks the risen Jesus, "Are you the only visitor to Jerusalem who doesn't know the things that have happened there in these days?" (24.18) Similarly, in Acts 10.37, Peter assumes that Cornelius and his household are aware of this "word" (λόγος), which "began in Galilee after the baptism that John proclaimed."

news that spreads throughout multiple geographic regions and amongst a wide variety of people. Such an evolution contributes to the development of a continuous overarching plotline that counterbalances the narrative's episodic features.

Rumors about Jesus further contribute to the pace of the narrative's forward movement, since the reports themselves are not actually quoted: the reader is simply told *that* they occur in summary précis.[413] It is well-known that direct speech (also called direct discourse) slows the speed of the telling (*Erzählzeit*) to the speed of the story event itself (*Erzählte Zeit*).[414] Narrative summaries, on the other hand, accelerate scenic pace. Although scholars debate the relative amount of direct speech, indirect speech, and narrative summation in Luke's Gospel,[415] I find it more helpful to compare the modes of speech representation in different parts of Luke's Gospel to one another, and to ask how each mode functions in the narration.[416] To illustrate the difference in narrative pace that direct discourse makes in contradistiction to narrative summation, compare the following two accounts of Jesus' exorcisms:

4.33 In the synagogue there was a man who had the spirit of an unclean demon,

---

[413] Cf. John 4.28-29: "Then the woman left her water jar, went off into the town and said to the people, 'Come, see a man who told me everything I ever did. Surely he can't be the Messiah, can he?'"

[414] The terminology scholars use to describe the fictional, literary time of a narrative and the time it takes to tell that narrative can get quite convoluted. Sternberg speaks of "represented" versus "representational" time, which he develops from G. Müller, "Die Bedeutung der Zeit in der Erzählkunst," in *Morphologische Poetik* (Tübingen, 1968). For Genette, "narrative time" is the time span covered in the story, while "narration time" is the material time it takes the teller to relate that story. *Figures III*, 122-144.

[415] Stephen Moore describes Luke-Acts as having a "dearth of indirect-speech reporting" compared to direct discourse. *Mark and Luke in Poststructuralist Perspectives*, 134. Similarly, Jo-Ann Brant claims that the Synoptic authors rely mainly on summary, whereas in the Fourth Gospel, the story is uniquely built "without narration through the comments of characters." *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004), 33-34. However, this has not always been the scholarly consensus. In the early twentieth century, Henry Cadbury made the redaction-critical argument that the Lukan author tended to change direct discourse into indirect discourse. See Cadbury, "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts," and his later work, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 171.

[416] Lee, for instance, offers an analysis of the proportions in each narrative unit of "speech and action" versus "speech and dialogue." David Lee, *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 193n.17.

> and he cried out with a loud voice, 34 "Let us alone! What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God." 35 But Jesus rebuked him, saying, "Be silent, and come out of him!" When the demon had thrown him down before them, he came out of him without having done him any harm. 36 They were all amazed and kept saying to one another, "What kind of utterance is this? For with authority and power he commands the unclean spirits, and out they come!" 37 And a report about him began to reach every place in the region.
> …
>
> 4.40 As the sun was setting, all those who had any who were sick with various kinds of diseases brought them to him; and he laid his hands on each of them and cured them. 41 Demons also came out of many, shouting, "You are the Son of God!" But he rebuked them and would not allow them to speak, because they knew that he was the Messiah.

It is easy to see how these otherwise similar accounts differ with respect to the length of time it takes to tell them. Whereas the first exorcism pericope (4.33-37) recounts the dialogical exchange between Jesus and the unclean demon (in 92 Greek words), and thus takes longer to present, the latter (4.40-41) speedily summarizes multiple exorcisms (in 52 Greek words), with only one directly quoted outburst ("You are the Son of God," 4.41). The repetition and sequential development of summarized reports about Jesus create a cumulative momentum as the plot progresses. As reports about Jesus increase exponentially, so too, does the momentum of the narrative begin to pick up speed.

The Narrative Rhetoric of Characterization through Speech and Silence

The following section analyzes the narrative's rhetoric of characterization in the Galilean Ministry section of Luke's Gospel. Before embarking on this discussion, however, it is essential to clarify that Luke does not simply associate positive characters with speech and negative characters with silence. The prior chapter's handling of Zechariah's silencing by Gabriel may have given this erroneous impression, since Zechariah is shown

progressing from negatively marked silence to positively marked speech. Furthermore, Jesus' silencing of the demons might seem to support the view that Luke privileges speech over silence. Neither would this theory be inappropriate with respect to ancient narratives in general, since such a privileging certainly occurs elsewhere in contemporaneous literature.[417] But as this section will show, Luke's uses of speech and silence in characterization are considerably more complicated.

Luke's world of words can be unpredictable; speech and silence both have potential for good or for evil. For Luke, what matters most is how one uses speech and silence. Patrick Spencer usefully delineates three specific ways that character speech contributes to narrative characterization, which I would expand to include characters' silences, as well: 1) they provide information about the speaker(s); 2) reveal characteristics of antagonists and protagonists based on how they respond to the speaker(s); and 3) establish interpretive frameworks from which readers can evaluate characters.[418] Jesus' Galilean ministry introduces two main character groups: the religious leaders and Jesus' disciples. This section of Luke also furthers the characterization of Jesus that began in the preceding section, though now it is through Jesus' own voice and his control of others' speech. As we will see in the following pages, Luke's rhetoric of characterization hinges on the complex narrative portrayals of these characters' uses of speech and silence.

---

[417] Deborah Kamen, for example, argues that *The Life of Aesop* depicts Aesop undergoing two parallel transformations, from slave to freedman, and from muteness to free speech (*parrhêsia*). Deborah Kamen, "Between Slavery and Freedom, Silence and *Parrhêsia*: The Case of the Freedman in Ancient Greece," Paper Presented at Classics Graduate Student Conference, "Speaking Your Mind/Minding Your Speech in Classical Antiquity," Princeton University, 2004. See also Silvia Montiglio's discussions of ancient Greek culture in *Silence in the Land of Logos*.

[418] Spencer, *Rhetorical Trajectories*, 40.

The Religious Leaders

The story of the healed paralytic in 5.17-26 introduces the corporate character group – the scribes and Pharisees – who eventually become Jesus' opponents in Luke's tale. Historically speaking, scholars have identified significant diversity behind the various Jewish groups to which Luke's Gospel refers; thus, many of the contemporary scholarly studies concerning Luke's depiction of Israel distinguish between the chief priests (οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς), elders (οἱ πρεσβύτεροι), leaders among the people (οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ), experts in the law/scribes (οἱ γραμματεῖς), Sadducees (οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι), and/or Pharisees (οἱ Φαρισαῖοι).[419] The Lukan Pharisees in particular often are singled out as a static character group portrayed in relatively positive terms.[420] However, recognizing the rich polyphony of historical reality that lies behind the Lukan narrative, in this study, I refer broadly to "the religious leaders" for several reasons. First, I am not aiming to make socio-historical claims about ancient Jews and Judaism; rather, my concern is with the narration of Luke's Gospel as it now stands. The Lukan narrator uses amorphous terms like "chief priests," "elders," and "experts in the law" with little technical precision or consistency;[421] he does not appear to be overly concerned with

---

[419] For an overview, see Joseph Tyson, *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999).

[420] Key works include Joseph Tyson, "The Opposition to Jesus in the Gospel of Luke," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 5 (1978): 144-50; J. Ziesler, "Luke and the Pharisees," *NTS* 25 (1978): 146-57; J. T. Sanders, "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts," *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders* (ed. D. Groh and R. Jewett; New York: University Press of America, 1985); Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews*; John Carroll, "Luke's Portrayal of the Pharisees," *CBQ* 50 (1988): 604-21; David Gowler, *Host, Guest, Enemy and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991); Kingsbury, "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts," in *The Four Gospels: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. F. Van Segbroeck; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1497-1512.

[421] Juhwan Joseph Kim explains this by noting that Luke is most concerned with "the universal spread of the word." Kim, *"What is This Word?"* 278.

distinctions between them.[422] I am focusing on the uses of speech and silence in the narrative's rhetoric of characterization, which means that for my purposes, it is enough to note that Pharisees, Sadducees, scribes, and priests are all shown at various points in conversational combat with Jesus.

Furthermore, John Darr has successfully challenged the view that the Pharisees ought to be seen as distinctively positive, arguing that this longstanding scholarly perception relies heavily on redaction-critical concerns and does not adequately account for the sequential dynamics of reading.[423] Attention to speech and silence in the relevant passages reinforces Darr's point that the Pharisees are not treated favorably in Luke's Gospel. It is true that, initially, the scribes and Pharisees are not necessarily inimical toward Jesus. Their first appearance in the Gospel, Luke 5.17-26, begins with the expository note that the Pharisees and teachers of the law are quietly observing Jesus as he heals (5.17). When Jesus says to the paralytic, "Man, your sins are forgiven you" (5.20), the scribes and the Pharisees react to his statement by beginning "to reason to themselves (διαλογίζομαι), 'Who is this man who is uttering blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone?'" (5.21) Clearly, they find his statement intolerable, and yet they refrain from speaking directly to Jesus. Instead, they are described as "reasoning to

---

[422] Indeed, the Lukan depictions of various Jewish groups defy systematization. The situation is considerably more complicated when one adds the depictions of the Jews in Acts, where as Tyson puts it, "viewpoints and attitudes are not altogether clear and perhaps not even consistent." Tyson, *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars*, 2. Among others, Marguerat identifies both anti-Jewish and pro-Jewish sentiments in Luke-Acts. "Jews and Christians in Conflict," in *First Christian Historian*, 129-54. See also Bovon, "Israel, the Church and the Gentiles in the Twofold Work of Luke," in idem, *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives* (trans. J. Happiseva-Hunter; PTMS 36; Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick Publications, 1995), 81-95.

[423] On the sequential accumulation of the Pharisees' characterization, see John Darr, "Observers Observed: The Pharisees," in *On Character Building*, 85-126.

themselves" (διαλογίζομαι), a verb that Luke regularly uses in a negative sense.[424] This is a form of what Lisa Mazzei calls "veiled silence,"[425] since the legal experts and Pharisees refuse to engage Jesus directly.[426] Evidently, they find security in hiding behind a shield of self-protective silence.

Jesus characteristically destroys their shield, demonstrating his prophetic powers[427] of perception and his authority over who speaks and when. Jesus commands power by defining boundaries around the combat zones of conversational content *and* context. With the express statement that Jesus has "perceived their hostile thoughts" (ἐπιγνοὺς…τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, 5.22), the narrator again recalls the devout Simeon's prophecy that because of Jesus, the thoughts (διαλογισμοί) of many hearts will be revealed (ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν, 2.35). Jesus' privileged knowledge confirms that he is a prophetic figure and affords him a place of power in the ensuing conversation. Since the scribes and Pharisees do not expect him to know their διαλογισμούς, they are unprepared for his response and thus at a disadvantage in the ensuing interaction.

Jesus brings the religious leaders' silently voiced objections into the realm of public knowledge by confronting them directly: "Why are you raising objections in your hearts (διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν)?" (5.22) Jesus then poses a riddle

---

[424] See 2.35, 6.8, 9.47.

[425] Mazzei describes "veiled silence" as those times when people are not literally silent, but metaphorically silent; they either speak to someone other than the person to whom their comment is really directed, or speak of some other subject than that to which their interlocutor has referred. See Mazzei, *Inhabited Silence*, 85-86.

[426] The religious leaders use this strategy frequently in Luke's Gospel. Regularly refusing to engage Jesus directly with spoken words, they instead use strategies of indirection: they pose their questions to the disciples rather than to Jesus (5.30), they chastise the people for coming to be healed on the Sabbath rather than Jesus himself for doing the healing (13.14), and they speak "among themselves/with one another" (6.11; 7.49; 20.5-6). As we will see, in each instance, Jesus draws his opponents' accusations out into public by addressing them directly.

[427] On Jesus as prophet in Luke, see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 204-206.

("Which is easier, to say, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, 'Stand up and walk'?," 5.23), and without waiting for an answer to either question, he heals the paralyzed man – notably, simply by telling him to stand up. In the end, astonishment seizes them "all" (ἅπαντας, 5.26).

Although the referent of the "all" in 5.26 remains ambiguous, it is safe to assume that the Pharisees and scribes are among the group and have witnessed the miraculous healing. The narrator states that they glorify God, directly quoting their awe-filled testimony: "We have seen incredible things today" (5.26). Here, their speech attests to their surprise and wonder at Jesus' power. By the end of this pericope, then, those who initially questioned Jesus in private shift into the use of spoken praise that everyone can hear. This would seem to support the conventional scholarly view that the Pharisees are relatively positive in Luke. And yet, as we will see below, however, this positive response eventually switches entirely to one of malevolence – a negative characterization that is depicted through their uses of and responses to specific uses of speech and silence.

The pericope of 6.6-11 repeats many of the narrative details found in 5.17-26. Again, the story begins with Jesus teaching in the synagogue, and again, the scribes and the Pharisees are present (6.6). And yet, this is a divergent repetition, one that furthers the characterization of the scribes and Pharisees, rather than focusing on Jesus' prophetic abilities. Here, the narrator adds his own commentary in the form of a narrative aside: the scribes and Pharisees are watching Jesus to see if he will heal on the Sabbath "in order (ἵνα) to find a reason to accuse (κατηγορεῖν) him" (6.7).[428] Robert Alter's observation with respect to the Hebrew Bible applies to this passage, as well:

[428] It is strange that Sheeley does not include this in his compilation of Lukan narrative asides. See *Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts*. Lee, on the other hand, includes this verse in his more comprehensive list. *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 345.

> In a narrative tradition where dialogue is preponderant, it may often prove instructive to ask why the writer has decided to use narration instead of dialogue for a particular block of material or even for a particular brief moment in a scene.[429]

Why, then, does Luke use narration here, instead of dialogue? The Lukan narrator's commentary contributes to the developing portrait of the Pharisees and scribes as Jesus' adversaries. As opposed to the pericope in chapter 5, the religious leaders' intentions toward Jesus are now explicitly malicious. Grangaard writes: "Luke discloses through the confrontations that the root characteristic of the religious leaders is self-righteousness."[430] And yet, here as before, they do not voice their self-righteous intentions. They do not expect that their thoughts will be made public. Again, they do not plan to engage verbally with Jesus at all.

In spite of their intentions, the narrator stipulates that Jesus "knew their thoughts" (ᾔδει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, 6.8). Does Jesus address them directly, as he did before? Yes, but the narrator makes the reader wait for this moment. First, Jesus addresses the man with the withered hand: "Rise and stand here" (6.8). The man obeys. Only then does Jesus address his antagonistic audience. This pause increases the suspense of the scene, as the reader must wait to see whether Jesus will again act on his knowledge and address the scribes and Pharisees directly. When he does, he poses an enigmatic question challenging their understanding of the Sabbath ("Is it permissible on the Sabbath to do good or to do evil, to save life or to destroy it?"), looks at all of them (περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς) perhaps with defiance, and heals the man's hand.

It is significant that the narrator does not record any spoken response to Jesus'

---

[429] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 75.

[430] Grangaard, *Conflict and Authority*, 31.

question, nor to his actions. Dialogue simply stops. Instead, in the conclusion of the story, the narrator informs us through simple reporting that they were "filled with mindless fury" (ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας, 6.11). The mindlessness (ἀνοίας) of their fury contrasts with Jesus' absolute command of thought – both his own and others' – which the foregoing scene demonstrates. Theirs is a dangerous ignorance, one that differs strikingly from what Luke's implied readers might have assumed in encountering such characters, who are supposedly educated and trained in the law.

At the end of the pericope, the narrator again eschews direct dialogue, merely reporting that the religious leaders are "discussing with one another what they might do to Jesus" (6.11). Of course, this reaction is diametrically opposed to their (directly quoted) response of glorifying God after the healing of the paralytic man in 5.17-26. Many scholars have attributed the scribes' and Pharisees' fury to Jesus' blatant disregard for Jewish tradition, and indeed, this is clearly a major factor in their growing hostility. Still, the narrator's final explanatory summation in 6.11 does not highlight this reason. Instead, it underscores the religious leaders' suspicious speech: they were "discussing with one another (πρὸς ἀλλήλους) what they might do to Jesus." As before, they speak privately to those in their inner circle, but they hope to keep both their concerns and intentions hidden from Jesus. Again, they attempt to hide behind a self-protective shield of silence, a shroud of secrecy. The narrator permits this for the time being, but their private deliberations serve as an ominous harbinger of coming calamity.

The Disciples

The Galilean ministry section of the gospel (4.14-9.50) also introduces a second main character group: Jesus' disciples. Like the religious leaders, the disciples, too, are characterized by their uses of speech and silence. Notice that, despite being major characters in the story, the disciples rarely speak on their own authority.[431] Especially in the beginning of the narrative, they are with Jesus, "but as little more than stage props."[432] Jesus commands them to remain silent following Peter's confession that Jesus is the Christ in 9.22, and they "tell no one" (οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν) what they witness at the Transfiguration (9.28-36). The few times the disciples speak with authority, the only reason they can "heal diseases and proclaim the kingdom of God" is because Jesus has expressly commissioned them to do so (9.1-2; 10.1-17).

When the disciples do speak of their own accord, they are usually shown to be foolish or uncomprehending.[433] Although the so-called misunderstanding motif is regularly discussed regarding the disciples' characterization in Mark's Gospel,[434] this theme is rarely considered with respect to Luke.[435] Nevertheless, the disciples in Luke

---

[431] That is, until the book of Acts.

[432] Joel Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 103.

[433] One key exception to the disciples' foolish and uncomprehending speech is Peter's confession in 9.20 that Jesus is "the Christ of God" (τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ). Note that Luke diverges from the Synoptic pattern here, omitting any negative exchange between Jesus and Peter (cf. Jesus' subsequent rebuke of Peter in Matt. 16.22 and Mark 8.32). In Luke, Peter's confession that Jesus is τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ stands unchallenged.

[434] There is a long bibliography on this topic; some representative works include: J.B. Tyson, "Blindness of the Disciples in Mark," *JBL* 80 (1961): 261-68; R.C. Tannehill, "Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role," *JR* 57 (1977): 386-405; Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "Fallible Followers: Women and Men in the Gospel of Mark," *Semeia* 28 (1983): 29-48; Frank Matera, "The Incomprehension of the Disciples and Peter's Confession (Mark 6,14-8,30)," *Bib* 70 (1989): 153-72; Suzanne Watts Henderson, "Concerning the Loaves: Comprehending Incomprehension in Mark 6.45-52," *JSNT* 83 (2001): 3-25.

[435] Ivan Shing Chung Kwong is an exception; he recognizes this difference between Markan and Lukan scholarship. Though he uses a different methodology (analyzing word order), he comes to a conclusion that is similar to mine: the disciples' failure to understand Jesus is a "foregrounded message" in Luke. *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke*, 198.

also embody misunderstanding,[436] and this is most commonly demonstrated through their (mis)use of speech and silence.

For example, at Jesus' Transfiguration, Peter, James, and John witness Moses and Elijah standing with Jesus in "glorious splendor" (9.31). Peter attempts to render his presence useful, or at least beneficial, saying, "Master, it is good for us to be here. Let us make three shelters, one for you and one for Moses and one for Elijah" (9.33). The narrator, however, explains that Peter spoke, "not knowing what he was saying" (9.33). Peter's awkward response and the narrator's commentary on it bespeak an underlying sense that this miraculous event far exceeds the quotidian concerns of having a roof over one's head.[437] The Transfiguration is ineffable; the narrator's subsequent pithy explanation renders Peter's speech almost laughable.

Elsewhere, the Lukan narrator explicitly connects the disciples' misunderstanding of Jesus' words to their silence. On the one hand, although they ask Jesus to clarify a parable in 8.9 ("Then his disciples asked – ἐπηρώτων – him what this parable might mean"), they later voluntarily employ silence by refusing to ask about a confusing saying:

> But they did not understand (οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν)[438] this word (τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο), and it had been hidden from them so that they might not understand it, and they were *afraid to ask him* (ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτόν) about this word (τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου). (9.45)[439]

---

[436] See especially the rapid succession of misunderstandings and failures in chapter 9: 9.10-17, 28-36, 37-42, 44-45, 49-50, 54-55, 57-62.

[437] This is true even if, as Nolland proposes, Peter's real desire is to "preserve inviolate the scene of glory that the three have witnessed." *Luke 9.21-18.34*, 501.

[438] Although Mary says that she has not "known" a man in 1.34, this a biblical euphemism for sexual relations. Other instances of οὐ γινώσκω include 12.46; 18.34; 19.44; 24.18. συνιημι occurs in the negative in 2.50, 8.10, 18.34. ἀγνοέω is found in 9.45; οὐδεὶς γινώσκει occurs in 10.21-24.

[439] Note that for Luke, the disciples' fear is focused on the word, rather than Jesus himself as in Mark 9.32. Even after Jesus' third Passion prophecy, the disciples remain uncomprehending: They "understood none of these things. This saying was hidden from them, and they did not understand (οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον) what had been said" (18.34).

Note that the very next verse throws their silence into stark relief by directly contrasting their refusal to ask Jesus about his suffering with their eager readiness to enter into a verbal debate (εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμός) about who among them is the greatest.[440]

On the other hand, the disciples' misunderstanding also leads them to try and silence others. At one point, they even try to stop someone from using the power of Jesus' name to cast out demons (9.49). Jesus corrects them: "Do not stop him; for whoever is not against you is for you" (9.50). Up until this point in Luke, the disciples are consistently characterized by foibles of speech and failures of understanding.

Jesus

In the Galilean ministry section, speech and silence further the characterization of Jesus that began in the introductory section of Luke's Gospel. In this section, I will highlight three distinct aspects of this characterization: others' speech about Jesus, Jesus' speech-related teachings, and Jesus' own uses of speech and silence.

Jesus In Others' Words

The previous chapter demonstrated that in Luke's preface and introduction, the narrator establishes Jesus' authority through the repeated attestations of authoritative, reliable characters. In this section of the Gospel, others' words about Jesus continue to contribute to his characterization as an authority figure, albeit more indirectly than the speech of divine messengers and prophets in Luke 1.1-4.13. As discussed earlier, the Galilean ministry initiates the repeated refrain of spoken reports about Jesus, or "Jesus-news." In

[440] The contrastive δὲ connects the two verses more closely than most English translations depict.

Luke's world, talk is a medium of exchange and plays a major role in shaping people's perceptions of their social reality. Malina and Rohrbaugh briefly discuss the "gossip network"[441] in Luke from a social-scientific perspective:[442]

> Among nonliterate people…communication [was] basically by word of mouth [and was] a major factor in the identification and legitimation of leaders. A widely acknowledged reputation, confirmed and sustained by an informal gossip network, provided a foundation for public authority.[443]

The spread of spoken reports by others establishes Jesus' acquired honor and positive public reputation, thereby increasing his authority and stature in the narrative.

Jesus' Words About Speech

Whereas Jesus is relatively silent in Luke's beginning materials, in the Galilean Ministry section of Luke's Gospel, Jesus begins to teach publicly, "with authority."[444] Jesus' teachings in Luke span a wide range of ethical, theological, and practical matters, and resources on these are readily available elsewhere.[445] Here, I want to highlight Jesus' speech-related teachings, especially as a window onto Luke's rhetoric of characterization:

---

[441] This reference to "gossip" differs from the common understanding of gossip as malicious slander (and the equally common association of such speech with women). Several scholars have explored the question of whether women in the New Testament are stereotypically connected to gossip and/or "empty talk." See Seim, *The Double Message*, 156-63; Anne Thurston, *Because of her Testimony: The Word in Female Experience* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1995); Richard L. Rohrbaugh, "Gossip in the New Testament," *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2001); Marianne Bjelland Kartzow, *Gossip and Gender: Othering of Speech in the Pastoral Epistles* (New York: de Gruyter, 2009), esp. ch. 5.

[442] Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary*, 325-326.

[443] Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary*, 367.

[444] Lk. 4.32, 36.

[445] Many such inquiries focus on the pedagogical interests of Jesus and/or the narrator. Nathan Dickman asserts that Jesus' questions tend to be studied "as a strategy by which Jesus promotes discernment in his interlocutors..." *Dialogue and Divinity: A Hermeneutics of the Interrogative Mood in Religious Language* (Ph.d. Diss.: The University of Iowa, 2009), 20. See Pheme Perkins, *Jesus as Teacher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). Gillian Clark also states, "Jesus tells stories…that work by conversation..." "'Can We Talk?': Augustine and the Possibility of Dialogue," in *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity* (ed. Simon Goldhill; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 117-18.

what Jesus says about speech reveals aspects of his own character and suggests a framework of evaluation for readerly interpretation.

What does Jesus teach about speech? At first, it appears that Jesus contradicts himself in his teachings about the spoken word. On the one hand, as Spencer points out, Jesus' second Galilean ministry speech (6.17-49) establishes that "ethical behavior derives from the καρδία ('heart')."[446] For Luke, καρδία refers to the realm of one's intentions, thoughts, feelings, and desires, and can even denote the internal processing and remembering of what one sees and hears.[447] In this public oration, Jesus specifically uses speech as an illustration of ethical behavior that originates in the καρδία: "A good person brings forth what is good out of the good treasure (θησαυροῦ) of his heart; and an evil person brings forth what is evil: for out of the abundance of the heart (καρδία), [one's] mouth (στόμα) speaks" (6.45).[448] This statement implies that whether good (ἀγαθὸς) or evil (πονηρὸς), what one says clearly reflects what is in one's heart.[449] Another way of putting this is to say that for Jesus, a person's speech tells us something about the nature of his or her inner character. Hultin writes: "The effect of this teaching is

---

[446] Spencer further writes, "the actions of those who embody Jesus' teaching as well as the actions of those who are opposed to the new religious and social order Jesus preaches originate from the inner being of the person." *Rhetorical Texture*, 145-46.

[447] See, e.g., 2.19, 35, 51; 10.27; 12.34; 16.15; 21.34. For more on this, see the article by Baumgärtel and Behm, sv *kardia* in *TDNT* III, 605-613.

[448] Note that the parallel in *Gospel of Thomas* 45 does not explicitly mention *speaking*: "Out of the abundance of the heart he brings forth evil things."

[449] This concept was by no means unique. In the fifth-century B.C.E., Euripides wrote of speaking truth from the heart (καρδία). *Iphigenia in Aulis*, 475. The first-century C.E. author "Longinus" insists that "great utterance is the echo of greatness of soul." *On the Sublime*, 9.2. The early second-century C.E. Sirach says: "The root of the heart's deliberations produces four branches: good and evil, life and death; and the tongue is the absolute master over them all." Sir. 37.17-18. Elsewhere in Luke, see 11.39, 41: "But the Lord said to him, 'Now you Pharisees clean the outside of the cup and the plate, but inside you are full of greed and wickedness . . . But give from your heart (καρδία) to those in need, and then everything will be clean for you.'"

to collapse any gap between who people are and what they say."[450] This can be distinguished from another prevailing ancient viewpoint; Plato, for instance, insisted that behavior (including the uses of particular kinds of language) changes one's inner character.[451]

And yet, there is a tension here: what Jesus says directly after this statement appears to overturn the conclusion that one's speech indicates what is in the heart; Jesus asks his disciples, "Why do you call me 'Lord, Lord,' and don't do what I tell you?" (6.46)[452] With this question, Jesus casts the veracity of others' words into question and suggests that speech can be an unreliable index of one's true intentions. Those who merely flatter others with their words are fickle friends. As we have seen through the religious leaders' uses of and responses to speech, the spoken word has dangerous potential. For Luke's Jesus, one specific reason that speech can cause harm is that words often are deceptive. Without behavior that corresponds to and corroborates what one says, speech becomes idle chatter at best and vicious weapon at worst. At times, in contrast to Hultin's statement cited above, what one says might actually *mask* who one really is.

How does one reconcile these two juxtaposed views? Does speech *reflect* what is in one's καρδία, or *conceal* it? The answer to this question is woven like a richly textured tapestry throughout Jesus' teachings in Luke's Galilean ministry section. The common thread throughout is the power of the spoken word, and the answer specifically

---

[450] Hultin is discussing the Matthean parallel, but his comment applies to Luke's version, as well. Jeremy Hultin, *Watch Your Mouth*, 158-59.

[451] See, e.g., *Republic* 3, where Plato outlines the dangerous ways that imitating (*mimesis*) establishes bad habits in "body, speech, and thought" (3.395D).

[452] Compare to the much earlier Homeric quote from Achilles: "Hateful to me as the gates of Hell is he who conceals one thought in his heart but speaks another." *Iliad*, 9.312.

hinges on the right reception of "the word of God" (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ). The logic for Jesus' emphasis on the state of one's heart can be adumbrated as follows (and will be developed in further detail below): if one's heart is good, one will receive the word of God and bear fruit; one critical form of this "bearing of fruit" – and thus, a measure of one's internal disposition – is the nature of one's speech.

The programmatic Parable of the Sower in 8.4-21 is perhaps the best depiction of this concatenation of ethics, speech, internal disposition, perception, and God's word. The parable and Jesus' subsequent explanation vividly demonstrate that for Luke's Jesus, simply listening to the word of God is not enough to indicate a good and noble heart. Like the seed that falls on the path, rocks, or thorns, some people receive the word of God, but for various reasons, it does not take root and bear fruit in their lives.[453] Instead, one's pre-existing internal disposition determines whether or not one will willingly welcome the word of God into her or his heart: only those who hear the word (ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον), cling to it (κατέχουσιν) with an honest and good heart (καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ),[454] and bear fruit (καρποφοροῦσιν) with steadfast endurance (8.15) demonstrate their good character.

Scholarly interpretations of this parable tend to focus on the theological theme of hearing and doing the word of God. Indeed, Lukan coupling of the word of God and the "bearing of fruit" – i.e., doing good deeds – is well known.[455] Jesus states, "No good tree

---

[453] As John Darr puts it, the Parable of the Sower answers the question, "Why is it that some (like the Pharisees), despite paying rapt attention to Jesus, fail to apprehend him and his message, while others truly 'see and hear' immediately?" Darr, "Watch How You Listen," 100.

[454] This is a common Hellenistic formulation for a noble character. Cf. Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics* 1, 8, 13.

[455] For other instances connecting the metaphor of "bearing fruit" with one's true nature, see Lk. 3.8-9; 6.43-44; 8.14-15; 13.6-9.

bears bad fruit, nor again does a bad tree bear good fruit; for each tree is known by its own fruit" (6.43-44).[456] He cautions against being one who "*hears* but does not *do*" his words (6.49), and boldly redefines his family as those who "who *hear* the word of God *and do it* (ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες)" (8.21).[457] The "hierarchy of values" portrayed by the Lukan text is, as Darr puts it, "attention-retention-production."[458]

What often becomes eclipsed by the emphasis on *hearing and doing* is that Jesus is also concerned with *saying*. Significantly, Jesus uses speech as the crowning application of the more general principle:[459] "Out of the abundance of the heart (καρδία), [one's] mouth (στόμα) speaks" (6.45).[460] The state of one's heart dictates whether one will receive the word of God, and it also determines the nature of one's own speech.

Jesus' speech-related teachings develop the Lukan narrative's rhetoric of characterization in two directions. First, Jesus' assertions that the state of one's heart

---

[456] This refrain is not unique to Jesus: as Downing demonstrates, the literature of antiquity often juxtaposes hearing and doing. Downing cites, for example, James 1.22: "Be doers of the word, and not merely hearers," and Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 6.4: "People who say fine things but don't do them are no different from a harp – deaf and insensible." Downing also points out how many biblical scholars assume that narrated "events" are more historically accurate than "sayings." See especially the second chapter, Francis Gerald Downing, "Words as Deeds and Deeds as Words," *Doing Things with Words in the First Christian Century* (New York: T&T Clark, 2000), 41.

[457] Similarly, when a woman in the crowd indirectly praises Jesus by saying his mother is blessed, Jesus responds by correcting her: "Blessed rather are those who *hear* (ἀκούοντες) the word of God *and do it* (φυλάσσοντες)" (11.28). Although this word, φυλάσσω, is rare in the New Testament, it is common in the LXX, where it most commonly refers to observing divine commandments. (See, e.g., Exod. 23.22; Deut. 7.12). Jesus strikingly refers to his own words in the same way (6.47-48).

[458] Darr, "Watch How You Listen," 99.

[459] That the Matthean parallel in 12:34-35 has the order reversed (speech example, and then general principle) underscores the Lukan emphasis on speech as the optimum demonstration of one's internal disposition. Further, notice that the saying is told in a polemical context in Matthew, whereas in Luke, Jesus is teaching the disciples.

[460] Topel hints at the importance of this when he italicizes "spoken": "This restored heart produces…not only the good works that manifest the Christian character of the disciple's heart, but also a *spoken* good judgment that helps the brother (6.45c)." *Children of a Compassionate God*, 211.

determines whether one will receive God's word can be applied to Jesus' words, as well. It is quite common to observe that Jesus often speaks the word of God: he is the "heaven-sent mouthpiece of God."[461] In studies of this theological theme, "the word" (ὁ λόγος) is taken as a theological category that refers to "the word of/about God," and often is understood as synonymous with "the word of/about Jesus." However, fewer scholars have considered how, over the course of the telling of the story, Jesus' words become so closely aligned with "the word of God" that hearing Jesus speak becomes "equivalent to hearing the divine word."[462] This "perceptional alignment"[463] becomes progressively evident over the course of the narrative.

From the very beginning of the Gospel narrative, people are described as being amazed (θαυμάζω) at the miraculous acts of God.[464] As Luke's story progresses, the amazement of the crowds becomes increasingly linked to Jesus' speech.[465] Jesus claims for himself the authority to forgive sins, and "astonishment (ἔκστασις) seizes them all" (5.24-26). Jesus also boldly declares, "Everyone who comes to me and hears my words (μου τῶν λόγων) and does them" is like a man who builds his house on a firm foundation (6.47-48). Conversely, those who reject Jesus' words also "reject the one who sent" him (10.16). Jesus even goes so far as to characterize his own words as eternal, using imagery that in the Hebrew Bible refers to God's word: "Heaven and earth will

---

[461] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2: 1032. Indeed, the Lukan text itself makes this clear: "Now Jesus was standing by the Lake of Gennesaret, and the crowd was pressing around him to hear the word of God (τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ)" (5.1).

[462] Darr, "Watch How You Listen," 92.

[463] Darr, "Watch How You Listen," 92.

[464] See 1.63; 2.18, 33.

[465] See 4.22, 32, 36.

pass away, but my words (οἱ λόγοι μου) will never pass away" (21.33).[466] The language Jesus uses to describe the ideal relationship to God's words also describes the ideal relationship to his own words: just as God's words must be received and obeyed, Jesus' words must also be received and obeyed. This, in turn, contributes to Jesus' characterization by heightening his authority in the story and implicitly subordinating all other characters to him.

Second, on the level of the telling, Jesus' teachings about speech allow the narrator to establish an interpretive framework from which readers can evaluate various characters. For instance, Jesus himself can be seen as the quintessential "good soil," the recipient of God's word *par excellence*, because Jesus obediently receives and speaks the word of God. Read through the lens of Jesus' authoritative teachings on the subject, other characters' spoken words situate them with respect to God's word and/or Jesus' words, and correlatively, to the narrative world's normative values. For instance, the prophetic words of characters like Gabriel, Simeon, and Anna – and the subsequent fulfillments of those prophecies in the narrative – identify these characters as reliable recipients of and witnesses to ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.[467] On the other hand, the antagonistic speech of Luke's religious leaders situates them as Jesus' opponents and simultaneously, as opponents of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.

In the section that follows, we will consider how Jesus' own uses of speech and silence in the Galilean ministry section reflect and authenticate his teachings on the

[466] Isaiah 40.8 has similar imagery, but with reference to God's word: "the grass dries up, the flowers wither, but the word of our God (LXX: τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν) lasts forever."

[467] Compare to Deut. 18:21-22: "Now if you say to yourselves, 'How can we tell that a message is not from the LORD?' whenever a prophet speaks in my name and the prediction is not fulfilled, then I have not spoken it; the prophet has presumed to speak it, so you need not fear him."

subject. In other words, the story the Lukan narrator tells his readers about uses of speech mirrors the story Jesus tells his disciples.

Jesus' Miraculous Uses of Speech and Silence

As Jesus begins his public ministry, the reader begins to witness him using speech and silence in powerful ways. In addition to verbally emphasizing that his disciples should put his words into practice, Jesus also demonstrates that using words is itself a kind of practice. Jesus' interactions in Luke's Gospel exemplify the claim (popularized in contemporary scholarship by speech-act theorists) that words do particular kinds of work.[468] Words are *per*formative, not solely *in*formative: words can harm or heal, comfort or condemn, rebuff or renew.[469]

Miracles. During his time in Galilee, Jesus uses speech to enact miracles:[470] he "commands" (ἐπετίμησεν) Simon's mother-in-law's fever to leave her and it does (4.38-39); he tells Simon to let down his nets and Simon receives a miraculous catch of fish (5.5-7); he says to a leper, "Be made clean" (καθαρίσθητι) and the leprosy immediately leaves (5.13); he commands a paralyzed man, "I say to you, stand up..." and immediately, the man stands and walks home (5.23-25). These and other similar examples demonstrate Jesus' uses of speech to perform miracles which, in turn,

---

[468] The paradigmatic work is J.L. Austin, *How To Do Things with Words* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975). The literature relating speech-act theory to biblical interpretation is substantial. Representative works include Hugh White, ed., *Speech-Act Theory and Biblical Criticism* (Semeia 41; Decatur: Scholars Press, 1988).

[469] Actions – even those done silently – also communicate. Even Jesus' healings that are described with no direct speech are themselves a message, communicating to other characters and to readers that Jesus has supernatural power.

[470] Accounts of Jesus' miracles do not always explicitly mention speech. See Lk. 4.40; 5.15;

corroborate audacious claims he makes about his identity and divine calling: he asserts that he has been sent to "preach good news (εὐαγγελίσασθαι) to the poor [and] proclaim (κηρύξαι) release to the captives" (4.18), to "proclaim (κηρύξαι) the year of the Lord's favor" (4.19), and to "preach the good news (εὐαγγελίσασθαί) of the kingdom of God" (4.43); and he claims to be able to forgive sins (5.20, 24; 7.47-48).

Exorcisms. The exorcisms in Luke present speech and silence as evidence of control. Luke's demonic characters repeatedly attempt to act as gatekeepers of who can and cannot speak. For instance, when the devil tempts Jesus in the wilderness, he does so by trying to direct Jesus' use of speech: "If you are the Son of God, say (εἰπὲ) to this stone that it should become bread" (4.3). The demons take a different approach; rather than endeavoring to regulate Jesus' speech, they suppress the speech of the humans they inhabit.[471] Notice that in each exorcism story, the possessed human cannot speak; the demon renders the human speechless, and in so doing, signals the human's powerlessness.[472]

And yet, Jesus unfailingly refuses to allow the demons to continue silencing their victims; Jesus' first exorcism directly follows an explicit mention of his authority in 4.32. Significantly, the means of depicting that authority is through the technique of silencing: Jesus silences "the spirit of an unclean demon" (4.33).[473] At the beginning of this scene,

---

[471] This is not to say that the demon's control over the human is *solely* verbal. See 4.35; 8.27, 29; 9.39, 42.

[472] 4.33-37; 8.26-39; 9.37-43; 11.14. In two cases, the demon itself speaks to Jesus (4.32; 8.28, 30).

[473] It is significant that the demon "cries out" (ἀνακράζω) "with a loud voice" (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, 4.33). In Luke-Acts, this verb is only used to describe demons' speech, with one significant exception: during Jesus' trial before Pilate, the chief priests and crowds cry out (ἀνακράζω) in condemnation of Jesus, calling for the release of Barabbas in his place (23.18). Indeed, the use of this verb in 23.18 may be an intentional relating of Jesus' human opponents with demons.

the demon cries out to Jesus "with a loud voice" (4.33). And yet, in this and other exorcism pericopes, once Jesus has performed the miracle, the demons are involuntarily silenced. Each time a demon leaves, it is never to be heard from again in the narrative.[474] Notably, the demons all respond to Jesus by leaving without protest – with the silence of defeat, they forfeit their power over the possessed ones.

This acquiescence should not be taken for granted;[475] after all, as we noted earlier, human characters do not always obey Jesus' command to remain silent.[476] In contrast to the disobedient human characters, every time Jesus tells demons or unclean spirits not to speak, they are immediately – and completely – silenced.[477] The demons move from being controllers of speech to being silenced themselves by Jesus. As such, these moments provide a concrete picture of Jesus' supernatural power: the demons are silenced and the forces of darkness are contained.

It is also significant that Jesus silences the demons simply by *telling* them to be silent. As opposed to other exorcists of the time, when exorcising a demon, Jesus does not recite a magical incantation[478] or invoke a god's name in arrogation of someone or

---

[474] In this way, the telling of the story is analogous to what is described: Jesus commands silence, and the demon disappears from the story altogether.

[475] Compare this to the second-century text, *Acts of Peter* 11, in which a demon who is being expelled causes the possessed man to rush forward and break the emperor's statue.

[476] See Lk. 5.12-16.

[477] This coheres with David Lee's suggestion (based on different criteria) that the narrator perceives Jesus as "*less* authoritative in his interaction with the people than with the demons." Lee, *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 219.

[478] Todd Klutz does consider Jesus' command, "Be quiet and come out" (4.35) to be an "incantatory formula." Oddly, Klutz does not include 11.14 in his treatment of the exorcisms in Luke-Acts. Todd E. Klutz, *The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading* (SNTSMS 129; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 66.

something else's power.[479] Instead, he rebukes (ἐπιτιμάω) demons with his own authoritative word: "Be silenced (φιμώθητι)[480] and come out of him!" (4.35). The bystanders' subsequent exclamation focuses on the power of Jesus' exorcistic command, his "word": "What is this word (τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος)? For with authority and power (ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει)[481] he commands the unclean spirits and they come out" (4.37).

Jesus' exorcisms enact the prophetic claim of his Nazareth sermon that he has been sent to free the oppressed (ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει, 4.18). Twice, Jesus is specifically described as restoring the previously possessed person's voice. Jesus tells the Gerasene demoniac, for example, "'declare (διηγοῦ) what God has done for you.' So he went away, proclaiming (κηρύσσων) throughout the whole town what he had done for him" (8.39). After the exorcism in 11.14, miraculous speech is the sign that Jesus has performed a miracle: the narrator reports that the formerly mute man "began to speak" (ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν). For these possessed characters, Jesus authoritatively reinstates the power to speak and in this way, restores them to life in a metaphorical recapitulation of his raising of the dead man in Nain (7.11-17).

---

[479] There are many examples of such exorcisms in ancient literature. See, e.g., collections and related discussions in John Gager, ed., *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); Robert Daniel and Fraco Maltomini, *Supplementum Magicum* (2 vols.; Opladen: Westdeutscher, 1990-1992); Hans Dieter Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Vol. 1* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Paul Mirecki and Marvin W. Meyer, eds. *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 141; Leiden: Brill, 1995); Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus* (Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1993); idem, "Jesus the Exorcist and Ancient Magic," *A Kind of Magic: Understanding Magic in the New Testament and its Religious Environment* (ed. Michael Labahn and Bert Peerbolte; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 57-86.

[480] This is the only occurrence of φιμόω, "to put to silence" in Luke-Acts. The use of the passive imperative form underscores that the agent who does the silencing is Jesus; the demon himself no longer has any control over his speech.

[481] In Greek, this phrase ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει is in an emphatic position at the beginning of the clause.

Jesus' Control of Others' Speech

Jesus' power over who can and cannot speak is not limited to demonic characters. Perhaps the most dramatic instance of this power occurs in Luke 7.11-17. There, Jesus enters the town of Nain, where he encounters the burial procession of a widow's only son. Moved by compassion for the woman, Jesus raises the man from the dead, saying, "Young man, I say to you, rise!" (7.14) The proof that the man has risen is that his speech is restored: "The dead man sat up and began to speak (ἤρξατο λαλεῖν)" (7.15). In this brief narrative moment, Jesus displays miraculous power over the ultimate form of silencing: death. Jesus' restoration of the man's speech is – literally – a return to life.

Messenger Scenes as Speech Control. Luke 7.1-10 adds another dimension to our consideration of speech control as a manifestation of power. Dominant members of society not only (attempt to) regulate when subordinates can or cannot speak; they also have the power to send others to speak on their behalf. Such scenes challenge the conventional assumption that physical distance implies the absence of voice. In messenger scenes, the sender's physical distance does not decrease his authority; instead, his voice establishes his authority even as it is mediated through the subordinate messenger. In Luke 7.1-10, when a centurion sends messengers to ask Jesus to heal his ailing servant, the situation is a unique kind of paradox: "the centurion is the main character, but never personally appears on stage."[482]

Still, the centurion understands the power of the spoken word. Despite his own physical distance from Jesus and, as a Gentile, his metaphorical distance from God's chosen people, the centurion nevertheless believes in Jesus' power *as expressed through*

[482] Bovon, *Luke 1*, 265.

the spoken word. He asserts, "only speak the word, and let my servant be healed" (εἰπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήτω ὁ παῖς μου, 7.7). As Bovon points out, in antiquity, "miraculous healings were thought to be possible only through direct contact."[483] In contrast to this common ancient conviction, the centurion believes that Jesus' spoken word will function as a deed in and of itself – by speaking a word, Jesus will enact healing. Readers know that the centurion is right because they have already witnessed Jesus heal with only a word.[484] As we saw earlier, for his part, Jesus reacts to the centurion's faith with amazement and admiration (θαυμάζω, 7.9),[485] commends him to the crowd, and grants the request to heal his servant.

Additionally, the mode by which the centurion communicates his message is a direct instantiation of the message itself. In this case, the narrator develops the theme of the power of the spoken word through the use of the common literary trope of the intermediary.[486] In these types of stories, the voice of the absent character is Luke's way of rendering him present *in absentia*. The centurion's literal absence from the scene is mitigated first by the Jewish elders who speak on his behalf (7.3-4),[487] and then by his friends, who speak his words *in the first person*: "Lord, do not trouble yourself, for I am not worthy that you should enter under my roof" (κύριε, μὴ σκύλλου, οὐ γὰρ ἱκανός

---

[483] Bovon, *Luke 1*, 262.

[484] 5.24-26, 6.10.

[485] θαυμάζω might also be translated as "to marvel at" or "to admire." Many scholars have oriented their discussions of this text around Jesus' explicit contrast of the centurion with Israel. The centurion stands as a paragon of faith and a corrective to those Lukan readers who still privileged Jews over Gentiles.

[486] Elsewhere in the Lukan narrative, Jesus similarly sends people to speak on his behalf (See e.g., 19.32, 22.13), and God also speaks through intermediaries such as angels/divine beings (See e.g., 1.11-19, 26-38; 2.9-10; 24.4-7) and prophets (one of whom is Jesus himself; See e.g., 1.67; 2.25-36; 3.16; 7.27; 9.52; 10.1).

[487] The elders speak in their own voices on behalf of the centurion: "He is worthy of having you grant this for him…" (7.3).

εἰμι ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς, 7.6). The fact that the centurion's friends speak in first person direct discourse enacts the very point he wishes to make: he has the power to tell others what to do, and his word is fulfilled (7.8).[488]

In the power dynamics of such situations, Luke establishes a clear hierarchy: representative intermediaries, though they speak, nevertheless remain subordinate to the one whose words they voice.[489] The centurion knows this to be true, likening Jesus' authority to his own role as a superior officer: "I say to this one, 'Go,' and he goes, and to another, 'Come,' and he comes, and to my slave, 'Do this,' and he does it" (7.8). Despite his authority, however, the centurion is unable to heal his servant; in this sense, he is wordless – powerless – to heal his servant and therefore needs Jesus' help. Implicitly, then, even as he poses an analogy between Jesus and himself, the centurion also recognizes where the analogy breaks down. He knows that he himself is a man "under authority" (ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, 7.8) and that with respect to the miraculous ability to heal, his wordlessness is synonymous with powerlessness.

The ending of 7.1-10 further indicates that the healing of the centurion's slave is not the main point of this passage. The narrator simply reports in somewhat anti-climactic fashion that those who had been sent returned and found the slave in good health. Of

---

[488] Similarly, just a few verses later in chapter 7, John the Baptist sends two disciples to Jesus, directing them to ask, "Are you the one who is to come, or should we be looking for another?" (7.19). When the disciples reach Jesus, they repeat John's question word-for-word: "Are you the one who is to come, or should we be looking for another?" (7.20). Like the centurion's friends, John's disciples speak on John's behalf *using his words*; though he is literally absent from the scene, by faithfully giving voice to his words, his disciples render him present. Jesus then sends John's messengers back with a message of his own.

[489] The only exception to this is Luke 19, where a group of subjects send a delegation (πρεσβεία) after their new king to tell him they do not want him to rule over them (19.14). Still, this exception may in fact prove the rule, since the king ultimately commands that they be slaughtered before him (19.27). The implication is that the king's subjects should have maintained the silence of subordination. This text communicates the ideological ideal that only figures with authority can rightfully send messengers, that these messengers must faithfully give voice to their masters' messages, and that any breach of this proper procedure will lead to dire – even fatal – consequences.

course, this implies that Jesus has in fact "said the word" (7.10). Still, the reader does not hear any dialogue to this effect; instead, direct dialogue gives way to the privileged summation of the narrator, who then quickly moves on to the next scene. In each Lukan instance of the messenger motif, the same dynamic is at work: a speaker (the intermediary), in faithfully portraying the sender's message,[490] dramatizes the very point of the centurion's message to Jesus – the words of an authority are themselves powerful deeds, and true authorities have control over speech, even when they are not physically present.

Speech control is not limited to messenger scenes; it is a pervasive underlying assumption throughout Luke's narrative that the ability to manipulate others' speech demonstrates social hierarchy. To understand this motif fully, we must dispense with the popular misconception that ancient Greco-Roman societies held a similar concept to our contemporary idea of "freedom of speech."[491] Even in democratic Athens, the freedom to speak was a status-based privilege, and this was still more the case in the Roman Empire of the first and second centuries C.E.[492]

---

[490] The high value of a trustworthy messenger was already part of the Jewish tradition. Prov. 25.13, for example, says, "Like the coolness of snow at harvest time is a trustworthy messenger to those who send him. He refreshes the spirit of his masters." Prov. 26.6 says, conversely, "Like cutting off the feet or drinking violence, so is sending a message by the hand of a fool."

[491] Hansen demonstrates this assumption: "The most treasured of individual rights is freedom of speech…we find the same ideal in democratic Athens." *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles and Ideology* (Oxford, 1991), 77.

[492] D.M. Carter, "Citizen Attribute, Negative Right: A Conceptual Difference Between Ancient and Modern Ideas of Freedom of Speech," in *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity* (ed. Ineke Sluiter, Ralph Mark Rosen; University of Pennsylvania, 2002), 197-221. In Euripides' *Phoenissae*, Polyneices tells his mother Jocasta that the worst part of being an exile is to "not have freedom of speech" (οὐκ ἔχει παρρησίαν), to which she replies, "Not to speak openly is a slave's life." *Phoen.* 390-394. A.S. Way, *Euripides,* 4 vols. LCL (New York: Macmillan, 1912), 374. Closer to the time of the Gospel, Philo writes, "You are a slave, you have no claim to speech." *Every Good Man is Free* 48. F.H. Colson, G.H. Whitaker, et al., *Philo*, 12 vols. LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-1953). Though there are also exceptions; Laird cites Ovid's love elegy *Amores* as an example of the speaker who is in a subordinate role to the silent addressee. *Powers of Expression*, 19.

Against this background, it is fitting that one way social hierarchy manifests itself in Luke's story is that characters who perceive themselves as having a higher status than other characters will attempt to regulate whether those people can speak. When the blind beggar calls out to Jesus for help, the crowd "rebukes" (ἐπετίμων) him so that he will be silent (ἵνα σιγήσῃ, 18.39); they assume not only that Jesus should not be bothered by someone so unimportant, but also that they have the right to silence him.[493] As we saw previously, even the disciples try to silence others, and Jesus corrects them (9.49-50). Any time characters fail to control others' speech, they are signaling their subordination to the true head of the speech hierarchy: Jesus.

Furthermore, Jesus' influence over distinct character groups' speech actualizes different aspects of Jesus' overall characterization in the narrative. Whereas his control of the demons' speech demonstrates his otherworldly power, his control of certain human characters' speech – especially their thoughts – establishes his prophetic knowledge and his role as judge. The next section addresses this latter category of speech control as an element of Jesus' characterization.

Jesus Exposes Others' Unspoken Speech. Thus far, we have discussed overt instances of Jesus' powerful influence over others' speech, including his silencing of the demons and his supernatural restoration of a dead man to life and speech. Within the story, then, Jesus' control over who can and cannot speak consolidates his authority. We can further nuance this claim by turning to a narrower category that belongs somewhere between speech and silence as commonly construed: unspoken words, or thought. Throughout the

[493] Notably, Jesus himself does not silence the man. On the contrary, he rewards the man's faith by healing him (18.40-43).

Lukan narrative, characters are described as thinking, considering, pondering (διαλογίζομαι, συμβάλλω, δοκέω, κατανοέω), or wondering, marvelling (θαυμάζω, ἐκπλήσσω, γίνομαι θάμβος), or speaking "in their hearts" (ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν) or "to themselves" (πρὸς ἑαυτούς).[494] The Lukan Jesus consistently knows and exposes their thoughts. Considering the instances of unspoken speech in the narrative underscores Jesus' control not only over who can and cannot speak, but also over who can and cannot remain silent.

Most scholars neglect, or downplay, this aspect of the Lukan narrative.[495] Oddly, Philippe Rolland, in an article on Jesus' ability to perceive his opponents' unspoken thoughts, cites only one Lukan example: Luke 20:23, in which Jesus perceives (κατανοέω) the intentions of the chief priests and scribes who are questioning him.[496] Though David Lee undertakes to outline the narrator's characterizations of Jesus throughout Luke, he includes only one sentence on this particular narrative strategy: "The narrator explains that Jesus 'knows the inner thoughts of those with whom he is engaged' (opponents 5.22, 6.8; helpers 9.47) and this contributes to the stature of the character Jesus."[497]

Some scholars do note that Jesus' knowledge of others' thoughts fulfills the Spirit-authenticated oracle pronounced by Simeon over the infant Jesus: "as a result of

---

[494] 1.21, 29, 63; 2.19, 33; 5.22; 6.8; 9.47; 11.17; 20.23; 24.12, 38.

[495] Phillip Sellew's work on internal monologue in Jesus' parables is a notable exception and his insights will become crucial in the next chapter; still, Sellew's claim that there are only two instances outside of a parable in which the Lukan narrator refers to a character's inner thoughts (Luke 7.36-50 and Acts 12.11) is misleading.

[496] Philippe Rolland, "Jésus connaissait leurs pensées," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 62 (1986): 118.

[497] Lee, *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 227.

him the thoughts of many hearts will be revealed" (2.35). Additionally, many scholars have written about Jesus' role as prophet. And yet, fewer have connected these two observations to recognize that the depiction of Jesus discerning – and directly addressing – the unspoken thoughts of those around him functions as one of the main Lukan strategies for characterizing Jesus as prophet and judge.[498] Because Lukan scholars have not sufficiently considered Jesus' revealing of others' unspoken judgments,[499] I will spend a considerable amount of the rest of this chapter discussing this phenomenon and its implications for Jesus' characterization.

As noted in the introductory chapter, Luke's implied readers did not necessarily consider thought to be a form of silence.[500] Still, when a character speaks to himself, that unspoken speech is a form of silence vis-à-vis the other characters, who are not privy to the thinker's thoughts. At several points in the Lukan text, we encounter characters who deliberately do *not* engage Jesus in spoken dialogue, and yet, in every single case, Jesus engages them in public conversation. Notice in the table below that the verbs that describe Jesus knowing others' thoughts are consistently connected with verbs that depict

---

[498] Luke often uses the optative to reveal characters' thoughts. See, for example, 1:29; 3:15; 8:9; 18:36; 22:23.

[499] Camery-Hoggatt is an exception: he rightly calls this is "a significant theme," especially because it represents "the fulfillment of a messianic prophecy in 2:35 on the lips of Simeon, the old man at the temple." *Speaking of God*, 179. Tannehill recognizes the importance of Jesus' "discerning the resistance to his mission" as a fulfillment of another section of Simeon's prophecy: "This child is destined to be … a sign that will be rejected" (2.34). See Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 43-44. As far as I know, only Philip Sellew (working on Jesus' parables) and Bernhard Heininger (working on potential parallels in ancient comedy and romance stories) have done extended work on internal monologue in Luke's Gospel. See Heininger, *Metaphorik, Erzahlstruktur und szenischdramatische Gestaltung in den Sondergutgleichnissen bei Lukas* (NTAbh 24; Münster: Aschendorff, 1991), and Sellew, "Interior Monologue as a Narrative Device in the Parables of Luke," *JBL* 111 (1992): 239-253.

[500] In contrast, today we often assume an intrinsic conceptual link between silence and thought. In her classic essay, "The Aesthetics of Silence," Susan Sontag proposes the following "uses for" silence, all of which relate to thinking: "…certifying the absence or renunciation of thought...certifying the completion of thought...[or] providing time for the continuing or exploring of thought." Susan Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," in *Styles of Radical Will* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1983).

him speaking directly to them.

VERBS LINKING JESUS' "KNOWING" WITH HIS "SPEAKING"

5.22	"When Jesus perceived (ἐπιγνοὺς) their thoughts, he answered, saying (ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν) to them…"
6.8-9	"Jesus knew (ᾔδει) their thoughts and said (εἶπεν) to the man with the withered hand…then Jesus said (εἶπεν) to them…"
7.40[501]	"Jesus answering, said (ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν) to him…"
9.47-48	"When Jesus discerned (εἰδὼς) the thoughts of their hearts, he took a child, had him stand by his side, and said (εἶπεν) to them…"
11.17	"Jesus, knowing (εἰδὼς) their thoughts, said (εἶπεν) to them…"
20.23	"having perceived (κατανοήσας), he said (εἶπεν) to them…"
24.37-38	"Startled, they were afraid, thinking (ἐδόκουν) ... And he said (εἶπεν) to them...

By speaking directly to those who would rather not speak, Jesus draws them into a public confrontation. The significance of this rhetorical move is not to be overlooked. Tim Whitmarsh, in his analysis of Homeric literature, describes the power dynamics that are operative in "face-to-face competition in public space": "Power is 'held' only for the fleeting moments of victory; thereafter it dissolves as the memory of the moment fades, and must be renewed through new challenges."[502] Although in some cases, silence can be shared communally, in this case, unspoken speech functions as an isolating silence insofar as the thinking person does not want to engage in dialogue with the other. The fact that Jesus initiates such dialogue anyway denotes a power differential in which Jesus already has the upper hand.

[501] This and 24.38 are the only cases in which Jesus is not explicitly the subject of a verb of knowing. Still, Jesus' responses to Simon's internal questioning in Luke 7 and to the disciples in Luke 24 clearly imply that he knows their thoughts.

[502] Tim Whitmarsh, *Ancient Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004), 89.

It is worth considering that this is the opposite of what most commonly happens: powerful groups and individuals tend to silence the voices of marginalized groups and individuals. As we have seen, even Jesus silences others. Power in those cases is manifested in the dominant persons' privileging of their own speech and ignoring or censoring of others' speech.[503] In the cases of exposed thought, however, power is manifested in Jesus' refusal to allow others to remain silent; the outcomes of these encounters give the distinct impression that Jesus is not aiming to "give these characters a voice" in the same way that contemporary postcolonial thinkers call for fair and equal engagement with all voices; on the contrary, Jesus often gives voice to their unspoken thoughts in order to prove them wrong. Jesus plays two roles: he is gatekeeper of speech, deciding that others cannot remain silent, and he is also judge, exposing and challenging other characters' unspoken thoughts.

Illustrative Pericope: Speech, Silence, and Simon the Pharisee (Luke 7.36-50)

In Luke 7.36-50,[504] Jesus has been invited to dine in the home of Simon, a Pharisee. The precipitating event of the ensuing narrative is that suddenly, a "woman who was a sinner in the city" appears and anoints Jesus' feet (τοὺς πόδας)[505] with her tears and expensive

---

[503] The literature and perspectives on this are vast. One of the foundational texts of postcolonial studies raises this very issue: Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg; Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988). More closely related to our text, see the ways that feminist theory helpfully questions how ancient male authors render (and, more commonly, silence) women's voices. See *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (ed. André Lardinois and Laura McClure; Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

[504] This is one of the longest narrative units in the Gospel of Luke. For a helpful chart comparing lengths of Lukan pericopes, see Lee, *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 353. The majority of verbs in this story are in the aorist form; this is typical of Luke's episodic style, in which he tends to employ aorist verbs in individual episodes and imperfect verbs in shorter summaries. See François Bovon, *Luke 1*, 3.

[505] Neither Matthew nor Mark includes a reference to Jesus' feet, although John does. The text of D omits

ointment. There are variations of anointing stories in all four canonical gospels,[506] though within the variations, Luke's is the most distinctive; the Lukan particularities function together to depict a dramatic enactment of contested power relations between Jesus and his opponent in which speech and silence play crucial roles.

To begin with, only Luke has Jesus being invited to dine in the home of a Pharisee.[507] This small narrative detail creates the sense of a symposium;[508] though scholars debate over the extent to which this story is an instance of the conventional Hellenistic symposium genre, what matters for our purposes is that an atmosphere for critical and engaged dialogue has been created.[509] The setting itself primes readers to expect some type of linguistic transaction.

Additionally, Jesus' presence in a Pharisee's home heightens the potential for conflict, since the religious leaders have been shown challenging Jesus' authority in conversational combat at earlier points in the narrative.[510] The resonances of these confrontations are cumulative; by the time the reader reaches Luke 7.36, she has already been primed to view the central point of contention between Jesus and the Pharisees as the inextricable questions of Jesus' identity and his authority, and the central means of

---

any reference to the anointing of Jesus' feet. On this, see Konrad Weiss, "Der westliche Text von Lc 7,46 und sein Wert," *ZNW* 46 (1955): 241-45.

[506] See Mark 14.3-9, Matthew 26.6-13, and John 12.1-11.

[507] Bovon notes that the phrase "to eat with" (ἵνα φάγῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ) is a Semiticism found also in the LXX version of 1 Sam. 9.19 and Prov. 23.8. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 293.

[508] For specifics supporting this argument, see Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 84. John Darr also argues that this is a Hellenistic symposium, a view that he develops from E. Springs Steele, "Luke 11:37-54 – A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?" 23.

[509] Heininger points to another similarity with symposium dialogues: "Und ganz in der Anlage solcher Literatur ist weiter, daß dem Dialog eine einleitende Rahmenerzählung vorausgeht." Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 84.

[510] 5.21, 30, 33; 6.2, 11.

portraying that contention as verbal exchange.

Still, this is a symposium with a twist. Unlike conventional Hellenistic symposia, the entire first half of the story occurs without any speech at all. Instead, characters' silences precede and give rise to the dynamic linguistic exchange between Simon and Jesus that occurs in the latter half of the story. First, an uninvited, unnamed woman weeps, wets Jesus' feet with her tears, wipes them with her hair, kisses them, and anoints them with perfumed oil – all without speaking a word (7.38). In ancient Greek symposia, the catalyst for discursive dialogue is often the *fait divers* – a notable event that provides impetus for the discussion. Here, this extraordinary occurrence is a symbolic deed, silently performed. Still, the woman's silent symbolic action speaks: she honors Jesus as she anoints him.[511] Jesus' silent acceptance of her actions implies that he advocates her behavior *and* her message. Simon, too, gets the message, and he is offended.

The narrator explicitly tells us that Simon condemns Jesus *in his mind*; he objects "to himself" (ἐν ἑαυτῷ),[512] thinking, "If this man were a prophet, he would know who

---

[511] Scholars have discussed the significance of the woman's action at length, with some arguing that it has messianic overtones (Jesus makes this explicit in the gospel parallels to this story; see Matt. 26.12; Mk. 14.8; Jn. 12.7), and others countering that it is simply a lavish act of loving hospitality by a faithful woman. The absence of any references to the poor in the Lukan version of this story furthers the sense that this pericope is preoccupied with the potential verbal interactions between the main characters. The Lukan text omits references (found in all three of the parallel accounts) to the "costliness" (Matthew 26:7 has βαρυτίμου, whereas Mark 14:3 and John 12:3 both have πολυτελοῦς) of the ointment and the observers' objections that such ointment could have been "given to the poor" (Matthew 26:9 has δοθῆναι πτωχοῖς, Mark 14:5 reads δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς, and John 12:5 has ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς). This is particularly puzzling because Luke is generally more concerned with the poor than his gospel counterparts [On this theme, see (among many others) Robert Karris, "Poor and Rich: The Lukan *Sitz im Leben*," in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (ed. Charles H. Talbert; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978), 112-25; Walter E. Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981); David Peter Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts* (Linz: Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt, 1982)]. The Matthean, Markan, and Johannine versions of this pericope could be read as discourses on the correct use of one's possessions; uncharacteristically, Luke does not leave this option open to his readers.

[512] In comparison with the gospel parallels to the anointing story, only Luke makes it clear that Jesus' interlocutor expresses his objection silently. In the Markan version, the onlookers object to the woman's actions "to themselves" (πρὸς ἑαυτούς, 14.4), which implies that they spoke aloud, though perhaps only amongst themselves, rather than to Jesus. In Matthew 26.8, the disciples object openly, and similarly, in

and what kind of woman this is who is touching him, that she is a sinner" (Οὗτος εἰ ἦν προφήτης,[513] ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν τίς καὶ ποταπὴ ἡ γυνὴ ἥτις ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν, 7.39).[514] This is an under-explored feature of Luke's storytelling: the use of internal monologue.[515]

As Mary Ann Tolbert rightly cautions, because interior monologue and stream of consciousness are common in modern narrative, "we may not recognize the important but sparing use of interior monologue in ancient writings."[516] Thus, a brief review of the ancient use of this literary technique is in order.

Excursus: The Literary Technique of Internal Monologue

Internal Monologue in Ancient Greek Literature. Scholes and Kellogg posit that Homer's formulaic use of this literary device served as a model for other ancient writers.[517] Sellew agrees that this mode of dramatizing a character's inner life is quite ancient:

> The distinction between a distanced or "plain" narration and imitative narration, where the narrator speaks in the person of a character, was already a matter of interest for Plato [who was] primarily concerned with the moral effects of imitation

---

John 12.4-5, Judas voices his concerns aloud. Only the Lukan version of this pericope uniquely highlights Jesus' perceptive powers.

[513] The manuscripts B*, 040, and 205 insert the article before προφήτης, which Bruce Metzger dubs "an exegetical allusion to 'the Prophet' in Dt 18.15." *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament,* 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 120.

[514] The use of the second class conditional in Greek indicates that the Pharisee essentially thinks, "If this man were a prophet (but he is not)…"

[515] Literary critics Scholes and Kellogg define internal monologue as "a direct, immediate presentation of the unspoken thoughts of a character without any intervening narrator." R. Scholes and R. Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative*, 177-79.

[516] Mary Ann Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 214.

[517] They also discuss the use of internal monologue in Virgil, Ovid, and Xenophon of Ephesus. *Nature of Narrative*, 178-88 and Appendix, 283-99.

of unworthy persons, emotions, or forms of behavior.[518]

We can note here two similarities between how ancient Greek writers and the gospel writer use this literary technique in the telling of their particular stories. First, in ancient Greek literature, internal monologue was conventionally used at a moment of crisis in the narrative, in which the hero must negotiate an intense internal conflict. Bernhard Heininger notes that ancient Greek comedies commonly employed the following tripartite formula, which sets the character's dilemma at the heart of interior monologue: (1) The speech introduction (*Redeeinleitung*) (2) Taking stock of the problem (*Bestandsaufnahme*) (3) The character's chosen solution (*Problemlösung*).[519] As we will see, Luke also tends to incorporate interior monologue into crisis situations.

Lest the modern reader be tempted to overly psychologize such internal disputes, we must remember that ancient texts do not necessarily reflect the common modern presumption that individuals are entirely in command of their own will. On the contrary, many instances of internal monologue in ancient Greek sources reflect the assumption that the gods are able to enter and change a human's mind.[520] For instance, in a prayer from Xenophon's *An Ephesian Tale*, the hero, Habrocomes, undergoes an intense internal conflict and finally admits, "You have beaten me, Eros, and deserve a great trophy for your victory over the chaste Habrocomes" (1.4.4). The ancient concept of the divided psyche is primarily rhetorical, designed to persuade the audience in some way.[521]

---

[518] Sewell, "Interior Monologues," 240.

[519] Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 34.

[520] See Stephen Halliwell, "Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character," in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (ed. Christopher Pelling; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 53-55.

[521] See Scholes and Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative*, 185.

This leads us to our second observation: instances of internal monologue increase the dramatic pathos of the narrative moment in which they are embedded. As Heininger puts it, such a "dramatische Akzentuierung" is aimed at creating "eine besondere Wirkung auf die Leser…wie sie Aristoteles schon anläßlich seiner Bemerkungen zur Charakterzeichnung empfahl."[522] This is particularly fitting for the Gospel of Luke, a narrative that depicts its storyline in such theatrical, mimetic fashion. Internal monologue can uniquely engage readers' emotions by inviting them to imagine their own personal reactions to similar situations. Heininger also adds that use of the first person singular can act as a cue to the reader to take on a character's perspective for himself: "Die Leser können sich in dessen Rolle hineinversetzen und den Monolog selber sprechen."[523] Instances of this literary technique in ancient Greek literature serve dual purposes: 1) On the story level, internal monologue highlights the dramatic plight of the thinker; 2) On the level of the telling, internal monologue invites the reader to engage personally in the events of the story.

Internal Monologue in the Hebrew Bible. We also find instances of internal monologue in the Hebrew Bible, most especially in the Psalms. The majority of such cases do not occur within narratives, but rather, they record the pithy inner thoughts of the wicked. In the *LXX*, the Greek formulations indicating interior thought are the same as those found in the New Testament.[524] Still, there are a few notable exceptions in which internal

---

[522] Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 44-45.

[523] Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 45.

[524] For example, see Ps. 10.6/9.27: "He said in his heart, "I am not moved" (εἶπεν γὰρ ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ Οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ); Ps. 10.13/9.34: The wicked "said in his heart, 'You will not call us to account'" (εἶπεν γὰρ ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ Οὐκ ἐκζητήσει); Ps. 14.1/13.1 and 53.1/52.2: "The fool said in his heart, 'There is

monologue occurs within a narrative setting. In the Flood story of Genesis 8, God says "in his heart" (אֶל־לִבּוֹ) that there will never again be a world-wide flood (8.21).

In Genesis 18, Sarah overhears divine visitors telling her husband Abraham that she will bear a son, despite the fact that they are quite old.[525] In verse 12, Sarah reacts to this news by laughing "to/in herself" (LXX: ἐν ἑαυτῇ). And yet, note that despite the fact that Sarah has kept her reaction secret, the divine visitor nevertheless perceives her thoughts.[526] Similarly, in 2 Samuel 14.1, Joab perceives that the king meditates in his heart on Absalom, though this passage does not explicitly recount the king's unspoken speech. Both Genesis 18 and 2 Sam. 14 provide examples of a main character's privileged access to another character's thoughts in his capacity as the Lord's prophet, sent with a divine message. In light of the foregoing observations, we return now to Luke 7.36-50.

Defamiliarizing the Symposium Type-Scene in Luke 7.36-50. Like his Hellenistic predecessors, Luke tends to incorporate interior monologue into crisis situations in which the thinking character faces an important decision. But Luke also uses the technique differently. To demonstrate, let us return to the previous point that in Luke 7.36-50, the stage has been set for some type of dialogue within a symposium setting. Still, despite the similarities to the ancient genre, this scene is also unlike what one would expect of a Hellenistic symposium. Unlike typical symposia, the dialogue in Luke 7.36-50 is

---

no God'" (εἶπεν ἄφρων ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ Οὐκ ἔστιν θεός).

[525] Origen declared that because so many before Abraham and Sarah had lived "for numerous years, but no one was called *presbyter*," the term πρεσβύτεροι "is ascribed to the saints not by reason of longevity but of maturity." *Homilies on Genesis* 4.4. However, the context of the passage is not referring to their maturity, but to the impossibility of their conceiving a child by natural means.

[526] See 8:13, in which the divine visitor asks Abraham why Sarah has laughed to herself.

prompted by a silent action (the woman's anointing of Jesus, 7.38). Focusing on the narratorial technique of internal monologue also allows the reader to see that, contrary to what one would expect of a Hellenistic symposium, the host, Simon, does not appear to want to engage in dialogue with his guests at all. Despite Simon's characterization as the one who invited ("called"; καλέσας, 7.39) Jesus, he does not initiate a conversation with his chief guest. Instead, as John Darr puts it, "Here and elsewhere in Luke symposia are used only as stages for Jesus to criticize severely his Pharisaic hosts and fellow guests."[527] Using characters' silences – including, but not limited to, internal monologue – Luke defamiliarizes the symposium type-scene, encouraging readers to reconsider conventional assumptions.[528]

Also unlike its ancient Greek counterparts, Simon's use of internal monologue does not strictly represent a crucial point of dramatic crisis for the story's hero. Although this does represent a moment of internal conflict for Simon (who must choose between two opposing views of Jesus' identity), he is far from representing the "hero" of the narrative. Sellew identifies this as a common characteristic of Lukan internal monologues: "None of the personalities whose thoughts are described is particularly commendable; indeed they tend to embody anything but noble characteristics."[529] In each case, the public exposure of a character's unspoken speech reveals that the character's thoughts must be judged and, ultimately, challenged.

In stark contrast to the silences of the woman's symbolic action and Simon's internal questioning, Jesus initiates the first oral communication of the story and thereby

---

[527] Darr, *On Character Building*, 35.

[528] James Resseguie, "Automatization and Defamiliarization in Luke 7:36–50," *LitTh* 5 (1991): 137–50.

[529] Sellew, "Interior Monologue," 242.

opens up a floodgate of verbal communication. Speaking directly to Simon, Jesus says, "Simon, I have something to say *to you* (σοί)" (7.40).[530] The emphatic position of σοί in verse 40 underscores the contrasting juxtaposition of Simon's and Jesus' respective modes of communication. Not only does Jesus initiate the dialogue, but he also defines its proper setting: in public, where Simon can be held accountable. Whereas Simon *conceals* his judgment, trying to keep it private, Jesus *reveals* Simon's judgmental nature before his household and his guests; not only this, but Jesus broadcasts the fact that Simon himself deserves judgment for failing to fulfill his duties as host:[531]

> Do you see this woman? I entered into your house; you did not give me (οὐκ ἔδωκας) water for my feet, but she bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair. You did not give me a kiss (φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας), but she, from the time I entered, did not stop kissing (καταφιλοῦσά) my feet. You did not anoint (οὐκ ἤλειψας) my head with oil, but she anointed (ἤλειψεν) my feet with perfume.[532]

Jesus' response to Simon proves that he does, in fact, know what is in the heart of not only the one who is touching him (the woman), but also of the one who is watching him suspiciously (Simon).[533] E. Springs Steele considers this a case of what David Daube first called "Socratic interrogation," in which Socrates led his opponent to assist in

---

[530] Kenneth Bailey argues that this formulation was a typical way of introducing an unwelcome saying. *Through Peasant Eyes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 12.

[531] Cf. Robert C. Tannehill, "Should We Love Simon the Pharisee? Hermeneutical Reflections on the Pharisees in Luke," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 21 (1994): 424-33.

[532] Luke 7:44-46.

[533] Gathercole divides Jesus' prophetic knowledge "into two distinct types: his knowledge of human hearts and his very detailed knowledge of future events. . . . Jesus shows signs of being able to 'mind-read' and does so with considerable regularity." Simon J. Gathercole, *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Mathew, Mark, and Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 70. However, Jesus' perception in Luke 8.46 does not fit either of Gathercole's subcategories; in this passage, Jesus perceives that a woman in the crowd his touched him and been healed: "For I knew power was going out from me" (ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ).

refuting his own position.[534] This, in turn, has social consequences; as Simon's esteemed position as host is challenged, the attribution of honor shifts to Jesus.[535] Ultimately, Simon does not engage in dialogue with Jesus except on Jesus' terms, which further fosters the sense that Jesus is the verbal victor in this scene.

Like its Hebrew Bible counterparts, Jesus' response to Simon also highlights his prophetic ability. Simon's undisclosed questioning of Jesus' identity provides the opportunity for narrative disclosure of the very thing he questions – Jesus' identity as a prophet of God.[536] According to Jean-Noël Aletti, the placement of this story in the Galilean ministry section of Luke's narrative[537] strategically establishes a crucial point for the rest of the story: "la reconnaissance de Jésus comme prophète."[538] From the narrator's perspective, it is precisely Jesus' knowledge of Simon's unspoken thoughts that establishes his identity as God's prophet.[539]

Simon's interior monologue, juxtaposed with Jesus' response, has several effects

---

[534] E. Springs Steele, "Luke 11:37-54: A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?" *JBL* 103 (1984): 379-394; 383.

[535] Vernon Robbins makes this point: "When Jesus responds publicly to Simon's silent challenge, Simon is put on the defensive. Simon's honor decreases as he joins all the other Pharisees who have been bested by Jesus, and Jesus' honor increases." Robbins, *The tapestry of early Christian discourse*, 163.

[536] The one Lukan instance in which a character *other* than Jesus reads the thoughts of others is Lk. 3.15, in which John the Baptist addresses the crowd, who are wondering "in their hearts" (ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν) about whether he is the Messiah. This may be the exception that proves the rule, however, since John himself is portrayed as a prophet; this small literary detail establishes that knowing what is in the heart of another is a prophetic ability. As Jesus does later in the narrative, John engages with these unspoken questions, answering them directly.

[537] Matthew and Mark situate this story in close proximity to the passion narrative, as an honorary anointing in preparation for Jesus' impending death and burial, and John closely connects this pericope with the raising of Lazarus, which is itself a foreshadowing of the death and resurrection of Jesus. Luke, on the other hand, places this story within Jesus' Galilean ministry, long before the passion narrative begins.

[538] Jean-Noël Aletti, *L'art de raconter Jésus Christ: L'écriture narrative de l'évangile de Luc* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1989), 102.

[539] In his comment on the Matthean parallel (12.25), Rolland goes so far as to interpret Jesus' ability to read Simon's thoughts as "privilege divin d'après Ps 94.11." Rolland, "Jésus connaissait leurs pensées," 121. Psalm 94.11 says that "the Lord knows the thoughts of man."

on the level of the interaction between text and reader. First, by offering readers a "telescoped view" of a character's inner life, internal monologue privileges the reader;[540] here, only Simon, Jesus, and the reader know the content of Simon's thoughts, while other characters remain ignorant of this information. This means that when Jesus speaks, he reacts to what has not been spoken, and the other characters cannot understand him. The reader, however, knows the secret. As Heininger puts it, "Lukas den Monolog als Mittel der Kommunikation zwischen Text und Leser benutzt."[541]

Second, internal monologue introduces dramatic irony (when a character in the story knows less than the audience knows).[542] The most commonly cited example of dramatic irony is Sophocles' *Oedipus the King*, in which the audience knows what Oedipus does not: he has unwittingly murdered his father and married his mother.[543] In Luke 7.36-50, because Simon's thoughts are quoted through internal monologue, the reader grasps a deeper meaning behind Jesus' language that Simon and the onlookers do not grasp. Specifically, the reader knows that Simon has unwittingly voiced what turns out to be the narrator's – and ultimately God's – perspective. Jesus *is* what Simon judges him not to be: a prophet of God. This is, indeed, a common strategy in Luke: Jesus' opponents and the apostles often speak God's perspective unintentionally.[544]

It is significant that the Lukan narrator delays exposure of Simon's failure in

---

[540] Meir Sternberg, "Between the Truth and the Whole Truth in Biblical Narrative: The Rendering of Inner Life by Telescoped Inside View and Interior Monologue," *Hasifrut* 29 (1979): 110-46.

[541] Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 177.

[542] Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 23.

[543] An ancient audience would most likely have thought of this in terms of Oedipus fulfilling his fate, rather than as an instance of "dramatic irony."

[544] William Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 137.

hospitality until *after* Jesus relates the parable of the two debtors. Narratorial delays (when a narrator postpones the telling of important information until later in the story) often surprise readers who are unaware that they are missing crucial information. This surprise can thereby challenge or subvert readers' conventional expectations. Thus, one effect of withholding the crucial detail that Simon himself deserves judgment is to implicate those readers who – like Simon – are tempted to judge the woman for her questionable behavior.

If the reader has viewed Simon sympathetically up to this point,[545] he or she is suddenly prompted to reassess such identification in light of the new information. As noted previously, a character's use of the first person can facilitate readerly association with that character. Simon's thoughts, which are quoted directly in the first person, will nudge some readers toward adopting his judgmental perspective. If this has happened, then with Jesus' comment, such readers must reevaluate retrospectively the entire foregoing scene with the newly acquired knowledge that Simon himself has behaved inhospitably, and accordingly, they must reflect on their own prejudices, as well.

Following the contentious exchange between Jesus and Simon, Jesus turns to the woman and announces, "Your sins have been forgiven" (7.48). The ending of the story deepens the onlookers' consternation, as they ask "among themselves" (ἐν ἑαυτοῖς), "Who is this who even forgives sins?" Everything in this pericope suggests that even if Jesus does not hear their question directly, he is well aware of their sentiments. Nevertheless, although he spoke directly to *Simon's* withheld word, Jesus remains silent, comparatively deaf to the onlookers' question. Perhaps this is because the question is not

[545] It is likely that many in the first-century would be tempted to identify with Simon's incredulity; the woman's behavior appears to be inappropriate, but Jesus remains unconcerned by any potential improprieties.

worth answering: they ought to know the answer by now.

Just as Jesus leaves his fellow dinner guests to answer the question, Who is this who even forgives sins?, so too does Luke leave the reader to fill in the unspoken answer. Contrast this with the unanswered questions that the boy Jesus poses to his parents in the temple: "Why were you looking for me? Did you not know that I must be in my father's house?" (2.49); in the last chapter, I noted that these enigmatic questions raises readerly curiosity, since an answer is not provided or intimated in the text. However, by the time Jesus is invited to Simon's home, readers ought to know the answer to the guests' unanswered question. Through Jesus' silence toward these onlookers, Luke implicates his readers in the task of identifying Jesus correctly.[546]

Refusing to engage with the other guests, Jesus instead redirects his attention (and theirs) to the woman, saying, "Your faith has saved you; go in peace" (Ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε: πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην, 7.50). With that, the story ends. Jesus has the last word in the pericope – literally. So-called "curtain lines" such as these carry great weight in the telling of a story: as soon as Jesus speaks them, the curtain falls on the scene and in the hush that follows, the audience is left to ponder the implications. What remains unspoken here is an implicit point that unlike the woman, Simon and his misguided guests do not have faith that saves them, and thus they deserve no formal farewell from Jesus.

The convergence of compositional strategies such as the modified symposium

[546] For many ancient commentators, Jesus' final words to the woman identify him as not merely a prophet, but as God in the flesh. Cyril of Alexandria argues that the onlookers "learned that the Word being God was not like one of the prophets, but rather far beyond the measure of humanity although he became a man." *Commentary on Luke, Homily 40*. Qtd. in Arthur Just, ed., "Luke 7:36-50: Jesus Eats with a Pharisee and Forgives a Sinful Woman." *Luke* (Ancient Christian Commentaries on Scripture; Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 129.

setting in a Pharisee's home, Simon's use of internal monologue, and Jesus' exposure and challenging of Simon's unspoken speech highlight the rhetorical identification of Jesus as an authoritative prophet who is able to read the minds of – and effectively address – his opponents. The dynamic interplay of speech and silence also deepens the ironic dimensions of this narrative, while implicating the reader in the task of correctly identifying Jesus and judging his interlocutors accordingly.

IN SUM: SPEECH AND SILENCE IN JESUS' GALILEAN MINISTRY

Focusing on speech and silences can help delineate the symbiotic relationship between plot, characterization, theme, and readerly experience in the Galilean ministry section of Luke's Gospel. In particular, speech establishes causality and creates unity across discrete episodes. Speech also introduces conflict (which, in turn, propels the plot) in two distinct ways. First, Jesus' confrontations with the religious leaders take the form of verbal sparring; second, the spread of spoken reports despite Jesus' commands for silence presents speech control itself as a subject of narrative tension. The wide reach of Jesus-news into all sectors of society also instantiates the theological theme of salvation for all nations, while the narrator's use of summary (as opposed to direct dialogue) to describe such reports quickens the pace of the narrative's forward movement. On the level of the reading, whereas narratorial silences like unanswered questions can stimulate readerly curiosity, delaying crucial information in stories like Jesus' anointing (7.36-50) implicates readers in the task of correctly identifying Jesus.

Additionally, in this section of the Gospel, the narrative rhetoric of characterization introduces the religious authorities; their calculated observations, veiled

silences, and contentious thoughts (διαλογισμοί) culminate in suspicious speech about what they "might do" (ποιήσαιεν) to Jesus (6.11). Thus, contrary to the conventional scholarly view that, as Brawley puts it, "the Pharisees hold a rather respectable position for Luke,"[547] instead their uses of speech and silence gradually reveal that they are Jesus' self-righteous opponents. The disciples, too, are introduced, and though they are portrayed more positively than the authorities, they nevertheless rarely speak on their own authority; when they do speak, they commonly exhibit foolish misunderstandings that point toward their imperceptiveness.

Jesus' character is developed further through his interactions with these two major character groups. Jesus' speech-related teachings align his words with God's words, establish speech as a complex ethical concern in its own right, and create an evaluative framework by which readers can judge various characters. While his miraculous uses of speech to silence demons and heal the sick underscore his otherworldly power, his knowledge and disclosure of the religious authorities' unspoken thoughts cast him in the role of prophet and judge.

[547] Robert Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 92.

CHAPTER THREE
SPEECH AND SILENCE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION (LUKE 9.51-19.44)

INTRODUCTION

The long central section of the Gospel of Luke (9.51-19.44),[548] is often called the "Lukan travel narrative" because it relates Jesus' journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. Though it has been widely recognized as a crucial section of the Lukan narrative,[549] this long passage also has remained a stubborn structural enigma for Lukan scholars.[550] Many have attempted in vain to develop an historically accurate itinerary based on the text's so-called *Reisenotizen* (mentions of or allusions to the journey).[551] Others search instead for a coherent plot structure or connecting thread throughout this section; such proposals range over a wide territory: The travel narrative is constructed on a Deuteronomistic framework;[552] it's chiastic;[553] or it's built around particular themes.[554] Daniel Marguerat

---

[548] Viewing 9.51 as the beginning of the "travel narrative" is generally accepted in Lukan scholarship, though one prominent critic of this assessment is Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas* (Leipzig, 1913), 336-38.

[549] Egelkraut's view on the section's import is common: this section is "of key importance" for understanding Luke's work. *Jesus' Mission to Jerusalem: A redaction critical study of the Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke, Lk 9:51-19:48* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1976), 3. See, also, the bibliography on this section in François Bovon, *L'Évangile Selon Saint Luc (9,51-14,35)* (CNT; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1996).

[550] Indeed, the longstanding scholarly impasse over how to interpret the geographical references speaks to their cryptic nature; Luke 17.11 is particularly problematic, as it has Jesus in "the region between Samaria and Galilee" (διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας), no closer to Jerusalem than he was in 9.51. Contrast this with the travel narrative in Acts, which plays a much larger and clearer role.

[551] Contrary to Völkel's suggestion that Jesus actually traveled to the various regions cited in the Gospel, the narrative explicitly notes that Jesus' fame spreads due to spoken reports about him. See Völkel, "Der Anfang Jesu in Galiläa. Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch und zur Funktion Galiläas in den lukanischen Schriften," *ZNW* 64 (1973): 226-28. As early as 1938, McCown concluded that Luke was completely ignorant of Palestinian geography and suggested that the only appropriate title for this section is the "Central Section." C.C. McCown, "The Geography of Luke's Central Section," *JBL* 57 (1938): 51-66. Hans Conzelmann was the first to propose that Luke utilizes geography symbolically for theological purposes. See Conzelmann, "Geographical Elements in the Composition of Luke's Gospel," in *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; London: Faber & Faber, 1961).

[552] C.F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot* (ed. D.E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 37-53. More recently, see David

sees the travel motif itself as a structuring device,[555] whereas others like Rudolf Bultmann conclude that the journey is simply incoherent.[556] From there, it is but a short step to Reinhard von Bendemann's thesis that despite the contemporary moniker "Travel Narrative," the Gospel of Luke actually does not contain a travel narrative at all.[557] Despite all of this sustained scholarly attention, the central section of Luke remains as

---

Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989) and M.L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995).

[553] M.D. Goulder, "The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey," *TU* 87 (1963): 195-202.

[554] For example, G.W. Trompf argues that Luke alternates between the themes of security, discipleship, and reward and punishment. "La section médiane de l'évangile de Luc: I'organisation des documents," *RHPR* 53 (1973): 141-154. See also e.g., B. Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," *SE* I (ed. K. Aland; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), 206-216; W. Grundmann, "Fragen der Komposition des lukanischen 'Reiseberichts,'" *ZNW* 50-51 (1959-1960): 252-270; W.C. Robinson, "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative," *JBL* 79 (1960): 20-31; F.V. Filson, "The Journey Motif in Luke-Acts," in *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (ed. W. Ward Gasque and R. P. Martin; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970), 68-77; Robert Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts* (2 vols.; FFNT; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986-90); Frank Matera, "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (9.51-19.46): A Conflict With Israel," *JSNT* 51 (1993): 57-77. For a brief summary listing of the various understandings of the Travel Narrative with bibliography, see also D. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 2-5, and more recently, the longer summary review in Octavian Baban, *On the Road Encounters in Luke-Acts: Hellenistic Mimesis and Luke's Theology of the Way* (Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster Press, 2006), 27-71.

[555] Comparing Jesus' journey to Jerusalem to that of Paul to Rome in Acts, Marguerat writes, "[Luke] shapes the fate of the disciple according to that of the Master . . . this procedure of syncrisis indicates that the author is able to confer on the travel motif a structuring function in the narration." Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian*, 234.

[556] In this view, the journey minimally provides a basic frame for the section – a reason for Jesus to move from here to there – but beyond this, no strategic ordering of narrative units can be discerned. Bultmann posited that Luke used the background of a journey precisely because it was "well adapted to receive all kinds of situationless units." Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 365.

[557] Although 9.51 speaks of Jesus setting off for Jerusalem, and in the end, he does arrive there, Bendemann insists that other themes such as instruction of the disciples and the call for repentance are more programmatic for Luke-Acts than any travel account. Bendemann's arguments provide a salutary caution against over-emphasizing the travel aspect of this section of the gospel. Reinhold von Bendemann, *Zwischen ΔΟΞΑ und ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ: Eine exegetische Untersuchung der Texte des sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukasevangelium* (BZNW 101; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001). K.E. Bailey made a similar, though undeveloped, point in 1976: "The title 'Travel Journey' is a misnomer…We prefer to call it the "Jerusalem Document." *Poet and Peasant: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), 82-83.

Lee succinctly puts it, "famously difficult to analyze for structure."[558] In this chapter, I consider the ways that attention to speech and silence can help elucidate the narrative structure and rhetorical function(s) of Luke 9.51-19.44.

One theory about the so-called travel narrative is particularly relevant for our concerns: Luke is preoccupied throughout with the formation of faithful disciples.[559] Bendemann is correct in this respect: the central section of Luke spends far less time making note of Jesus' literal travels, and far more time depicting his spoken teachings about the metaphorical "way" (ὁδός)[560] that is the Christian life.[561] The narrative discourse focuses on discipleship as a spiritual journey, not a one-time decision.[562] Thus, as Darr writes, "The progression [toward Jerusalem] is primarily ideational (theological)

---

[558] Lee, *Luke's Stories*, 193.

[559] Scholars such as W.C. Robinson note that this section is especially didactic. See W.C. Robinson, "Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative," *JBL* 79 (1960): 20-31. E.H. Scheffler and C.H. Lindijer both discern a Lukan "on the road" paradigm. See Scheffler, "Emmaus—A Historical Perspective," *Neot* 23 (1989): 251-67 and Lindijer, "Two Creative Encounters in the Work of Luke (Luke 24.13-35 and Acts 8.26-40)," *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, NTSuppl 48 (1978): 77-85.

[560] Note that the Christian movement in Acts is called "The Way." Acts 9.2; 19.9, 23; 22.4; 24.14, 22. Ju Hur correctly notes that the word ὁδός appears forty times in Luke-Acts, and that twenty-four of these instances refer to a literal "road" or "way," while only eleven refer to a metaphorical "way." *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSS 211 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 185 n. 14. However, Hur does not recognize that in the travel narrative specifically, only three instances refer to Jesus' literal journey (9.51; 18.35; 19.36) and the rest are used in Jesus' teachings or parables. I agree with Talbert's description: "Luke's conception of the life of faith [is] as a pilgrimage, always on the move." *Reading Luke*, 113.

[561] Bo Reicke develops this observation further by identifying a pattern of alternation between instruction and discussion, as well as between an audience of disciples and an audience of outsiders. "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative of Luke," *SE* 1 (1959): 206-216.

[562] See James Resseguie, *Spiritual Landscape: Images of the Spiritual Life in the Gospel of Luke* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 29-43. Maria Do Thi Yen argues that the Lukan journey motif takes two metaphorical forms: the journey of the disciples' spiritual growth and the journey of Jesus' ministry. Maria Do Thi Yen, *The Lucan Journey: A Study of Luke 9:28-36 and Acts 1:6-11 As an Architectural Pair* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010), 341.

and only incidently (or symbolically) geographical."[563] We will return to this crucial point later in the chapter.

SPEECH AND SILENCE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF LUKE

It is true that a tightly unified plot is not readily apparent in the Lukan travel narrative. Jo-Ann Brant goes so far as to say that for Luke, "when or where something happens or who says something does not necessarily affect the coherence of the narrative."[564] Although Brant is correct that Lukan "chance encounters" are not always explicitly linked one to another, she underestimates the transitional and unifying functions of verbal utterances in Luke. I would amend her statement to say, "The very fact *that* someone says something affects the coherence of the narrative." In the discussion that follows, I argue that speech and silences offer the narrator powerful vehicles for achieving his rhetorical goals over the course of the Jerusalem journey. The following pages consider how:

1) On the level of the telling, the Lukan narrator's uses of speech in conjunction with geographical or temporal references signal transitions along the journey and in that way loosely unify the narrative. Speech also provides the impetus for plot development and creates causal connections between events. The narrator's silences – including ambiguities and delays – are powerful tools for provoking readerly responses such as surprise, suspense, and subversion of conventional views.

2) The narrative rhetoric develops the disciples' and religious leaders' characterizations as established in the Galilean ministry section of Luke through shifts in their respective uses of speech and silence. At the same time, Jesus' speech-related

[563] Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 174.

[564] Jo-Ann Brant, *Dialogue and Drama*, 26.

teachings and his parables further characterize him as an authoritative teacher, uniquely related to and sent by God; they also introduce a new dimension to Jesus' characterization: the Messiah was sent to suffer. Additionally, Jesus' use of internal monologue in two of his parables further complexifies the Lukan image of God.

3) Uses of speech and silence in the central section of Luke also illuminate the theological theme of discipleship as a journey involving the right reception of God's word; what scholars less commonly acknowledge is that, for Luke, the journey of discipleship also entails proper speech ethics.

Between the Narrator and the Reader

Like any good storyteller, the Lukan narrator had to structure his tale such that he could periodically provide clues to the reader that she or he is moving into a new event or scene; narrative transitions thus contribute to the comprehensibility of the story. Luke 9.51-19.44 is punctuated by narrative transitions that keep readers abreast of shifts in time, place, and action and ultimately move the characters along on the path toward Jerusalem. Since the passage of story time (*Erzählte Zeit*) does not usually correspond to the time of the telling (*Erzählzeit*), storytellers must specifically signal for their readers the onward march of time within the story. Authors can meaningfully exploit this temporal discrepancy; for instance, an author can linger over details and extend the length of time it takes to relate especially important scenes, such as the Passion narrative (which spans four chapters: 19.45-23.56). Conversely, an author can briefly summarize long periods of time with just a few words, such as John the Baptist's childhood (told in just one verse: 1.80).

Generally, in a journey narrative, authors mark progress using geographical references, temporal references, or terminological indications of movement;[565] Lukan scholars have tended to focus on the geographical references in Luke.[566] What is distinctive about Luke's journey narrative is that the narrator frequently connects geographical shifts with reported speech. Notice how many of the *Reisenotizen* are directly connected to a character's speech, most often through the use of a declarative verb:

THE REISENOTIZEN AND CORRESPONDING REFERENCES TO SPEECH

Reisenotizen (as identified by Gill)[567]	Reference to speech
9.51, 53	---
9.56, 57	"Jesus turned and *rebuked* (ἐπετίμησεν) them, and they went on to another village. As they were walking along the road, *someone said* (εἶπεν) to him…" (9.55-57).
10.1	"After these things, the Lord appointed seventy-two others and sent them on ahead of him two by two into every town and place where he himself was about to go. And he *said* (ἔλεγεν) to them…" (10.1-2).
10.38	"Now as they went on their way, he entered a certain village where a woman named Martha welcomed him as a guest. She had a sister named

[565] For a comprehensive list of the terminological indications of movement in Luke-Acts, including verbs of movement on foot, movement by boat, and movement imposed by others, see Maria Do Thi Yen, *The Lucan Journey: A Study of Luke 9:28-36 and Acts 1:6-11 As an Architectural Pair* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010), 34-38.

[566] This is unsurprising; as Alter notes in connection with Hebrew Bible narratives, "the formula of rising up and going off to a different place" is one of "the prevalent biblical conventions for marking the end of a narrative segment." Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 65.

[567] See David Gill's discussion of the *Reisenotizen*, which he cites as 9.51, 53, 56, 57; 10.1, 38; 13.22, 31, 33, (35); 14.25; 17.11; (18.36); 19.1, 11, (28), (29), (36), 37, 41, (45). (Passages in parentheses are not uniquely Lukan.) "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages," *HTR* 63 (1970): 199-221, fn. 2.

	Mary, who sat at the Lord's feet and *listened to what he said* (ἤκουεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ)" (10.38-39).
13.22	"Then Jesus traveled throughout towns and villages, *teaching* (διδάσκων) and making his way toward Jerusalem. Someone *said* (εἶπεν) to him…" (13.22-23).
13.31, 33, (35)	"At that time, some Pharisees came up, *saying* (λέγοντες) to him, 'Get away from here, because Herod wants to kill you.' But *he said* (εἶπεν) to them…" (13.31-32).
14.25	"Now large crowds were accompanying him, and turning to them he *said* (εἶπεν)…" (14.25).
17.11	"On the way to Jerusalem, he was passing along the border between Galilee and Samaria. As he was entering a village there, ten lepers met him, who were standing at a distance, *and they were raising up their voices, saying* (ἦραν φωνὴν λέγοντες), 'Jesus, Master, have mercy on us!'" (17.11-13).
(18.36)	"Now it happened that as he drew near to Jericho, a blind man…, when he heard a crowd going by, *asked* (ἐπυνθάνετο) what was going on" (18.35-36).
19.1	---
19.11	"While the people were listening to these things, he proceeded to *tell* (εἶπεν) a parable…" (19.11).
(19.28-29)	"After he *had said* (εἰπὼν) this, he continued on ahead, going up to Jerusalem" (19.28).
(19.36), 37	"As he approached the road leading down from the Mount of Olives, the whole crowd of his disciples began *rejoicing* (χαίροντες) to *praise* (αἰνεῖν) God *with a loud voice* (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ)…" (19.36-37).
19.41	"Now when Jesus approached and saw the city, he wept over it, *saying* (λέγων). . ." (19.41-42).
(19.45)	"Then Jesus entered the temple courts and began to drive out those who were selling things there, *saying* (λέγων) to them…" (19.45-46).

As the table above demonstrates, all but two references to the Jerusalem journey

are directly connected to a description of a verbal utterance.[568] For Luke, speech – paired with geographical references – is a means of marking travel insofar as each of the instances of speech above introduces a new pericope and consequently, a new scene on the journey. These instances indicate that Jesus has reached a new place and is now dialoguing with new characters. The conversations, and the movements of Jesus' interlocutors into and out of scenes, carry the journey forward.

The combination of new speech acts with the sporadic references to movement peppered throughout the travel narrative creates a consistent pattern signaling for the reader that a shift in time, place, or action has occurred. In this way, speech helps to facilitate a cohesive progression through the "beginning," "middle," and "end" that constitute the basic elements of plot.[569] Luke's repeated use of direct speech to launch new scenes on the journey (as opposed to using indirect speech or narrative summation)[570] unifies the narrative and evokes a world that is resonant with various

---

[568] The two exceptions in the table above (9.51-53 and 19.1) remind us that the introduction of a new scene did not *require* the use of speech; the narrator had other tools at his disposal when constructing transitions. In comparison with the many verbal utterances cited above, the lack of speech in these two expository passages is quite conspicuous. In other words, the narrative strategy of connecting direct speech with geographical references was not inevitable.

[569] Aristotle defined plot as a "beginning, middle, and end." *Poetics*, 7.1.

[570] In portraying the overwhelming amount of didactic material in this central section of the story, Luke makes extensive use of direct speech, as opposed to narrative summary or indirect speech. Lee's comparison of the proportions in each narrative unit of "speech and action" versus "speech and dialogue" demonstrates that the travel section contains far more "speech and dialogue" than "speech and action." Lee, *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 193n.17. The preference for direct speech is not unusual; both Hebrew Bible narratives and ancient Greco-Roman literature tend to privilege direct speech. According to the Greek historian Polybius, direct speeches "hold the whole history together." *Polybius* 4.369. Still, compare with the Gospel of Mark, in which Jesus' teachings generally are not related through direct discourse until later in the narrative. On Hebrew Bible narratives' preference for direct speech, see Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 65. For a recent treatment of these literary strategies in the Pentateuch, see Françoise Mirguet, *La Représentation du divin dans les récits du Pentateuque: Médiations syntaxiques et narratives*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 123 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

voices representing diverse responses to Jesus, all of which vie for authority in the lives of the story's characters and its readers.[571]

In addition to marking transitions between scenes, speech also functions as a plot device to create causal connections between events. In the previous chapter, I noted that divine will often is used to establish causality in ancient episodic narratives. In the so-called travel narrative, this becomes especially clear, as Jesus repeatedly highlights the *necessity* of God's plan: "It is necessary (δεῖ) for me to travel today, tomorrow, and the next day, because it is impossible for a prophet to be killed outside of Jerusalem" (13.33).[572]

As I also argued previously, however, this is not the only means by which the Lukan narrator creates causal connections; speech, too, points to a particular rhetoric of causality. Luke 11.45-54 is a case in point. In this scene, Jesus pronounces three woes against the scribes and Pharisees for hindering people's entry into the Kingdom of God. This is the first major turning point in Jesus' relationship with his opponents; although the groundwork has been laid for an antagonistic relationship between Jesus and the Pharisees prior to this point,[573] this is where the Pharisees' and lawyers' intentions toward

---

[571] It is significant that each of the verbal utterances highlighted in the table above is spoken by, to, or about Jesus. This observation coheres well with David Gill's argument that the *Reisenotizen* coincide with mistaken notions of either Jesus' identity or Jesus' purpose (specifically, the Gentile mission). Just as the lesson of the Parable of the Sower shows that different people respond to God's word in different ways, these dialogue-focused pericopes along the journey to Jerusalem depict different people responding to Jesus in different ways.

[572] See, similarly, 9.22; 17.25; 21.9; 22.37; 24.7, 26, 44. In 1920, Henry Cadbury identified the use of Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ plus an infinitive as one of Luke's favorite constructions. Henry J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* I (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920), 132. Following Cadbury, Albert Fuchs calls this an "Indiz für Lk-Redaktion." *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur Qullenkritik* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), 185. For the argument that δεῖ is used because Luke believes that a personal deity rules the world, see Charles Cosgrove, "The Divine Δεῖ in Luke-Acts," *NovT* 26 (1984): 170.

Jesus turn explicitly malevolent. I want to draw attention to the fact that their enmity is directly triggered by *what Jesus says*.[574]

The narrator reports that, as Jesus is rehearsing a series of woes against the Pharisees, "One of the experts in religious law answered him, 'Teacher, when you say these things you insult us too'" (11.45). This religious expert voices his objection to what Jesus says because Jesus is *implicitly* insulting them, and as if deliberately fanning the flame of his opponents' indignation, Jesus responds by *explicitly* adding them in: "Woe to you, experts in religious law as well!" (11.46). Jesus' spoken response causes the tenor of his relationship with the religious authorities to turn markedly hostile, and that hostility is expressly verbalized. The scribes and Pharisees "attack him with hostile questions" (ἀποστοματίζω, 11.53) and begin "plotting against (ἐνεδρεύω)[575] him to catch (θηρεύω)[576] him *in something he might say*" (11.54). This narrative moment is, of course, a pivotal one in the plot. Jesus' speech sets in motion the series of events that ultimately result in his death on the cross.

In light of the religious leaders' beginning to plot against Jesus in 11.54, one later exchange between Jesus and the Pharisees is particularly puzzling. In 13.31-35, the Pharisees warn Jesus that Herod intends to murder him and encourage him to leave Herod's territory. With this, several questions arise: Is this a legitimate warning, or did

---

[573] On the Pharisees' characterization, see John Darr, "Observers Observed: The Pharisees," in *On Character Building*, 85-126.

[574] Many scholars identify this passage as marking an important shift in Jesus' relationship to the authorities. Luke Timothy Johnson's statement is paradigmatic: "Luke in contrast [to Matthew] uses this controversy to mark a critical point in the growing hostility between the prophet Jesus and his opponents." *The Gospel of Luke*, 191.

[575] This Greek verb means "lying in ambush against."

[576] This term was often used in a hunting context (BDAG 455 s.v. θηρεύω).

they fabricate it?[577] Do they truly intend to help Jesus,[578] or do they simply want to get Jesus out of Galilee? Without overt narratorial guidance, the reader is left to assess the account based on clues from the narrative leading up to this point.[579] One effect of leaving the encounter ambiguous is to increase the narrative suspense and keep the reader reading; without a clear explanation of the Pharisees' motives, the reader, curiosity aroused, must take a guess based on what he knows already, but ultimately, he must look forward for the answer.

Contrast this with another type of narratorial silence that was discussed in previous chapters: narratorial delays of information. Usually these delays in imparting crucial narrative details exploit the fact that readers encounter the story in a linear way and draw conclusions (right or wrong) as they go. In contrast to the creation of suspense, which is predicated on the reader's awareness that she does not know something, delays often engender surprise, since the reader is "lured into a false certitude of knowledge," believing that she knows all that she needs to know to make sense of the story.[580] This surprise, in turn, often prompts readers to reassess assumptions they have made unconsciously.

For instance, in the story of the healing of ten lepers in 17.11-19, the entire miracle is recounted before the reader is told in verse 16 that the one man who returns to

---

[577] A. Denaux, "L'hypocrisie des Pharisiens et le dessein de Dieu. Analyse de Lc 13,31-33," in F. Neirynck (ed.), *L'Evangile de Luc. Problèmes littéraires et théologiques* (BETL 33; Gembloux: Duculot, 1973), 155-95.

[578] M. Rese, "Einige Überlegungen zu Lukas XIII, 31-33," in J. Dupont (ed.), *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (BETL, 40; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975), 209-212. Darr also finds the account plausible. *Herod the Fox*, 177.

[579] See Darr's critique of the many scholars who do not take the sequence of the story into account. *Herod the Fox*, 175-77.

[580] Sternberg, *Poetics of the Biblical Narrative*, 309.

thank Jesus is a Samaritan – a "foreigner" (ἀλλογενής, 17.17).[581] This parenthetical aside likely would have come as an unsettling surprise for those Jewish readers who assumed that all ten of the lepers were Jewish, and whose relationship with Samaritans was tenuous at best.[582] The only character to respond to Jesus commendably is not an "insider" Israelite, but a foreigner. The delay in recounting this unexpected detail makes it even more startling, and subtly prompts readers to reassess any erroneous beliefs they might have held before.[583] In brief, narratorial delays can maintain readerly attention and subvert conventional expectations.

The Narrative Rhetoric of Characterization Through Speech and Silence

Now let us consider how speech and silence in the central section of Luke supplements, challenges, and/or reinforces the rhetoric of characterization that was established in the beginning sections of Luke's Gospel. Previously, we saw that the religious leaders initially are introduced as ambiguous characters, but eventually, their hostile speech and veiled silences together cast them in a negative light by revealing their agonistic intentions. We also considered how in the scenes leading up to the travel narrative, the disciples' speech and silences characterize them as uncomprehending. As we will see, shifts in the religious leaders' and the disciples' uses of speech and silence in the central section of Luke raise intriguing interpretive questions about their respective characterizations. Jesus's uses of speech, however, remain consistent. His speech-related

---

[581] On the Samaritans in Luke-Acts, see J. Jervell, "The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel: The Understanding of the Samaritans in Luke-Acts," *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1972), 113-132.

[582] Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 651.

[583] Marshall recognizes that "the dramatic art of the story…holds back the detail to this point for emphasis." *Gospel of Luke*, 651.

teachings and parables on the journey to Jerusalem reinforce the previously established narrative picture of him as a powerful miracle worker and authoritative teacher, uniquely related to and sent by God. They also introduce another dimension to Jesus' character: though he is powerful and authoritative, Jesus is also the Messiah who must suffer and die.

The Disciples

As previously mentioned, I agree with the assessment that in the central section of Luke, Jesus is preoccupied with the formation of his disciples. Here, I would like to add to that general observation the more precise point that Luke's concern with the disciples' formation along the journey specifically involves their change from one type of relationship to the spoken word to another. The disciples undergo a realignment of identity: across the central section of Luke, the disciples progress from confused, uninformed followers, silenced by their leader, to loud, unashamed admirers who call out in exuberant praise.

We can see this most notably in the fact that two scenes in which Jesus displays opposing positions on the disciples' uses of silence and speech bracket the travel narrative. Just before embarking on his journey, Jesus forcefully commands his disciples not to tell anyone about Peter's spoken confession that he is the Messiah (9.20-22). The hendiadys in the Greek ("commanding them, he ordered," ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλεν) emphasizes that Jesus' command to "tell no one" (μηδενὶ λέγειν) is authoritative and powerful (9.21).

Compare this with the end of the journey, during the so-called "Triumphal Entry"

of Lk 19.36-40.[584] As Jesus rides down the road from the Mount of Olives to enter Jerusalem, he does so to the sound of a "whole multitude of disciples" (ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν) praising God loudly, "with a great voice" (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, 19.37), "Blessed is the king[585] who comes in the name of the Lord! Peace in heaven and glory in the highest!" (19.38). These details paint the picture of an explosive and exuberant scene: a horde of people throng around Jesus, and shouts of praise fill the air.[586]

At first, Jesus himself remains "silencieux et passif,"[587] apparently in silent approval of the disciples' loud cries. Seemingly out of the blue, the Pharisees – whose presence had not yet been mentioned (yet another delay in the telling of the tale) – assert, "Teacher,

---

[584] Discussing Mark's version of the story, Ched Myers objects to the title: "The popular title usually given to this episode (the 'triumphal entry') is a misnomer, for the procession is neither unambiguously 'triumphal' nor does it actually enter Jerusalem (until the anticlimactic 11:11)." *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988), 294. Paul Brooks Duff agrees, calling this a "decisively nontriumphal 'triumphal entry.'" "The March of the Divine Warrior and the Advent of the Greco-Roman King: Mark's Account of Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem," *JBL* 111 (1992): 73. Though these scholars focus on Mark's account, the reasons they give for their conclusions are not unique to Mark and therefore can be applied to the Lukan account, as well.

[585] Commentators point out that this verse echoes Psalm 118.26 (LXX: 117.26), though Luke uniquely adds the title, "king" (ὁ βασιλευς, 19.38). On Jesus' title here, see L. Cerfaux, "Le titre Kyrios et la dignité royale de Jésus," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 12 (1923): 125-153. On Luke's use of Psalm 118 in this pericope, see James A. Sanders, "A New Testament Hermeneutic Fabric: Psalm 118 in the Entrance Narrative," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 177-190.

[586] This is one of the most hotly contested passages regarding the question of Jesus' aspirations to kingship. Some view this pericope as a straightforward depiction of Jesus as quintessential rival to Caesar. Crossan, for instance, argues that Jesus is a liberatory, revolutionary figure who resists and condemns the ubiquitous Roman imperialistic and Jewish religious authorities. *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994). Such scholars often point out that the pomp and pageantry described in this passage mirrors the elaborate ceremonies marking Roman emperors' *adventus* ("arrival") into a city. Others like Kinman and Duff take the diametrically opposing view – that Jesus is portrayed as a misunderstood humble servant marching resolutely, not toward the seat of power, but toward the cross. Paul W. Walaskay goes so far as to say that Luke is a *pro*-Roman argument written for anti-Roman readers, though not many share this extreme view. *'And So We Came to Rome': The Political Perspective of St. Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[587] Bovon, *L'Évangile Selon Saint Luc*, 4:27.

rebuke (ἐπιτίμησον) your disciples" (19.39).[588] By telling Jesus to silence his disciples, rather than addressing the disciples themselves, the religious leaders are actually attempting to control *both* the disciples' *and* Jesus' uses of speech; they are attempting to assume the authoritative position of determining who can and cannot speak.

Establishing yet again that controlling others' speech is not the religious authorities' role, Jesus will not silence the multitude. Instead, he responds to the Pharisees with the cryptic reply, "I tell you, if these were silent (σιωπήσουσιν), the stones would cry out" (19.40).[589] In stark contrast to his earlier command that the disciples remain silent (9.20-22), Jesus now refuses to silence them. Luke's travel narrative depicts a shift from the disciples' silence, commanded by Jesus, to their rejoicing and praising "with a loud voice" (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, 19.37), and Jesus' unwillingness to quiet them.

What has happened on the journey to occasion this change? One explanation is found in scholarly discussions of the so-called Messianic secret and coheres with the view that the disciples are imperceptive – namely, the suggestion that Jesus silences the

---

[588] This detail is uniquely Lukan. See also the similar situation in Acts 3.1-4.21, where the officials warn Peter and John to "no longer speak" (μηκέτι λαλεῖν) in Jesus' name (4.17).

[589] Jesus' enigmatic response to the Pharisees – "I tell you, if these ones were silent (σιωπήσουσιν), the stones would cry out" (19.40) – has stimulated quite a bit of scholarly discussion, especially about whether the stones' cries would be negative or positive. A number of commentators suggest that Jesus is alluding to Habakkuk 2.11: "Surely the stone will cry out from the wall and the rafter will answer it from the framework." Lloyd Gaston, among others, argues that the stones would cry out in judgment against those who oppose Jesus. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (Leiden: Brill, 1970). Others argue that the stones would have called out in joy. See, e.g., F. Rilliet, "La louange des pierres et le tonnerre. Luc 19,40 chez Jacques de Saroug et dans la patristique syriaque," *RThPh* 117 (1985): 293-304; B. Kinman, "'The Stones Will Cry Out' (Luke 19, 40) – Joy or Judgment?" *Bib.* 75 (1994): 232-235. For an argument that this text evokes a sense of divine mastery over nature, see Anne Elvey, "Earth as intertext: 'the stones would shout out' (Luke 19:40)," *Council of Societies for the Study of Religion Bulletin* 35 (2006): 27-30. See also the outline of the most typical interpretations of the stones' cries in B. Kinman, *Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem in the Context of Lukan Theology and the Politics of His Day* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 98-100.

disciples early on because they do not yet grasp that the Messiah must suffer.[590] This kind of silence does not characterize the disciples as Jesus' opponents, as the religious leaders' silences do in Luke 14.1-6 (discussed below). Luke 9.45 supports the view that the disciples' silence is due to misunderstanding:

> But *they did not understand this word* (τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο), and it had been hidden from them in order that they might not understand it, and they were afraid to ask him (ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτὸν) about this word (τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου).

Those scholars who emphasize the disciples' incomprehension insist that Jesus' identity cannot be fully understood until after his death and resurrection.[591] Kingsbury writes: "[A]lthough the disciples know who Jesus is, they do not as yet know that his destiny is suffering and death. Until they comprehend the latter, they are in no position to proclaim the former."[592] Essentially, they need to be properly informed. Indeed, the disciples do become bold preachers following Jesus' death and resurrection and subsequent commissioning in Acts 1.8: "You will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and as far as the ends of the earth." The Lord even appears to Paul in a vision and expressly tells him, "Do not be afraid, but speak and do not be silent (λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσῃς)" (Acts 18.9).

And yet, the nagging question remains: If the disciples are silenced because they cannot fully understand Jesus' identity until after his death and resurrection, then why does Jesus refuse to silence them in 19.40, *prior to* the passion? This narrative moment poses a problem for the traditional explanation of the disciples' silencing. Let us look

---

[590] Luke's narrative emphasizes the necessity of the Messiah's suffering (πάσχω) in Luke 9.22; 24.26, 46; Acts 3.18; 17.3; 26.23. Luke also invokes the theme of ignorance in Acts 3.17 and 13.27.

[591] Wrede, *Messianic Secret*, 160. Joel Marcus argues the same in *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Bible Commentary (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 525-27. See also Mark Sheridan, "Disciples and Discipleship in Matthew and Luke," *BTB* (1973): 235-55.

[592] Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke*, 53.

more closely at this pivotal pericope.

The Triumphal Entry scene is a fitting end to Luke's central section, functioning as "a literary hinge" between the journey to Jerusalem and the tragic events that occur when Jesus arrives there.[593] As such, the setting of the Triumphal Entry constitutes a liminal, in-between space, a space of passage, of comings and goings. Jesus and his disciples are no longer itinerant travelers, moving on from town to town, though neither can they be said to have arrived at their final destination quite yet. For Jesus and his disciples, this interstitial space represents a moment of opportunity: at the end of the journey, they face a choice. They can continue on into Jerusalem and undergo the suffering that awaits, or they can turn around and avoid further trouble with the authorities.

Jesus' refusal to silence his disciples amounts to an implicit embrace of where he is going and what will happen there. Not only this, but when Jesus says that if his disciples were silent, stones – naturally inanimate, voiceless objects – would call out, he indicates that ultimately, praise in response to his Messianic identity not only will not, but cannot, be silenced.[594]

The Triumphal Entry represents simultaneously a retrospective moment, in which the foregoing journey toward Jerusalem finally culminates, and a prefatory moment, in which the reader anticipates impending events. Looking back to what has preceded this point in the narrative, the exchange between the Pharisees and Jesus as Jesus enters Jerusalem serves as a recapitulation and thus, solidification of the speech-related lessons

[593] Kinman, "Parousia, Jesus' 'A-Triumphal' Entry, and the Fate of Jerusalem (Luke 19:28-44)," 5.

[594] On the religious leaders' attempts to silence responses of praise, which De Long dubs the "silence of Jerusalem," see De Long, *Surprised by God*, 232-236.

woven throughout the Gospel thus far. The disciples demonstrate that their hearts are in the right place as they praise God and verbally attest to Jesus' "mighty works" (δυνάμεων, 19.37). Still, this is not to say that their speech-related lessons are complete. At this point, they still need Jesus to speak on their behalf. The true test will be how they use speech when Jesus is no longer with them. As we will explore in the following chapter, the disciples' speech ethics ultimately *cannot* be fully formed until Jesus is absent from their midst.

Just as the Triumphal Entry scene recalls what has gone before, it also proleptically anticipates the tragic events to come, as Jesus finally begins to enter the place he has repeatedly predicted will be the site of his suffering and death. As the following chapter will demonstrate, the passion narrative proves to be a spectacular failure of speech on the part of the disciples; they are silent in the very moments when their leader most needs them to speak on his behalf. The situation then changes yet again when, following his resurrection, Jesus embodies his authoritative role of gatekeeper of speech, this time opening the gate wide and commissioning his disciples to speak freely: "You will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and as far as the ends of the earth" (Acts 1.8).

Returning to the scholarly suggestion I mentioned earlier, then, we might ask: are interpreters like Kingsbury right when they assert that the disciples cannot truly testify to Jesus until after the resurrection? I believe that at a very basic level, Kingsbury and others are correct that the disciples cannot preach boldly until they understand Jesus' call to suffer as the Messiah. However, the pre-resurrection moment of unfettered speech in 19.36-40 demonstrates that the disciples' inability to perceive Jesus' Messianic mission

only partly explains their early silencing by Jesus. The fact that the bookends of the journey portray a major shift in the disciples' speech practices reinforces Jesus' teachings over the course of the journey: the disciples must be instructed and formed with respect to proper speech ethics before they can be authorized to speak on Jesus' behalf.

If one of the main concerns of the travel narrative is forming the disciples, and if one of the primary elements of that formation is the shaping of their speech, then at the end of the journey, one might ask: have they been adequately formed? Are they now characterized in opposition to their former selves? If we were to judge only by Jesus' willingness to allow them to speak, the answer would appear to be yes. If the narrative were to end here, this would be a fitting, joyful conclusion: the disciples' vocal practices are an index of their growth and maturity. Of course, the narrative does not end here. Everything changes again after Jesus and his disciples enter Jerusalem. Their transformation is incomplete. As such, the Triumphal Entry – during which the disciples shout out praises, but do not yet grasp Jesus' Messianic mission or speak on his behalf – can be read as a symbolic precursor to the divinely-endorsed freedom of speech they will experience after Pentecost.

Jesus

The previous chapter established that Luke's Jesus is particularly concerned with the right uses of speech. We have also noted that the central section of Luke is preoccupied with the theological theme of discipleship; whereas the majority of Jesus' teachings in the Galilean Ministry section of Luke are addressed broadly to "crowds" and "great

multitudes of people,"[595] on his way to Jerusalem, Jesus turns especially to the shaping of his disciples. In contrast to the early sections of Luke, which describe Jesus using the power of speech to enact miracles, the central section highlights his authoritative teaching and his identity as the suffering Messiah.

Jesus' Words – and Silences – in Parables

One of the most salient features of Jesus' teachings in the central section of Luke is his use of parables; roughly twenty of the Gospel's twenty-four parables occur on the journey to Jerusalem.[596] An intriguing dimension to the parables is that they are *both* stories told by the narrator within the gospel story as a whole, *and* stories told by Jesus to other characters within the story.[597] Essentially, a parable is a story within a story – in literary terms, a form of *mise en abyme*.[598] In many ways, then, our analysis of the ways a parable works for Jesus' hearers mirrors the ways it works for Gospel readers, as well. Discussing contemporary novels, Leona Toker dubs this phenomenon "parallel experience":

---

[595] See, e.g., Lk. 6.17; 7.1; 8.4.

[596] This distribution of parables in Luke is itself significant, since the journey to Jerusalem is concerned with the disciples' formation, and parables are an effective teaching tool. Still, the exact definition of a parable differs depending on the scholar, and thus, so too does the number of pericopes identified as parables in the Gospel of Luke. See Bultmann's discussion of the difficulties of categorizing parables in *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 174.

[597] F. Bovon notes, "Luke *writes* what Jesus *says*." Emphasis original. Bovon, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15.11-32): Second Reading," in *Exegesis: Problems of Method and Exercises in Reading (Genesis 22 and Luke 15)* (ed. F. Bovon and G. Rouiller; trans. D.G. Miller; Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978), 442.

[598] *Mise en abyme*, a term coined by André Gide, refers to "an internal reduplication of a literary work or part of a work." Chris Baldick, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary*, 211. The classic critical work on *mise en abyme* is Lucien Dällenbach, *The Mirror in the Text* (trans. J. Whiteley and E. Hughes; Chicago: University of Chicago Press and Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989); *Le récit spéculaire: Essai sur la mise en abyme* (Paris: Seuil, 1977). In postmodern novels and artwork, the concept tends to refer more to an infinite regression in which the macrostructure is repeated in miniature indefinitely. Still, the most basic definition applies to the parable.

> By placing us in an intellectual predicament analogous to that of the characters, parallel experience can turn into a direct means of conveying to us the specific emotional climate of the novel's world.[599]

The following discussion on the parables therefore applies to *both* Jesus and the Lukan narrator as storytellers, as well as to *both* Jesus' auditors and Luke's readers as audience.

Contrary to the common view that parables communicate one simple lesson,[600] it is axiomatic now in parable scholarship to observe that parables are intrinsically ambiguous, and that this is part of their power.[601] C.H. Dodd's is the most cited definition:

> At its simplest the parable is a metaphor or simile drawn from nature or common life, arresting the hearer by its vividness or strangeness and leaving the mind in sufficient doubt about its precise application to tease it into active thought.[602]

The very fact that the disciples must ask for Jesus' interpretation of a parable indicates that its meaning is not self-evident ("His disciples asked him what this parable meant," 8.9); similarly, the question of a parable's intended audience often remains ambiguous, even for the disciples ("Then Peter said, 'Lord, are you telling this parable for us or for everyone?'" 12.41). Indeed, straightforward interpretation of the parables has eluded gospel readers for centuries.[603]

---

[599] Toker, *Eloquent Reticence*, 4.

[600] In the late 1970s, Frank Kermode put it this way: "For the last century or so there has been something of a consensus among experts that parables of the kind found in the New Testament were always essentially simple, and always had the same kind of point, which would have been instantly taken by all listeners, outsiders included." *Genesis of Secrecy*, 25.

[601] Sallie McFague writes, "The parable does not teach a spectator a lesson; rather it invites and surprises a participant into an experience. This is its power…" *Speaking in Parables: A Study in Metaphor and Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 69.

[602] C.H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, 1935), 5.

[603] For a rich bibliography and discussion of the history of parable interpretation, see François Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 15,1–19,27)* (EKKNT 3/3; Düsseldorf: Benziger, 2001) and idem., "Parabel

Broadly speaking, then, silence is central to the way parables function because "their meaning emerges in terms of what is said against the background of *what is not said*."[604] This section considers the rhetorical impact of four particular silences deployed in the telling of parables: gaps, delays, open endings, and internal monologue.

Gaps. As Maxwell notes, "all audience participation in co-creating a story is made possible by some sort of omission."[605] I have pointed out already that in order to create meaning, readers consistently must fill in aporias in the text.[606] Ambiguity – often explicitly termed a literary "gap"[607] – is a form of narratorial silence, since the storyteller leaves something unsaid and hearers must supply the missing information or interpretation themselves.[608]

The very proliferation of interpretations of Luke's parables can be traced back to narratorial gaps. Consider the fact that the Lukan parables simply leave some questions unanswered:[609] Does the fate of the traveler in the Parable of the Good Samaritan (10.25-

---

des Evangeliums — Parabel des Gottesreiches," in Hans Weder, ed., *Die Sprache der Bilder. Gleichnis und Metapher in Literatur und Theologie* (Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1989), 11-21.

[604] Emphasis original. J. Breech, *The Silence of Jesus: the Authentic Voice of the Historical Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 221.

[605] Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines*, 51.

[606] Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1974 [orig. German, *Der Akt des Lesens* (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1976)]). See also Zoltán Schwáb, "Mind the Gap: The Impact of Wolfgang Iser's Reader–Response Criticism on Biblical Studies—A Critical Assessment," *Literature and Theology* 17 (2003): 170-181.

[607] Following Meir Sternberg, Joel Marcus defines a "gap" as "deliberate ambiguity in the narrative." "Blanks and Gaps in the Markan Parable of the Sower," *Bib Int* 5 (1997): 247.

[608] See Tom Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, 69-71.

[609] For a long list of unanswered questions in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, see George W. Ramsey's article (esp. 34), where he insists that the ambiguity is purposeful, "Plots, Gaps, Repetitions, and Ambiguity in Luke 15," *PRS* 17 (1990): 33-42.

37) represent the human race falling into the clutches of Satan (as Irenaeus believed),[610] or does it depict the reader's need to be saved from a "ditch of incomprehension" (as Kermode more recently proposed)?[611] In the Parable of the Unjust Steward (16.1-9), one of the most puzzling of Jesus' parables, is Jesus commending dishonesty, or is Jesus being sarcastic?[612] Of course, the ways that one answers these questions depends upon whether one views parables as fundamentally allegorical,[613] analogical,[614] metaphorical,[615] or as something else altogether.[616] What is important here is that the requirement that readers must supply what is missing is part of a parable's rhetorical

---

[610] On this, see P. Siniscalo, "La parábola del figlio prodigo (Lc 15, 11-32) in Ireneo," *SMSR* 38 (1967): 536-53.

[611] Kermode, *Genesis of Secrecy*, 35.

[612] Proponents of the view that Jesus is using sarcasm include R. Collins, "Is the Parable of the Unjust Steward Pure Sarcasm?" *ExpT* 22 (1910): 525-526; Richard Hiers, "Friends by Unrighteous Mammon: The Eschatological Proletariat," *JAAR* 38 (1970): 30-31.

[613] Arland Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, 2000); Craig Blomberg holds that "each parable makes one point per main character." Craig L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1990), 163. Adolf Jülicher famously distinguished between *Gleichnis* (which refers to universally applicable similitudes) and *Parabel* (a more subtle story about a one-time event). *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. 2. Teil. Auslegung der Gleichnisreden der drei ersten Evangelien* (Freiburg, 1899).

[614] John Sider believes that each parable is essentially an analogy "in the service of moral or spiritual argument." *Interpreting the Parables* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 84.

[615] Robert W. Funk, "The Parable as Metaphor," *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966); Paul Ricoeur, "Biblical Hermeneutics," *Semeia* 4 (1975): 27-138. The distinction between allegory (which is intelligible) and symbol (which paradoxically expresses what cannot be expressed) is fundamental for John Dominic Crossan's definition of parable. For Crossan, parables are metaphorical symbols that cannot be paraphrased and instead must be experienced. *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973).

[616] The field of parable research is crowded, indeed. Some important discussions include: Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (2nd ed.; trans. S.H. Hooke; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972); Kenneth Ewing Bailey, *Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976); Norman Perrin, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976); John Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989); Jean Delorme, *Les Paraboles evangeliques: Perspectives nouvelles* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1989); Bernhard Heininger, *Metaphorik, Erzahlstruktur und szenischdramatische Gestaltung in den Sondergutgleichnissen bei Lukas* (NTAbh 24; Münster: Aschendorff, 1991); CW Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994); William Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994).

power, because the process engages readers in the story and implicates them in the interpretive task.

Delays. One of the defining characteristics of parables is that they surprise readers and prompt them to reevaluate their own views.[617] Resseguie, discussing "estranging devices," writes that, "[A]mbiguity seeks to deracinate the hearer's deficient or limited point of view by offering a possibility that does not lie right on the surface."[618] The uniquely Lukan Parable of the Good Samaritan (10.25-37) is emblematic of this characteristic. As many scholars have noted, in this parable, Jesus' depiction of the true "neighbor" being a despised Samaritan would have shocked his hearers and Luke's earliest readers. The fact that this unexpected information is not revealed until *after* the priest and Levite have already passed by the half-dead traveler increases the surprise through the contrast with those who would have been expected to help.

A similar narratorial delay occurs in the Parable of the Unjust Judge (18.1-8). The beginning of the parable describes a judge who "neither feared God nor respected people" (τὸν θεὸν μὴ φοβούμενος καὶ ἄνθρωπον μὴ ἐντρεπόμενος, 18.2, 4). He does not care for true justice, and only because the widow "bothers" (παρέχειν…κόπον, 18.5)[619] him does he finally agree to do what she asks. The real surprise comes in verse 7, when Jesus compares this "unrighteous judge" (ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας, 18.6) to God:

[617] See the classic work by Paul Ricoeur, "Listening to the Parables of Jesus," *Criterion* 13 (1974): 18-22.

[618] Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel*, 42.

[619] This Greek construction also appears in the twin parable to this one, the Parable of the Friend at Midnight (11.7).

"And will not God grant justice to his chosen ones who cry to him day and night? Will he delay long in helping them?"

Most commentators simply explain this comparison away as a lesser-to-greater argument (*qal wahomer*):[620] if even this immoral man finally listens to the widow's pleas, how much more will a just God do so?[621] Even if this is the case, nevertheless, as Herzog puts it, "the unjust judge is, at best, a poor choice to communicate such a message."[622] Jeremias similarly insists that the narrator's choice of "a brutal judge to illustrate God's helpfulness must have shocked his audience."[623] My point is that it is precisely because the comparison is delayed to the end of the parable, *after* the judge has been depicted as a negative character, that the surprise is so striking.[624] If the parable began with an introductory statement such as, "God is like this judge…," it would read differently; the comparison would be less shocking because it would not come on the heels of the demonstration that the judge is a negative character. Narratorial silences like delaying important information can thus contribute to the impact of a parable.

Open Endings. In addition to gaps and delays in narration, many parables are left open-ended. In the Parable of the Fig Tree (13.6-9), for example, Jesus does not say whether the vineyard owner heeds his gardener's suggestion, or insists upon cutting the tree down.

---

[620] This is similar to Luke 11.13.

[621] See, e.g., Kistemaker, *The Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980), 252; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1180; Wiefel, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas.* Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 3 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1988), 315; Bock, *Luke*, 1450; Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus*, 258.

[622] Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, 217.

[623] Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 156.

[624] Indeed, Hultgren cites the "outlandish form of argument from the behavior of an unjust judge to an assertion about God" as evidence of its authenticity. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus*, 258.

Nor does the Parable of the Rich Fool (12.16-21) include a description of the rich man's response to God. We do not know whether the elder brother went in to join the feast in the Parable of the Prodigal Son (15.11-32), and we never find out if the master's house is filled in the Parable of the Great Supper (14.15-24). Notice that each of these open endings concerns a character's response to God; by leaving their responses untold, the storyteller (Jesus, and by extension, Luke) invites the hearers to consider what their response might have been in such a situation, and what the narrator believes the correct response ought to be.

Something similar happens in the way that the Lukan narrator situates the open endings of the parables within the larger gospel narrative. In many cases, the gospel readers are not told how audience members respond to Jesus' parable. Luke 10.25-35 is a ready example. First, a Jewish lawyer asks a question "to test" (ἐκπειράζω) Jesus: "Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" (10.25) Jerome Neyrey's point about the Markan parallel applies here, too: "Questions, then, serve as weapons with lethal intent, for the person asking them does not seek information from Jesus but attempts to embarrass him."[625] After an exchange about the law, the lawyer asks Jesus another question: "Who is my neighbor?" (10.29). In response, Jesus tells the Parable of the Good Samaritan, and then turns the question back around on the lawyer: "Which of these three, do you think, was a neighbor to the man who fell into the hands of the robbers?" (10.37). Though the lawyer answers, "The one who showed him mercy," the reader is given no sign of how he reacts to this conclusion. Perhaps he scoffs and walks away. Perhaps he

[625] Jerome Neyrey, "Questions, *Chreiai*, and Challenges to Honor: The Interface of Rhetoric and Culture in Mark's Gospel," *CBQ* (1998): 657-680.

grieves.[626] Perhaps he embraces Jesus' point and whole-heartedly goes and does "likewise" (10.37).[627] Raj Nadella describes the open ending this way: "Given Luke's silence about the lawyer's future, the readers following (t)his story might be prone to supply their own 'finalizing' endings to the lawyer's story."[628] The gap in narration leaves the end untold, and in this way, invites the reader to step into the lawyer's role and decide for herself how she will respond to Jesus' story.[629]

Internal Monologue. The parables contain several instances of internal monologue, which also facilitates readerly identification with a parable's main character. As I said in the last chapter, because internal monologue represents unmediated access to a character's private experience, it privileges Luke's readers (and, here, Jesus' listeners) and invites them to consider what their own response would be if they were in the thinking character's situation. Heininger highlights the way that internal monologue collapses any distance between the text and reader:

> Der Leser erkennt in den Gefühlsausbrüchen der handelnden Personen seine eigenen Stimmungen wieder, und das umso mehr, als die äußeren Ereignisse, denen die Reaktionen im Selbstgespräch gelten, seinen eigenen Lebenserfahrungen gleichen.[630]

---

[626] As he does in the Matthean and Markan parallels to this story (Matt. 19.16-22; Mk. 10.17-22).

[627] For a semiotic analysis of this parable in particular, see Groupe d'Entrevernes, "La parabole du bon samaritain," in *Signes et Paraboles. Sémiotique et texte évangélique* (Paris, 1977), 49-54.

[628] Nadella, *Dialogue Not Dogma*, 77.

[629] See also the parables in Lk. 5.34-39; 6.39-49; 12.16-21; 14.7-24; 15.1-32; 18.1-14; 19.11-27, where the narrator does not return to the story audience, and thus, the reader does not witness their reaction.

[630] Heininger, *Metaphorik*, 62.

Sellew similarly asserts that the technique makes the characters of the parables more realistic and life-like, and thus, "We see ourselves reflected in [Jesus'] little people caught in awkward places."[631]

In his article on internal monologue in the Lukan parables, Sellew hints at a dilemma that he does not develop. As Sellew writes, Luke "is not always consistent in his use of inner speech, nor does he always employ the device even when it might have been expected."[632] On the one hand, the thinking characters tend to be unheroic, embodying self-centeredness. Joel Green generalizes this way: "Throughout the narrative, self-talk (literally, 'saying in [his] heart') is negatively construed, a practice characteristic of those who oppose the divine purpose."[633] And yet, Green overstates his case, since two of the parables in which internal monologue occurs compare the thinker to God (The Unjust Judge of 18.2-5 and The Owner of the Vineyard in 20.9-16); Sellew briefly mentions that this fact raises intriguing questions "about the theology implicit in the parables that Jesus tells in this Gospel: theology in the strict sense," but he does not explore this line of thought.[634] One might also pose the related question: If internal monologue invites readers to imagine themselves in the same situation as the thinker, does this mean that readers of these parables ought to imagine themselves in the role of God?

---

[631] Sellew, "Interior Monologue," 253. Sellew also highlights three other characteristics of these examples of internal monologue. First, he notes that these instances mirror the conventional ancient Greek use of internal monologue, because they are also situated in moments of internal crisis; second, Sellew points out – contra many other scholars who view these parables as "example stories" – that the thinking characters tend to be negatively portrayed; third, Sellew contrasts Jesus' liberal use of internal monologue in the parables with what he considers the Lukan narrator's more sparing utilization of the technique. From this, he concludes that the internal monologues in the parables emphasize Jesus' unique powers of perception and his dramatic storytelling style.

[632] Sellew, "Interior Monologue," 249.

[633] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 505.

[634] Sellew, "Interior Monologue," 248-49.

My proposal is twofold: first, internal monologues in Jesus' parables illustrate and add a new dimension to Jesus' speech-related teachings (discussed in more detail below); second, the depictions of God in the final two parables develop and deepen our understanding of human-divine interactions in Luke's Gospel. Internal monologues in the parables of the Foolish Farmer, Unfaithful Servant, Prodigal Son, and Crafty Steward demonstrate the power and importance of *what one says to one's own heart*. In each of these parables, the thinker ponders a dilemma and ultimately attempts to solve matters himself. In each case (though to varying degrees), what the character says "to himself" runs counter to the divine will; his internal speech shows that the state of his heart runs counter to the divine will as well.[635] Those who hear these parables are invited to imagine themselves in the same moment of internal conflict, and if they adopt the thinking character's attitude, they will also experience the judgment and/or correction that follows.

In the Parable of the Unjust Judge (18.2-5), however, internal monologue is not aimed at creating a parallel experience for the reader. This is one of the few parables that the narrator prefaces with interpretive guidance: the narrator says explicitly that Jesus tells this parable "to show them they should always pray and not lose heart" (18.2). This means that from the outset, readers should know that the character in the parable with whom they are invited to identify is not the thinking judge, but the persistently prayerful widow. In this case, the character opposite the divine figure responds to him commendably; she is compared with God's "chosen ones, calling out to him day and night" (τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βοώντων αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, 18.7).

[635] In 12.16-20, this is explicit; in the other three parables, it is implied either within the parable or in Jesus' commentary afterward.

In the case of the Owner of the Vineyard parable (20.9-16), the audience is again *not* compared to the thinking character (the owner of the vineyard), but rather to those who respond to him (the tenants). The narrator's clarification about audience identification comes after the story has been told, when he states that the experts in the law and chief priests: "realized he had told this parable against them" (20.19). This statement by the narrator and the people's exclamation at the end of the parable ("May this never happen!" 20.16) together imply that Jesus' audience understands the vineyard owner to be God, and that *they* are being compared to the tenants who behave so badly.

To return to Sellew's tantalizing question, then, what are the theological implications of portraying God (not the human listeners) as the one who "speaks to himself"? For one thing, these portrayals are strikingly anthropomorphic. The judge and the vineyard owner wrestle with what to do and weigh their various options. Importantly, they both deliberate over the best way to respond to the other characters, who embody different possible responses to God: persistent faith or absolute rejection. Through internal monologue, the audience is given privileged access to the judge's and vineyard owner's thought processes – and even witnesses these God-characters changing their minds.

At the same time, however, the God-characters act decisively at the end of each parable, and their actions correspond directly with the human characters' behavior; whereas the judge grants justice to the tenacious widow, the vineyard owner eventually comes to "destroy those tenants and give the vineyard to others" (20.16). In both of these parables, the internal monologue adds complexity to Jesus' narrative picture of God, simultaneously depicting a God who personally wrestles over how to respond to humans

and a God who delivers justice "swiftly" (ἐν τάχει, 18.8). Every parable that includes internal monologue can be read as a cautionary message: one's response to God matters. The next section describes how this message is also a crucial component of Jesus' explicitly speech-related teachings.

Jesus' Words About Speech

In the central section of Luke, Jesus reiterates and further develops the lessons depicted so powerfully by the Parable of the Sower (Lk 8.4-21). As discussed in the previous chapter, through the Parable of the Sower, Jesus teaches his disciples that one's heart (καρδία) must be like "good soil" in order to receive[636] God's word and allow it to yield a harvest of powerful, reliable speech; conversely, if one's heart is bad, the word of God will fall on deaf ears, and one's speech will be misleading, or even run counter to the will of God.

Over the course of their journey to Jerusalem, the disciples must learn the power involved in using speech, and how to wield that power in positive ways. For example, Jesus builds on his previous teachings when he tells his disciples that they need only say the word – literally – and peace will enter a home: "Whatever house you enter, first *say* (λέγετε), 'Peace to this house.' And if anyone is there who shares in peace, your peace will rest on that person" (10.5-6). Similarly, Jesus tells them, "If you had faith the size of a mustard seed, you could *say* (ἐλέγετε) to this black mulberry tree, 'Be uprooted and

[636] Interestingly, one of the verbs Jesus uses to describe the reception of God's word – δέχομαι (8.13) – is repeated several times in the central section of Luke. Δέχομαι is a verb of hospitality (δέχομαι, TDNT, 146-48); following its occurrence in the sower parable, its usage shifts and it consistently denotes welcoming a person (often into one's town or one's home). Lk. 9.5, 48, 53; 10.8, 10; 16.4, 9. In Acts, the use of δέχομαι notably shifts to the reception of "living messages" (7.38), the "word of God" (8.14; 11.1), the "message" (17.11), or "letters" (22.5; 28.21). The repetition of this verb subtly evokes the message of the parable even as the narrative moves on; the shift in its referent further develops the theme of receiving God's word with a welcoming heart.

planted by the sea,' and it would obey you" (17.6). In other words, if the speaker has faith, her or his words will be miraculously effective.[637]

Jesus teaches the disciples that as his messengers, they essentially can speak his words, *if* they do so with his authorization and in alignment with God's will. This is clearly demonstrated when Jesus commissions the seventy-two[638] disciples to minister on his behalf. He conflates their words with his own, and even goes on to equate the rejection of those words with the rejection of God: "The one who hears (ἀκούων) you hears (ἀκούων) me, and the one who rejects you rejects me, and the one who rejects me rejects the one who sent me" (10.16). When the disciples return, they rejoice, saying, "Lord, even the demons submit to us in your name!" (10.17). William Baker treats the speech ethics in the Epistle to James, but his description applies here, as well:

> The power of anyone's words, from that of king to that of the humblest slave, is ultimately limited in proportion to the proximity of his words to God's will at the time and under the circumstances in which they are spoken.[639]

As we have seen, the disciples are not portrayed as being particularly close to God's will throughout much of the Gospel narrative. And yet, despite all the disciples' speech foibles and misunderstandings, Jesus teaches his followers that they have the potential to wield the liberating, healing power of words in the same way that he does, *if* they do so on his behalf and with his authorization.[640] By further solidifying the association of Jesus'

---

[637] Jesus is, of course, the quintessential example: among other passages, consider that when Jesus says to the blind man, "Receive your sight; your faith has healed you," the narrator says the man "immediately" (παραχρῆμα) regains his sight (18.42-43).

[638] There is a famous textual discrepancy here, where the number is either "seventy" (א A C L W Θ Ξ Ψ *f*1, 13 𝔐) or "seventy-two" (𝔓[75] B D 0181 *pc* lat). "Seventy-two" is the more difficult reading, which is why I use that number here.

[639] Baker, *Personal Speech-Ethics*, 42. Baker calculates that twenty-nine of the thirty-two ethical imperatives in James are related to speech.

words with God's words, this teaching contributes to Jesus' characterization as God's uniquely authoritative and authorizing messenger.

Still, Jesus' promise that they might speak his words does not come without a warning: he also insists that speech has perilous potential. Untrustworthy speech can be infectious, spreading fear, chaos, or misdirection; Jesus' followers must not fall victim to disingenuous speech. As they approach Jerusalem, for example, Jesus explicitly warns his disciples: "And they will say (ἐροῦσιν) to you, 'Behold! There he is!' or 'Behold! Here he is!' Do not go out or chase after them" (17.23).[641] Jesus thus cautions his disciples that some people will use speech maliciously to cause confusion and thereby mislead them.

What Jesus says next further contributes to both his characterization and the disciples'. After warning his disciples about the dangers of deceptive speech, Jesus asserts that the Son of Man must "suffer many things" (πολλὰ παθεῖν, 17.25). Indeed, this is a common thread woven throughout the Gospel: the disciples' incomprehension clusters especially around the motif of Jesus' Messianic call to suffer and die.[642] Jesus clearly states before leaving Galilee that the Son of Man must "suffer many things and…be killed" (πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ…ἀποκτανθῆναι, 9.22), and that he will "be betrayed into the hands of men" (παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, 9.44); he repeatedly predicts the passion on the trip to Jerusalem (12.50; 13.32-33; 17.25) and

---

[640] After they return, delighting in the fact that the demons obey their commands, Jesus explains, "Look, I have given you authority (τὴν ἐξουσίαν) to tread on snakes and scorpions and on the full force of the enemy, and nothing at all (οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ) will hurt you" (10.19). Note the emphatic double negative at the end of the statement.

[641] Later, he reiterates that vigilance is required in order to avoid being misled by what others say: "Be on guard that you are not misled. For many will come in my name, saying (λέγοντες), 'It is I,' and, 'The time is near.' Do not follow them!" (21.8).

[642] Fitzmyer calls the idea of a suffering Messiah an "exclusively Lucan theologoumenon." Joseph Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 259.

refers to his suffering during the Passover meal (πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν, 22.15); the risen Jesus clarifies yet again on the road to Emmaus that it was necessary for the Messiah "to suffer these things" (ταῦτα…παθεῖν) in order "to enter into his glory" (εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, 24.26), and that "it is written that the Messiah would suffer" (γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν, 24.46).[643] And yet, despite the repetition, until the very end of the Gospel, the disciples consistently fail to comprehend Jesus' words and therefore, they remain vulnerable to others' deceptive speech.

How can Jesus' disciples avoid the dangers of untrustworthy speech? The solution is, again, rightly receiving the word of God and – as we saw previously – rightly receiving the words of Jesus, as well. The narrative portrays Jesus himself using speech as a potent and powerful shield against his opponents. Despite the chief priests' and experts' desire to assassinate Jesus, they cannot find any way to do it "because (γάρ) all the people hung on his words" (19.48). In this moment, Jesus is shown living out the truth of what he repeatedly assures the disciples: they do not need to fear their adversaries if they rightly receive the word of God into their hearts (καρδίας) and speak accordingly. Addressing a situation of persecution in which the disciples are brought before the authorities and expected to defend themselves, Jesus reassures his disciples that when they face opposition, they need not worry about producing their own apologetic speech; he himself will provide the words they need:

> Determine in your hearts (καρδίαις) not to rehearse ahead of time how to make your defense. For I myself (ἐγώ)[644] will give you the words (lit: "mouth," στόμα)[645] along with the wisdom that none of your adversaries will be able to

[643] I will discuss this scene in more detail in the following chapter.

[644] The pronoun is unnecessary in the Greek and therefore reflects emphasis.

withstand or contradict (21.14-15).

Jesus depicts speech as an unassailable shield from one's adversaries. Furthermore, based on Jesus' teachings about the reception of God's word, and the invocation again of the word καρδία, it is safe to assert that the unspoken assumption in 21.14-15 is that the disciples must first be in a proper internal state – in the right state of heart – to receive the words from Jesus that will protect them.

In the central section of Luke, the Holy Spirit is explicitly added to the figures of God and Jesus as a third entity whose words ought to be received and trusted.[646] Indeed, throughout Luke's Gospel, the Holy Spirit is depicted as a source and guarantor of prophetic, or divinely inspired, speech.[647] One Lukan doublet in particular unites Jesus and the Holy Spirit in the role of providing speech as a shield in times of danger (12.12/21.15).[648] Just as he says he will give the disciples the words and wisdom they need to defeat their adversaries, Jesus also teaches that the Holy Spirit "will teach [them] what it is necessary to say" (διδάξει...ἃ δεῖ εἰπεῖν, 12.12).[649]

To sum up Jesus' speech-related teachings to his disciples: speech has the potential to be either powerfully negative or powerfully positive. Whether or not one wields such potential in positive ways depends on rightly receiving and employing words

---

[645] This is a common metonymy used to depict the words that come from one's mouth. See also Judges 9.38 (LXX) and Luke 19.22.

[646] The role of the Holy Spirit in Luke is a hotly contested topic, not least because Luke-Acts contains the vast majority of references to τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα when compared with the other canonical gospels. For a list of references, see Ju Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: SAP, 2001), 131 §5.1.1.1 and Appendices I, II, and IV.

[647] For an argument that emphasizes this function of the Holy Spirit based on a narrative-critical methodology (and building upon the work of John Darr), see William Shepherd Jr., *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1994).

[648] Many scholars have argued that Luke equates the Holy Spirit with the Spirit of Jesus, especially in Acts.

[649] This prophecy is fulfilled in Acts 4.8, 31.

provided by the authoritative characters God, Jesus, and/or the Holy Spirit. The next section considers the character group of the religious leaders in light of the interpretive framework established by these teachings about speech.

The Religious Leaders

In the central section of Luke, words are depicted as both the impetus for the religious authorities' anger against Jesus and the potential means by which they will entrap him (11.54). As Jesus journeys to Jerusalem, the conflict with the Jewish leadership escalates, and the modes of attack and defense – speech and silence – undergo a noticeable shift: the Pharisees, chief priests, and scribes move from boldly verbalizing their complaints and questions (5.30, 33; 6.2; 11.15-16, 45; 13.14) to being publicly silent before Jesus (14.4, 6).

Like the disciples, the religious leaders undergo a realignment of identity, though they move in the opposite direction to the disciples: whereas Jesus' disciples move from silence to shouts of praise, Jesus' opponents move from verbal aggressors to subordinates whose speech has failed them. In the next section, an extended analysis of the religious leaders' dramatized failure to speak in Luke 14.1-6 will elucidate this realignment of identity during the central section of Luke: despite the initial scene of praise (5.26), they spend most of the narrative as strong opponents, verbally bargaining with Jesus for authority over who can and cannot speak. They aggressively question, ensnare, evade, and prevaricate with their words. In the end, however, they are no match for Jesus' vocal prowess; they must surrender to Jesus the territory of linguistic debate. After a few more failed attempts to assert verbal authority, they resort instead to the duplicitous

machinations that ultimately lead to the fateful night in Gethsemane, when the conflict turns from verbal to physical.

Illustrative Pericope: The Pharisees' Silence Before Jesus (Luke 14.1-6)

In Luke 14.1-6, Jesus is depicted dining in the home of a synagogue official, a Pharisee. The pericope begins on an ominous note, as the Pharisees in attendance are described as "watching him closely" (παρατηρούμενοι, 14.1).[650] This, combined with the foreboding statement in 11.54 that they seek a way to catch him, could indicate that they are hoping to trap him at this very meal.[651] When Jesus sees a man right in front of him suffering from dropsy, he turns directly to the Pharisees and experts to question them: "Is it legal to heal on the Sabbath or not?"[652] Jesus' question, which Tom Thatcher considers a "riddle,"[653] limits their powers of maneuver.[654] If they say that healing is permitted, they will challenge their own traditional view of the law. If they say that healing is not permitted, they will appear both unloving and – as Jesus' second question reveals – hypocritical. Thus, faced with their inability to stake a decisive claim either way, they

---

[650] The same verb is used in a similar context in Luke 6.7. Riesenfeld prefers "watch lurkingly." *TDNT* 8:147.

[651] Bock argues that "a set-up is likely." This man was probably "invited to the meal in order to trap Jesus." *Luke*, 1256-57. Tannehill agrees that, "The motive for the invitation seems suspect." *Luke*, 227. Moessner, on the other hand, believes this is a different group from that in 11.53-54. See *Lord of the Banquet*, 156.

[652] Interestingly, Luke introduces Jesus' question with the word ἀποκριθείς, "answering," or "reacting," rather than "asking" or "saying" (14.3); Bock and Evans believe this suggests that Jesus knows what they are thinking, although this is merely conjecture since the text itself gives no further clues. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 569; Bock, *Luke*, 1257.

[653] Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, 58. Thatcher considers a statement to be a "riddle" if: 1. The author says that it is; 2. It happens in a riddling session; 3. Other characters are confused; 4. It's calculated to challenge normal thinking. Thatcher believes Lk. 14.3 meets criteria 2 and 4.

[654] Tannehill recognizes this as a common strategy used by Jesus, "In all three [Sabbath controversies: 6.6-11; 13.10-17; 14.1-6] Jesus responds to his critics by asking questions that they do not answer." Tannehill, *Luke*, 227.

choose to remain silent (ἡσύχασαν, 14.4).

Jesus, for his part, remains unruffled. He simply and silently acts, healing the man and sending him away. He then returns to the fray with a counter-offensive, again in the form of a question: "Which of you, if you have a son or an ox that has fallen into a well on a Sabbath day, will not (οὐκ) immediately pull him out?" (14.5) The structure of the question is significant: the Greek οὐκ indicates that Jesus expects a positive answer. He implies that they undoubtedly *would* assist a son or an ox in danger. Again, however, they resort to silence: "They could not reply to these things" (οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἀνταποκριθῆνγαι πρὸς ταῦτα, 14.6). The use of the plural ταῦτα includes more than just Jesus' second question. The implication is that they make no response at all during the entire episode.

The narrator does not explain the religious authorities' reason for staying silent. Does it represent acquiescence and reluctant affirmation of Jesus' point, as silence often did in ancient legal settings?[655] Are they afraid, as the Lord's admonition to Paul in Acts 18.9 implies about silence?[656] Or does it signal their hard-hearted refusal to admit aloud that Jesus is right? A.C. Leaney suggests that they are divided amongst themselves.[657] Although the Lukan narrator leaves the precise reason ambiguous, the narrative does give us some clues.

---

[655] See Cicero, *De Inventione* 1, 32, 54: "*taciturnitas imitatur confessionem*." Kingsbury interprets it this way: "They concede by their very silence that their understanding of the law is exclusive and loveless." Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke*, 94; Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV).* Anchor Bible 28a. (Garden City, N.Y., 1985), 1041.

[656] "Do not be afraid, but speak and do not be silent (λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσῃς)" (Acts 18.9).

[657] A.C. Leaney, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke.* Harper's Commentaries (New York: Harper, 1958), 213.

First, we have observed that the scene begins on an inauspicious note. The lawyers and Pharisees are hostile toward Jesus; they have already been actively seeking a way to trap him. Thus, the silence should not be taken as tacit approval of Jesus. Second, Luke 14.6 specifies that the religious authorities are "unable" (οὐκ ἴσχυσαν) to reply. This inability differs, however, from Zechariah's or the demons' miraculously imposed silences that occur elsewhere. The lawyers and Pharisees' inability to reply signals instead that Jesus has neutralized any vestige of verbal power they once had; they are unable to meet Jesus' verbal challenge. The silence itself is voluntary on the authorities' part and functions here as a rhetorical technique, a refusal to participate with Jesus in open dialogue. Bock gets it nearly right: "For Luke, silence speaks louder than words, for it suggests that no response is possible and that the leadership stands condemned";[658] I would qualify this statement to say that no *spoken* response is possible, since in this case, the leadership's silence *is* their response. As such, it is powerfully loaded.

Just as we saw with Simon the Pharisee in chapter 7, Jesus' opponents' refusal to dialogue with him is particularly striking in light of this scene's significant resonances with the Hellenistic symposium tradition.[659] The literary form of the symposium situates philosophical discussion within the context of a formal banquet; the very point of a symposium is the dialogue.[660] In this setting, the Pharisees' and lawyers' unanswering

---

[658] Bock, *Luke*, 1259.

[659] From the time of Plato, symposia, with their formal meals and conversations, comprise a widely attested literary genre. Jesus' teaching about seating that directly follows this scene (14.7-14) is a common motif in symposium literature.

[660] Many scholars have argued that Luke intentionally draws upon this tradition here and throughout his gospel. See, among others, X. de Meeus, "Composition de Lc, XIV et genre symposiaque," *ETL* 37 (1961): 847-70; J. Delobel, "L'onction par la pécheresse. La composition littéraire de Lc., VII, 36-50," *ETL* 42 (1966): 414-475; E. Springs Steele, "Luke 11:37-54—A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?," *JBL* 103

silence signposts their abdication of the role of interpreting the law, a role that is *supposed* to be their purview in the first place. Drew Hyland's comment on Cleitophon's and Philebus' refusal to participate in Platonic dialogues applies here, as well: "There are people and positions that philosophy thus cannot either refute or incorporate due to the silence of refusal."[661] The religious leaders' silence – although it might protect them to some degree from being further refuted – also prevents their views from being heard, considered, or even adopted by the surrounding guests. As we saw in the previous chapter, the early sections of Luke show the religious leaders verbally sparring with Jesus; in the central section of Luke, they essentially relinquish their authoritative role when they refuse to engage verbally with him in a meaningful way.

This is not to say that the religious leaders do not speak at all between 14.1-6 and Jesus' Triumphal Entry beginning in 19.36. They do speak, but by this point in the narrative, Jesus has rendered their speech ineffective as an expression of authority. As I discussed earlier, during Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, the religious leaders lamely attempt to control who can and cannot speak; their indignation at the disciples' praises and their desire for Jesus to silence them indirectly testify to their belief in the power of speech. Twice after 14.1-6, they are reduced to grumbling *about* Jesus, rather than addressing him to his face (διαγογγύζω, 15.2, 19.7). In Luke 16.4, where the Pharisees "ridicule" (ἐξεμυκτήριζον)[662] Jesus, and in 17.20,[663] where they have "asked" (ἐπερωτηθεὶς) him a question, the narrator does not even take the time to describe what they say.

(1984): 379-394; D. Smith, "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke," *JBL* 106 (1987): 613-638.

[661] Drew Hyland, *Finitude and Transcendence in the Platonic Dialogues* (Albany: SUNY, 1995), 157.

[662] Compare to Lk. 23.25, where the rulers are also said to said to "ridicule" (ἐξεμυκτήριζον) Jesus, and their speech *is* quoted directly.

The religious leaders' silence before Jesus in chapter 14, followed by these few instances of feeble, fruitless speech, prefigures the real, decisive shift in their speech practices that occurs after Jesus' Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem. As we will see in the next chapter, the religious authorities finally alter their strategies for entrapping Jesus from using verbal provocations to employing spies, outright lies, and physical violence. All of these details together converge to bolster my earlier point that the Pharisees' and lawyers' uses of both speech and silence negatively characterize them as inferior to Jesus.[664] Luke 14.1-6 illustrates how, in the central section of Luke, Jesus emerges as the definitive gatekeeper of speech in the narrative, and the leaders' identity shifts correlatively to those who cannot control others' speech, and whose own speech is rendered ineffectual.

IN SUM: SPEECH AND SILENCE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF LUKE

In this chapter, I have highlighted several different ways that speech and silence function throughout the central section of the Gospel of Luke. On the level of the telling, direct speech signals transitions along the journey to Jerusalem, and furthers plot development by creating causal connections between events. At the same time, the narrator's silences

---

[663] This is an interesting case, since we have no explicit statements about their motivation for asking; they might be trying to trap him, as they do elsewhere, or it might be a genuine question. The vocabulary itself (Ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων, "having been asked by the Pharisees") is neutral. One could argue that Jesus' response to their question (οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως...ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν, "the kingdom of God is not coming in an observable way...the kingdom of God is among you," 17.22) is ironic because the Pharisees have been observing him and still cannot perceive what is happening right before them. Ultimately, their question is ambiguous and cannot be identified definitively as effective verbal provocation.

[664] Whitmarsh makes a similar observation regarding a moment in Homer's *Odyssey*: "The impotent silence of the other suitors marks Telemachus' empowered acquisition of mature manhood." *Ancient Greek Literature*, 89.

like ambiguities and delays engage readers by increasing suspense, maintaining attention, engendering surprise, and subverting conventional expectations.

On the level of the story, shifts in the religious leaders' and the disciples' uses of speech develop and complicate their respective characterizations. Specifically, I highlighted that: 1). The religious leaders shift from being verbal aggressors to employing defiant silence before Jesus and powerless speech subsequently, and 2). Jesus' disciples initially are silenced, but eventually grow in their courage and ability to attest vocally to "all the deeds of power that they had seen" (19.37). The latter shift is partly due to Jesus' speech-related teachings along the journey to Jerusalem, which begin (but do not complete) the process of shaping the disciples into effective witnesses; this claim corroborates the scholarly opinion mentioned earlier that the journey to Jerusalem emphasizes the theological theme of forming faithful disciples. Indeed, for both character groups, the journey to Jerusalem has occasioned significant changes in their speech practices.

In contrast, Jesus' parables and speech-related teachings do not exhibit a shift in his uses of speech and silence; rather, they reinforce his characterization as established in earlier sections of the narrative and add a new dimension to his narrative portrait: he is the Messiah who must suffer and die. Jesus' use of internal monologue in the parables also reveals a complex picture of God and thus deepens Luke's theological exploration of divine-human interactions.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE PASSION AND POST-RESURRECTION NARRATIVES
(LUKE 19.45-24.53)

INTRODUCTION

It is an understatement to say that much has been written about the last section of the Gospel of Luke. The Lukan passion and post-resurrection accounts have been mined for evidence of theological redactions,[665] analyzed in terms of historicity,[666] dissected in debates over dogma, and discussed in dialogues about doctrine.[667] The traditional scholarly consensus is that Luke's theology does not emphasize the salvific aspects of Jesus' passion, in its silence echoing Hans Conzelmann's famous remark that Luke assigns no soteriological significance to the cross at all.[668] Luke is more concerned with

---

[665] V. Taylor argues that a "proto-Luke" preceded Luke's narrative (i.e., a non-Markan source) in *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation* (ed. O. Evans; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972); the majority of scholars see the Lukan passion narrative as a re-interpretation of Mark's version. See, among others, Jerome Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology* (New York: Paulist, 1985); Frank Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through their Passion Stories* (New York: Paulist, 1986); Marion L. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22* (JSNTSup 14; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987); Donald Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989); François Bovon, "Le récit lucanien de la passion de Jésus (Lc 22-23)," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (ed. Camille Focant; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 393-423; Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative: The Markan Material in Luke 22, 54-23, 25. A Historical Survey: 1891-1997* (NTTS 30; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

[666] Paul Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961) most famously argues against its historicity, while Joseph Blinzler insists that it is historically plausible in *The Trial of Jesus: The Jewish and Roman Proceedings against Jesus Christ Described and Assessed from the Oldest Accounts* (trans. Isabel and Florence McHugh; Cork: Mercier Press, 1959). See also Otto Betz, "Probleme des Prozesses Jesu," *ANRW* 2 (1982): 565– 647; and August Strobel, *Die Stunde der Wahrheit: Untersuchungen zum Strafverfahren gegen Jesus* (WUNT 21; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980).

[667] G. Lohfink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts – und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas* (Munich: Kosel, 1971); J. F. Maile, "The Ascension in Luke-Acts," *TynB* 37 (1986): 29-59; M. C. Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987); H. Douglas Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology* (SNTSMS 89; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006).

[668] Many scholars today challenge the stark terms of Conzelmann's view. Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of Saint Luke* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 201. Bovon makes the more nuanced distinction that

theological themes like the role of the Holy Spirit, freedom for the oppressed, and Jesus' innocence and unjust rejection. As François Bovon puts it, in Luke, "salvation is more associated with the life of Jesus than his death."[669]

Given this apparent consensus, it is not surprising that relatively few scholars have written about the passion and post-resurrection stories from a narrative perspective,[670] and even fewer have considered the roles of speech and silence in these crucial scenes of climax and denouement. The final section of Luke is comprised of several subsections. Scholars have proposed various elaborate divisions of this material, but in this chapter, I will use the following basic narrative units: 1) Jesus teaches in the Temple (19.47-21.38); 2) The Passover and movement toward Jesus' arrest (22.1-38); 3) Jesus' arrest, trials, and death (22.39-23.56); 4) The resurrection (24.1-53).

SPEECH AND SILENCE IN THE PASSION AND POST-RESURRECTION STORIES

Narratologists note that narrative endings are inherently indeterminate,[671] and many scholars have discussed the inconclusive ending of Luke's sequel, the Acts of the

---

for Luke, Jesus was killed by humans and resurrected by God. François Bovon, "The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts," in *New Testament and Christian Apocrypha: Collected Studies II* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2009), 147.

[669] Bovon, *New Testament and Christian Apocrypha*, 153.

[670] Robert C. Tannehill, *The Gospel According to Luke* (vol. 1 of The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986); Joseph Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1986); Jean-Noël Aletti, *L'art de raconter Jesus Christ: L'écriture narrative de L'évangile de Luc* (Paris: Seuil, 1989); Ute Eisen, "The Narratological Fabric of the Gospels," in *Narratology Beyond Literary Criticism: Mediality, Disciplinarity* (ed. Jan Christoph Meister; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 195-212.

[671] As J. Hillis Miller notes, even the most finalized of endings can be re-opened later. "The Problematic of Ending in Narrative," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 33 (1978): 3. (This entire issue is dedicated to narrative endings.)

Apostles.[672] Still, ancient historians often extolled the virtues of finishing one's account with a sense of completion. For example, Dionysius of Halicarnassus laments the fact that Thucydides "left off his history unfinished" (ἀτελῆ τὴν ἱστορίαν καταλιπεῖν).[673] More recently, Frank Kermode famously argued in his landmark theoretical work, *The Sense of an Ending*, that a story's end unifies and organizes the entire narrative and thus gives rise to the story's sense, or meaning.[674] Correlatively, earlier narrative details prepare the reader for the story's ending. In light of the critical conversation about narrative endings, one might ask: In what ways does the ending of the Gospel of Luke create closure, and in what ways does it generate openness? How does the end of Luke's Gospel impact readers' experiences of the whole? How do speech and silence contribute to the narrative ending? In this chapter, I explore the following uses of speech and silence in the final section of Luke's Gospel:

1). On the level of the telling, speech continues to facilitate plot development, and the amount of direct speech in particular regulates the rhythm of the narrative. As previously, the narrator's uses of silences like literary gaps, delays, and open endings engage readers and provoke various responses. Additionally, in the final chapters of Luke, the narrator puts two implicit types of silence to especially strategic use: first, characters can be rendered silent *implicitly* through their disappearance or conspicuous

---

[672] For example, see Daniel Marguerat, "The End of Acts (28,16-31) and the Rhetoric of Silence," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht; JSNTSup, 90; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 74-89; Troy M. Troftgruben, *A Conclusion Unhindered: A Study of the Ending of Acts Within Its Literary Environment* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2010).

[673] Dionysius, *On Thucydides* 16.847. See the treatment of endings in ancient literature in Troftgruben, *A Conclusion Unhindered*, 61-113.

[674] Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966).

absence from a scene. Second, the narrator employs a different form of narratorial silence when he does not divulge a character's name. Though such silences have been used sparingly before, in this section of the Gospel, they are used to much more telling effect.

2) On the level of the story, the narrative rhetoric depicts dramatic shifts in all the main characters' speech practices, including those of Jesus himself. These shifts in characters' uses of speech and silence, in turn, impact their characterization and simultaneously give rise to the thematization of verbal witness as a constitutive component of true discipleship.

Between the Narrator and the Reader

As the Lukan narrator relates the final installment of the Gospel narrative, he employs speech in two major ways. First, here as elsewhere, speech facilitates the progression of the plot toward its teleological end. Second, the amount of direct dialogue in a scene regulates its tempo and thereby establishes particular points of emphasis.

Throughout Luke's Gospel, speech functions as a catalyst to propel the plot forward by creating causal connections between events. As we saw in the previous chapter, the travel narrative (9.51-19.44) contains the first major turning point in Jesus' relationship with the religious authorities (11.45-54); it was there that Jesus' opponents explicitly turned malevolent. Just as that pivotal instance in the plot was prompted by Jesus' speech, so too is the second major turning point in Jesus' relationship with his opponents – found in 20.7-19 – prompted by something Jesus *says*. After the chief priests, scribes, and elders refuse to answer Jesus' question about the baptism of John (20.7), and he consequently refuses to answer their question about the source of his

authority (20.8), Jesus then proceeds to tell the parable of the vineyard and the tenants (20.9-18). As he finishes, the scribes and chief priests want "to lay hands on him" (ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας), and the reason is precisely that they realize "he told this parable against them" (πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, 20.19). The parable functions as a public rebuke – what social scientists would call a challenge-riposte exchange that honors Jesus and shames the religious leaders.[675] Thus, Jesus' speech again causes a complication that drives plot development and ultimately leads to the crisis of his death on a cross. Here, it is important to clarify that I am *not* arguing that Luke's Jesus intentionally offends others in order to provoke his own passion. Rather, my goal is to highlight the fact that repeatedly, speech is used at strategic points in the composition of the plot.

The previous example of Jesus' telling of the parable of the vineyard in Luke 19 focuses on a key *conflict* in the plot of the Gospel. However, as I observed in the introductory chapter, contrary to a common scholarly assumption, plot development also occurs outside of scenes of antagonism. As Resseguie rightly avers, "[A] plot is more than the sum of its conflicts."[676] The final section of Luke includes several speech-related events that are not conflicts, but are of vital importance to the workings of the plot. One such instance is Jesus' prediction of Peter's denial in 22.31-34. Jesus warns Peter that Satan has demanded to put the disciples to the test, and that Peter himself will fall away (22.31, 34). However, Jesus also implicitly prophesies that Peter will eventually "turn back" (ἐπιστρέψας) and thus admonishes him to "strengthen his brothers" (στήρισον

[675] See, among others, Bruce Malina and Jerome Neyrey, "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World," JH Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models of Interpretation* (Peabody, Mass., 1991), 25-65.

[676] James Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel*, 171.

τοὺς ἀδελφούς, 22.32). Richard Cassidy recognizes the import of this scene for the Gospel's plot:

> Within the overall plot development of Luke's Gospel, Jesus' prediction that Peter will have a pivotal role in strengthening the other apostles and disciples is highly significant. How will his prediction be fulfilled…especially…if Jesus' other prediction regarding Peter's denials is also fulfilled?[677]

Jesus' prophecy that Peter will deny him appears to contradict his prophecy that Peter will strengthen the other disciples. Not only this, but it is likely that Luke's earliest readers would have known that Peter was a leader in the church; if this is the case, Peter's denial itself may have been the shocking episode, in which case such readers would wonder how he was rehabilitated. Jesus' complex prophecy about Peter initially remains unresolved and ambiguous, moving the plot forward and piquing the reader's interest.

The first proclamation of Jesus' resurrection is another pivotal speech-related scene in the plot that does not depict a clash between characters. In 24.4-7, several grieving female disciples approach Jesus' tomb, where two angels[678] meet them and declare that Jesus is alive: "Why do you look for the living among the dead? He is not here, but has been raised!" (τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν; οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη). This verbal announcement is clearly a critical moment in the plot, since it launches the women's faithful testimony to the other disciples, and eventually, the disciples' full recognition of Jesus' identity.[679] We will return to this scene in more

---

[677] Richard J. Cassidy, *Four Times Peter: Portrayals of Peter in the Four Gospels and at Philippi* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2007), 52.

[678] Luke 24.4 does not explicitly call these men "angels/messengers" (ἀγγέλων), but it describes them as clothed in "dazzling attire" (ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ), and the recounting of this event in 24.23 does use the term "angels/messengers" (ἀγγέλων).

[679] As Kindalee Pfremmer De Long puts it, the plot itself "depends on the crucial response of the disciples." *Surprised by God: Praise Responses in the Narrative of Luke-Acts* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 242.

detail later. The point here is that these speech-related episodes create causal connections that propel the plot, whether they are specifically related to conflict or not.

The exchange at the empty tomb is foregrounded by the so-called Triumphal Entry scene in Luke 19.[680] As Jesus enters the city, the dramatic tension mounts. And yet, at the same time, the rhythm of the narrative decelerates to almost a standstill; the time of the telling (*Erzählzeit*) slows as the narrator lingers over particular scenes and certain narrative details. In comparison with the depiction of Jesus' birth and ministry, which spans the course of over thirty years and multiple geographical locations, the passion and resurrection section of Luke gives us a slow, telescoped view of Jesus' crucial last days in Jerusalem. As Lee recognizes, "The slowing of the pace of the narrative in these tightly related scenes signals their importance for the narrator."[681] The pace of the passion becomes plodding and ponderous. The result is a story at once perplexing and profound.

As I pointed out earlier, narrators often vary the use of direct speech to accomplish the narrative effect of tempo regulation. The final four subsections of Luke differ from one another with respect to the amount of direct dialogue between Jesus and his opponents, between Jesus and his disciples, followers, and God (classified below as "friends"), and between characters other than Jesus. The following table documents the amount of direct dialogue in these narrative sequences as opposed to the amount of narratorial summation. The verses are listed in their corresponding column, and the number of Greek words is noted in bold:[682]

---

[680] This scene was treated in more detail in Chapter 3.

[681] Lee, *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 198.

[682] Word counts are of limited value, and many scholars make too much of them. Here, we simply note the number of words to give a broad indication of how much space within each section is allocated to direct dialogue versus summation.

DIRECT DIALOGUE IN THE FINAL SUBSECTIONS OF LUKE

Narrative Subsection:	Direct Dialogue Between Jesus and Opponents:	Direct Dialogue Between Jesus and Friends:	Direct Dialogue Between Others:	Narratorial Summation:
Jesus teaches in the Temple (Lk. 19.47-21.38) = **1,331 total Greek words**	**536 words / 1,331 total** (20.2-18, 21, 24-25, 28-39, 41-44)	**564 words / 1,331 total** (20.46-47; 21.3-4, 6-36)	---	**231 words / 1,331 total** (19.47-48; 20.1, 19-20, 23, 26-27, 40, 45; 21.1-2, 5, 37-38)
The Passover and movement toward Jesus' arrest (Lk. 22.1-38) = **585 total Greek words**	---	**456 words / 585 total** (22.8-12, 15-22, 25-38)	---	**129 words / 585 total** (22.1-7, 13-14, 23-24)
Jesus' arrest, trials, death (Lk. 22.39-23.56) = **1,365 total Greek words**	**219 words / 1,365 total** (22.48, 52-53, 64, 67-71; 23.3, 35, 37, 39)	**228 words / 1,365 total** (22.40, 42, 46, 49, 51, 61; 23.28-31, 34, 42-43, 46)	**280 words / 1,365 total** (22.56-60; 23.2, 4-5, 14-18, 21-22, 40-41, 47)	**638 words / 1,365 total** (22.39, 41, 43-45, 47-48, 50, 54-55, 62-63, 65-66; 23.1, 6-13, 19-20, 23-27, 32-33, 36, 38, 44-45, 48-56)
The resurrection (Lk. 24.1-53) = **825 total Greek words**	---	**380 words / 825 total** (24.17-26, 29, 36, 38-39, 41, 44, 46-49)	**86 words / 825 total** (24.5-7, 32, 34)	**359 words / 825 total** (24.1-4, 8-16, 27-28, 30-31, 33, 35, 37, 40, 42-43, 45, 50-53)

Based on this table, we can make several observations concerning the relative uses of direct dialogue and summative statements in the Gospel's final subsections. First, we can see that Jesus' teaching in the temple (19.47-21.38) is very significant for Luke, since he spends nearly as much time telling that piece of the story (1,335 Gk words) as he does relating the climactic scenes of Jesus' arrest, trials, and death (1,365 Gk words). The Temple section also contains the most direct dialogue (1,100 Gk words) compared to simple narration (231 Gk words). One effect of this use of direct speech between characters is to slow the narrative down even further, delaying the long anticipated climax, overlaying the story with ever deepening controversy and thereby heightening the suspense.

So much direct speech in the Temple teaching scenes (19.47-21.38) also gives special prominence to what Jesus and his interlocutors (both opponents and friends) say, most of which focuses on the themes of Jesus' authority and unjust rejection by the religious leaders. Though the traditional scholarly appellation for such scenes is "controversy dialogue," I would say something even sharper is in view. This is not mere controversy. These are not dialogues so much as duels: the speakers thrust, deflect, counterthrust. Though the reader no doubt knows how the plot – and the plotting – will turn out, the means of getting there is signicant: it is a war of words.

The narrator's prioritizing of speech in this section is further substantiated by the fact that this narrative unit is demarcated by mentions of Jesus' teaching. Luke 19.47-21.38 is marked by an *inclusio* formed by 19.47-50 and 21.38, both of which mention "all the people" (πᾶς ὁ λαός) listening (ἀκούω) to Jesus' daily teaching in the temple. In

this way, the narrator envelops the entire section of 19.47-21.38 in a framework emphasizing Jesus' speech and the people's positive response to it.

Additionally, the majority of the short subsection that establishes the Passover as the temporal setting and moves toward Jesus' arrest (22.1-38) is spent on direct dialogue between Jesus and his friends (456 of the 585 total Greek words); in fact, no one else speaks during this time. This is particularly remarkable when one realizes the import of what else happens in this passage: Judas Iscariot decides to betray Jesus, an indispensable moment in the plot of the story. Despite its magnitude for the plot, however, the scene in which Judas and the chief priests and temple officers confer is reported without any direct dialogue at all (22.3-6). Uspensky dubs this kind of narrative moment a "silent scene":

> In the silent scene, the observer, who is located at some distance from the action, can see the characters, but because of the distance, he seems to be unable to hear them. The remote position makes it possible for the author to present a general view of the whole scene.[683]

In a sense, the narrator keeps readers outside the scene by not allowing them to hear the verbal exchange between these antagonists. Although the episode is pivotal in the plot, Luke chooses to foreground Jesus' words at the Last Supper instead (22.7-38).

The passage relating Jesus' arrest, trials, and death (22.39-23.56) is the longest of the four final subsections with 1,365 Greek words. However, this subsection also contains the most summary statements, as opposed to direct dialogue (638 of the 1,365 Greek words).[684] As we saw in chapter 2, summation shortens the length of time it takes to tell a story, but it does so by increasing the narrative's relative speed. Thus, in this

---

[683] Boris Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition* (trans. Valentina Zavarin and Susan Wittig; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 65.

[684] As Bovon notes in his commentary, Luke alternates between narrative episodes (written in the aorist tense) and short summaries (written in the imperfect tense). The summaries serve as transitions, allowing readers to "above all, effect a generalization of the events." *Luke 1*, 3.

passage, the narrative recovers the momentum it lost in the dialogue-heavy Temple scenes. The unique point I am making here is that the amount of direct speech utilized in each subsection is one of the key tools Luke uses to regulate narrative rhythm, and in this way, achieve emphasis.

Correlatively, the narrator's silences also impact narrative tempo. As we have seen, throughout the Gospel, the Lukan narrator delays the telling of specific narrative details toward particular rhetorical ends. The account of Jesus' arrest and ensuing trial is a case in point. First, Jesus is seized and taken to the high priest's house (22.54). The attentive reader, who has foreseen Jesus' suffering in Jerusalem for quite some time, might expect that this moment marks the beginning of the narrative's climax: finally, the anticipation of Jesus' suffering will be fulfilled. But the narrator does not allow this yet. Suddenly, the scene switches to the high priest's courtyard, where Peter is about to deny Jesus. This literary technique slows the pace of the narrative. Since Jesus and his captors do not take center stage again until 22.63, the dramatic climax is delayed. This, in turn, heightens the suspense and intrigue of the story, since readers must wait even longer to discover how Jesus will be treated.

In addition to narratorial delays of information, another form of narratorial silence further prompts readerly engagement in the story: open endings. Not all of the loose ends are neatly tied up at the end of Luke's Gospel; there are many points about which the narrator simply remains silent.[685] This observation runs counter to the common scholarly

[685] Philippe Menoud recognized this when he argued that Lk. 24.50-3 and Acts 1.1-5 were added later in order to smooth the transition into what was originally the second half of one volume. Menoud has since rescinded this view. Philippe Menoud, "Remarques sur les textes de l'Ascension dans Luc-Actes," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), 148-156 and "'Pendant quarante jours' (Act. 1:3)," in *Neotestamentica et patristica, Festschr. O.Cullmann* (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 148-156.

assertion that the end of Luke's Gospel achieves narrative closure.[686] I would urge that an emphasis on Luke's closure rests upon a comparison with Mark[687] or Acts.[688] From a literary standpoint, such comparisons are problematic.

Focusing only on Luke's narrative, we can see that several narrative trajectories never do reach a final destination. For example, following his resurrection, Jesus promises the disciples that the Holy Spirit will be given to them (24.49), and yet this does not happen in Luke's Gospel. Jesus predicts that the disciples themselves will be brought before the synagogues and interrogated (12.11-12), arrested and persecuted (21.12), betrayed by their families and friends (21.16). None of these things has occurred when the Gospel ends. Neither are Jesus' predictions of Jerusalem's destruction fulfilled (21.20-24; 23.28-31). The implication is that these "disnarrated"[689] events take place outside the confines of the Gospel's final pages.

A lack of closure at the end of Luke's Gospel is not necessarily surprising, since closure and endings are not always the same thing. Still, readers naturally seek answers to open questions, and this desire itself can engage readers in the story and motivate them to (want to) keep reading. Several scholars have recognized this tendency when they speak of Luke's loose ends as proleptic links to Acts, where many of the instabilities and

---

[686] For example, in this final scene, Parsons detects a certain degree of closure through circularity, since the Gospel ends where it begins – in the Temple. Mikeal Parsons, "Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel: The Sense of an Ending in Luke 24:50-53," *SBL Seminar Papers 1986* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1986), 201-23. Parsons's article is predicated upon Marianna Torgovnick's influential work in *Closure in the Novel* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

[687] On Mark's ending, see Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 219, 258-59.

[688] Richard Horsley makes this explicit: "In contrast to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, the ending of the narrative itself in Mark is unresolved." *Hearing the Whole Story*, 76. William Kurz writes that Luke noticed "the deliberate Markan gap," and "chose to fill that gap at the end of his own Gospel. *Reading Luke- Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 30-31.

[689] This is narratologist Gerald Prince's word for the events that are referenced in a narrative, but do not occur. "The Disnarrated," *Style* 22 (1988): 1-8.

unanswered questions left at the end of the Gospel are finally resolved.[690] Acts is where the Holy Spirit descends upon the disciples (2.1-4), Stephen is dragged before the synagogue to defend himself (6.9-12), and Paul is arrested and persecuted (21.30-36). The narrator's open endings create connective tissue between the Gospel and Acts and thereby elicit readers' involvement in the Gospel story even as it comes to an end.

The Narrative Rhetoric of Characterization through Speech and Silence

In this section, I outline the ways that the characters' speech practices in the passion and post-resurrection scenes differ significantly from those we have seen in the story thus far, and I argue that changes in speech habits chart characters' growth (or lack thereof). Alter is right: "Characters reveal themselves through what they repeat, report, or distort of the speech of others."[691] I would add that characters also reveal themselves by what they do *not* repeat, report, or distort of others' speech. As we will see, in the final third of Luke's Gospel all three major character groups – the disciples, Jesus' opponents, and Jesus himself – reveal significant character traits through changes in their typical uses of speech and silence.

The Disciples

In the previous chapter, I traced the disciples' journey from being silenced by Jesus to having their joyful proclamations defended by Jesus. This may appear to support the view of scholars like Schuyler Brown, who considers the portrayal of the disciples in Luke to

[690] For an article focused on the narrative effects of Luke's loose ends, see Mikeal Parsons, "Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel," *SBL Seminar Papers 1986* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1986), 201-23.

[691] Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 76.

be unambiguously positive.[692] However, attention to the dynamics of speech and silence in the final scenes of Luke's Gospel paints a different picture. When readers witness the disciples' loud, jubilant praise in the face of the Pharisees' opposition in 19.37-40, they might legitimately expect the disciples to continue along this vocal path during the ensuing events. In fact, the opposite occurs. Much of the passion narrative itself hinges upon the disciples' fantastic failures of speech.

In contrast to their cries of praise during the so-called Triumphal Entry, the disciples' speech during the Last Supper is a far cry from praiseworthy. During this last meal together, the disciples actually use speech to turn on one another. When Jesus predicts that someone will betray him, the disciples begin to "argue," or "question" (συζητέω) each another, and later, a "dispute" (φιλονεικία)[693] arises about who among them is "the greatest" (μείζων, 22.23-24).[694]

As Jesus' passion begins, the disciples move into a silence that they have chosen – one that is *not* commanded by Jesus, and one that is distinctly contrary to Jesus' teachings about what should occur. In Luke 12.11-12 and 21.12-15, Jesus encourages his

---

[692] Brown praises the disciples' perseverance in Luke 22.28, though he takes this verse out of context. Jesus tells the disciples that they are "those who have stood by me in my trials," but this occurs at the Last Supper, *before* the passion narrative and therefore should not be taken as reflective of their behavior during those crucial events. Brown also does not consider Peter's denial to be a failure, though this perspective ignores that Peter himself expresses deep remorse for what he has done. *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 62-74. Similarly, Dawsey claims that in Luke, the disciples understand Jesus' identity by appealing to 22.28. *The Lukan Voice*, 91. Others who hold this view contrast Luke's portrait of the disciples with Mark's more negative depiction of them. See, e.g., Kyoung-Jin Kim, *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology* (JSNTSup 155; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998). Joel Green writes, "[I]t is surely significant that Luke does not set the disciples over against Jesus as they are in the other Synoptics." *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall; Leicester and Downers Grove: IVP, 1992), 159.

[693] Frederick Field's argument that φιλονεικία carries a neutral, not a negative sense, has not gained wide acceptance. *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899), 75-76.

[694] Though μείζων is comparative in form, here its sense is superlative.

followers that when they are brought before the authorities, this will be "an opportunity to testify" (ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον, 21.13). Jesus admonishes them to wait for the Holy Spirit or him to give them the words they need; he does *not* tell them to avoid arrest altogether or to remain silent in the face of persecution.

As soon as danger is imminent, the disciples are shown sleeping (22.45) and resorting to physical violence (22.49-50), not testifying or receiving words from the Holy Spirit, as Jesus advised. In the critical moments, the disciples disregard Jesus' teachings and instead have recourse to force. Indeed, the scene at the Mount of Olives (22.39-53) presents a number of proleptic motifs that will be demonstrated and developed in subsequent scenes – the disciples' self-protective silence and misunderstanding, the contrast between trustworthiness and deception, and the supplanting of verbal hostilities with physical aggression.

The disciples' negative characterization during this section of Luke's Gospel is further supported by the fact that as the narrative moves on from Jesus' arrest, the disciples are depicted denying Jesus completely (22.54-62) and silently watching the crucifixion from afar (23.49). They do not even allow themselves to be identified as Jesus' followers, let alone to provide trustworthy testimony, speak in his defense, or be taken along with him. Ultimately, they are quite conspicuously absent from the narrative following Jesus' arrest.

The table of direct dialogue above demonstrates that in the final third of Luke's Gospel, Jesus speaks most to his friends during the Temple subsection of 19.47-21.38 (42% of the 1,331 total Greek words) and the following subsection (22.1-38), which contains the Last Supper (78% of the 585 total Greek words). The contrast between these

first two subsections and the following passages is quite stark. Over the course of Jesus' arrest, trials, and death (22.39-23.56), the direct dialogue between Jesus and his friends dwindles to a mere 228 Greek words (16% of the 1,365 total Greek words). Furthermore, as Kindalee Pfremmer De Long points out:

> In the Passion Narrative…not a single voice extols God, with the exception of Jesus' own. This sudden suspension of the praise motif produces a dramatic, tensive silence that stretches from 19.39-23.47, where it is finally broken by the praise speech of a centurion who witnesses Jesus' death.[695]

Essentially, following Jesus' arrest, Luke renders the disciples almost entirely inaudible and invisible.[696]

One might challenge this claim by pointing to Luke 22.57-60, Peter's denial of Christ, where Peter is in fact the main speaker. And yet, even this scene underscores the disciples' metaphorical absence from Jesus' side, where an ideal disciple would be most present and most vocal in his leader's defense. Three times in a row, the reader witnesses Peter's tragic verbal disowning of the very one to whom he previously swore, "Lord, I am prepared to go with you even to prison and to death!" (22.33). The juxtaposition of Peter's initial expression of loyalty with his subsequent repeated denials paradoxically points toward his failure to testify (εἰς μαρτύριον) in the way Jesus admonished.

This pericope also contains a fascinating uniquely Lukan detail: the silent gaze of Christ. In one dramatic moment, Peter denies Jesus for a third time, a rooster crows, and, "immediately, while he was still speaking" (παραχρῆμα ἔτι λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ),

---

[695] De Long, *Surprised by God*, 231.

[696] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 747. Lee says they are absent even prior to Jesus' arrest in what he calls "Act 5" (19.45-21.38), where, "The absence of the Pharisees and the virtual absence of the disciples is striking" (197). Lee divides Luke into the following seven "Acts": 1). The Arrival of Jesus (1.5-3.20); 2). The Introduction of Jesus (3.21-4.44); 3). A Narrative Exposition of 'Who Jesus is' (5.1-9.50); 4). Jesus in the Shadow of Jerusalem (9.51-19.44); 5). Jesus Reclaims the Temple (19.45-21.38); 6). The Suffering and Death of Jesus (22.1-23.56); 7). The Triumph of the Risen Jesus (24.1-53). *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 189.

Jesus turns and looks at Peter (22.60-61). Jesus' silent gaze is not accompanied by a narratorial explanation, nor by any direct discourse from Jesus. This is a departure from Jesus' behavior prior to this scene; elsewhere, he has instructed his disciples verbally. What, then, is the significance of this look? Why does Luke isolate it for narration, and how is a reader to understand it?

One way to bridge this narratorial gap is by looking to what follows: Peter "remembers the word of the Lord" (ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου, 22.61), goes outside, and weeps bitterly (ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς, 22.62). The narrator does not tell the reader whether Jesus intends his look to be an angry rebuke, a compassionate reminder, or an expression of grief and disappointment; still, one can infer that for Luke, the most important aspect of Jesus' silent gaze is that it jogs Peter's memory about the words Jesus spoke to him, and thereby leads Peter toward the path of repentance.

The foregoing discussion has contrasted the disciples' cries of praise during Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, which might appear to point toward their loyalty to Jesus, with their behavior during the passion narrative, which reveals that in the critical moment of crisis, their declarations of loyalty are all hollow. At the critical turn, the rhetoric of the narrative characterizes the disciples negatively through their conspicuous absence from Jesus' side, as well as through their silences. Even the one potential exception to this rule, Peter's verbal denials of Christ, paradoxically underscores his failure to testify on Jesus' behalf.

The disciples' scandalous failure of nerve and voice retroactively illustrates the lessons Jesus taught them on the journey to Jerusalem – speech can have dangerous real-

life repercussions, and the disciples ought to pay attention to the state of their hearts. The narrator demonstrates over the course of the passion narrative that the state of the disciples' hearts is not yet in a positive place, or they would be producing the good fruit of faithful speech.

Green considers the disciples' return from their conspicuous absence to be the moment they witness the crucifixion (23.49).[697] However, even this verse downplays their presence, since they watch "from a distance" (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν). Furthermore, in contrast to the centurion, who "praises God" (ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν) and verbally declares, "Certainly this man was innocent" (ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν, 23.47), the disciples who witness Jesus' death "from a distance" remain absolutely silent.

I argue that despite their physical presence at Jesus' crucifixion and burial,[698] the narrator effectively silences the disciples until *after* Jesus' resurrection. The disciples do not speak until after the empty tomb is discovered. Even then, their return to speech is not immediate. Rather, we find a gradual progression: First, the narrator (using indirect dialogue) says that the women proclaim that the tomb is empty and indeed, "keep on telling" (ἔλεγον) the male apostles (24.9-10).[699] Then, those who meet Jesus on the road to Emmaus declare (in direct dialogue), "The Lord has truly risen" (24.34). Finally, when Jesus ascends into heaven, the disciples all worship him and bless God "continually" (διὰ παντὸς) in the temple (24.52-53).

Let us consider these pivotal narrative moments in more detail. In each scene – the empty tomb, the road to Emmaus, and the Jerusalem Temple – we find two subtle

---

[697] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 747.

[698] The women, at least, are present in 23.55.

[699] The imperfect ἔλεγον implies that this was an ongoing act.

forms of narratorial silence that are used more prominently in 19.45-24.53 than in earlier sections of the Gospel. First, characters are rendered silent *implicitly* through their disappearance or conspicuous absence from a scene. Several times after his resurrection, Jesus is rendered both present in his absences and absent in his presences. The only instance of a character's disappearance in the *prior* sections of Luke's Gospel occurs when Moses and Elijah, who are discussing Jesus' departure (τὴν ἔξοδον, 9.31) with him, disappear from the Mount of Transfiguration, and, "Jesus was found alone" (εὑρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος, 9.36).

Second, in addition to conspicuous absences, the narrator also employs a form of narratorial silence when he does not divulge a character's name. The passion and post-resurrection scenes are populated with some of the most memorable characters in Luke's Gospel, and yet many of these characters remain unnamed: the disciple who cuts off the ear of the high priest's slave and the slave whose ear is cut off (22.50), those who question Peter's loyalty to Jesus (22.56-59), several of the women who discover the empty tomb (24.1-10), the guards who cast lots for Jesus' clothing and mock him while he hangs on the cross (23.34-37), the two criminals who are crucified next to him (23.32-33, 39-43), the centurion who declares Jesus' innocence (23.47), and Cleopas' companion on the road to Emmaus (24.13-35).[700] Before discussing these examples, however, I offer a caveat.

The conceptual dichotomy of absence/presence is commonly utilized or assumed in everyday parlance and in scholarly inquiry; whereas *presence* is usually conceived of as existence, "thereness," or visibility, *absence* is often considered to be synonymous

[700] Oddly, Beck neglects to include this character in his table of anonymous characters in Luke. David R. Beck, *The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: EJ Brill, 1997), 28.

with non-existence, erasure, or invisibility. Additionally, scholars often equate absence with silence and presence with voice.[701] However, such binaries are seldom as diametrically opposed to one another as they might seem. Characters in a narrative can be implicitly present even when they are explicitly missing, and a character who is present can be rendered silent – effectively absent – by various narrative techniques. Indeed, as we saw in the discussion of the centurion (Luke 7) in chapter 2, speech and silence can become quite complex in such instances, since absent characters often speak through representative intermediaries.[702] Not only this, but texts can evoke the presence of a character (in absentia) in the mind of the reader.[703] Thus, in the discussion that follows, I consider absence to be a *form* of narrative silence, but I also explore the ways that the Lukan narrator complicates a strict absence-silence correspondence.

Relatedly, over the last century, feminist scholars have helpfully questioned ancient male authors' tendency to leave women anonymous, and proposed ways to counteract what they perceive as an effacement of female characters' identities.[704] Those who focus on the marginalized in ancient societies similarly point out that most extant literary sources, written by elite males, silence the voices of slaves and other non-elite peoples. The common assumption underlying these approaches is that anonymity is a

---

[701] On this, see especially Thomas Docherty, *Reading (Absent) Character: Towards a Theory of Characterization in Fiction* (Oxford University Press, 1983).

[702] See, e.g., 22.8-13, in which Jesus sends Peter and John to prepare the Passover meal.

[703] In 1 Corinthians 5.3, for example, Paul refers to the subjective sense in which one can be "absent in body, but present in spirit" (ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι). William James considered "presence in absence" to be a form of "pointing" to something about which one knows, but with which one is not directly acquainted (in short, something that is physically absent, but present in one's mind). See his lecture from December 1894, printed as "The Knowing of Things Together," in *Essays in Philosophy* (ed. Frederick Burkhardt and Fredson Bowers; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978), 73.

[704] See André Lardinois and Laura McClure, eds., *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

socio-historical marker of marginalized people groups who are rendered ideologically voiceless by ancient texts themselves, as well as by the scholarship that interprets them.[705] Such scholars offer crucial correctives to the nineteenth-century tendency to read ancient texts as straightforward objective historical accounts. Keeping these correctives in mind, I consider anonymity differently here.

Rather than taking anonymity to be an effacement of personal identity, I follow Adele Reinhartz in insisting that unnamed characters play vital functions in biblical narratives.[706] I also want to allow for the fact that many anonymous characters do, in fact, have significant vocal roles; for instance, Cleopas' unnamed companion on the road to Emmaus is depicted (along with Cleopas) as speaking directly to Jesus for a full six verses (24.19-24, 29). Contra David Beck's claim that anonymous characters in the Synoptics tend not to speak with Jesus, the reality is that in Luke, the absence of a proper name does not necessarily amount to the suppression of narrative voice.[707]

We can now return to the point that, even after Jesus' resurrection, the disciples' move toward unfettered speech is not an immediate, but a gradual one. Three crucial scenes depict this gradual progression: the empty tomb, the road to Emmaus, and Jesus' ascension. As the following discussion will show, two narratorial silences are operative in

---

[705] Melanie Johnson-DeBaufre summarizes the questions that are so familiar now in feminist scholarship: "How do we read the silences and biases of the text? Were there no wo/men present because no wo/men are mentioned?…Or are these silences largely by chance and bereft of any real value for historical reconstruction?" "'Gazing Upon the Invisible': Archaeology, Historiography, and the Elusive Women of 1 Thessalonians," in *From Roman to Early Christian Thessalonike: Studies in Religion and Archaeology* (ed. Laura Nasrallah, Charalambos Bakirtzis, and Steven J. Friesen; Harvard Theological Studies; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010).

[706] Adele Reinhartz, "Anonymity and Character in the Books of Samuel," *Semeia* 63 (1993): 117-42 and *Why Ask My Name? Anonymity and Identity in the Biblical Narrative* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

[707] Beck overstates his case when he claims that the anonymous characters in the Synoptics appear only very briefly and without any dialogue with Jesus. Beck, *The Discipleship Paradigm*, 28-29.

each of these three scenes: Jesus' presence/absence creates the space for his disciples to remember his words and speak on his behalf, and the anonymity of characters creates the space for readers to engage personally in the narrative.

The Empty Tomb (24.1-12). Following Jesus' crucifixion, the women disciples go to his tomb and are met by two messengers who declare, "He is not here. He has been raised" (24.6). This is the most shocking example of a character's disappearance: Jesus is absent from the tomb where he had been laid.[708] If anyone should be present in a particular place, it would be a dead body in its tomb.[709] And yet, the women "did not find the body of the Lord Jesus" (24.3).

After announcing his absence, the messengers urge the women, "Remember (μνήσθητε) how he told you, while he was still in Galilee, that the Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and on the third day rise again" (24.6-7). Using Jesus' own words, the messengers thus invoke Jesus' presence for the women, despite his literal absence. As a result, the narrator reports, "the women remembered (ἐμνήσθησαν) his words" (24.8). Remembering Jesus' words prompts the women to go "tell all these things" (ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα, 24.9) to the other disciples, suggesting that they correctly understand Jesus' absence from the tomb as an

[708] Here, we have in view how Jesus' absence from the tomb impacts the female disciples' characterization. David Lee speculates about who has caused Jesus' absences as a feature of Jesus' characterization: "If Jesus' absence is due to his initiative, then it makes a semiotic contribution to his self characterization; however, if the absence is due to God's activity, then it does not strictly contribute to Jesus' self-characterization. It is clear…that Jesus' resurrection is attributed to God's activity, and so the absence of the body would be a statement of God's activity. However, the discourse of the angels describes *the living Lord* who is not here (24.5). The risen Lord presumably may decide where he wishes to be, and so if this analysis is correct, the absence of Jesus is another contribution to his self-characterization." *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 290.

[709] For a lengthy discussion of ancient funeral rites from an anthropological perspective, see Sjef van Tilborg and Patrick Chatelion Counet, *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), esp. 129-168.

indication of his presence on earth again.[710] Van Tilborg and Counet underscore the complex narrative embeddedness of Jesus' "transition from a somatic to a linguistic presence":

> The visit of the women to the tomb becomes the story of the women which contains the story of the two men which contains the story of Jesus. Especially in this phase of the story, the figure 'the body of Jesus' dissolves completely into words…the figure 'the body of Jesus' is …in the words of the women which imply the words of the two men which imply the words of Jesus [and result in Peter's] inner words about which nothing more is said.[711]

Many scholars have noted that at this point in the narrative, the disciples are divided by gender in terms of their relationship to speech. Whereas the female disciples understand Jesus' absence from the tomb correctly and testify to what they have witnessed, the male disciples persist in perceiving the empty tomb as an absolute absence; they vacuously regard the women's testimony as "empty talk," a pejorative term (λῆρος, 24.11).[712] Even Peter, who runs to the tomb to see for himself, simply observes the strips of linen and "wonders (θαυμάζων) what happened" (24.12). Thus, at this point following Jesus' resurrection, the female disciples are characterized as understanding, remembering, and speaking rightly, while the male disciples persist in their previous pattern of silent misunderstanding.

---

[710] Contra Dillon, who argues that the women's faith and perceptions have not changed from the time when Jesus first made the predictions. *From Eye-Witnesses*, 51-52.

[711] Van Tilborg and Counet, *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances*, 117.

[712] Scholars disagree about whether the narrator approves of this reaction or not. J. Plevnik, for example, believes that the narrator sees the apostles' disbelief as wrong. "The Eyewitnesses of the Risen Jesus in Luke 24," *CBQ* 49 (1987): 93. Esther de Boer, on the other hand, proposes that the narrator also thinks that women are inadequate witnesses. "The Lukan Mary Magdalene and the Other Women Following Jesus," in *A Feminist Companion to Luke* (ed. Amy Jill Levine; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 156. I agree with Plevnik and others who insist that the narrator does not approve of the apostles' refusal to believe the women because the disciples' obtuseness is a theme that has been developed throughout the Gospel narrative.

This particular aspect of Luke's Gospel has provoked a spate of scholarly studies over the past several decades. On the one hand, the Lukan narrator states that women were the first witnesses of the risen Jesus;[713] church tradition has dubbed them "the apostles to the apostles" (*quae apostoli ad apostolos*).[714] On the other hand, although the women speak in the story world, they are not quoted directly. The reader never actually hears what they say to the other disciples.[715] Turid Karlsen Seim has insightfully dubbed this the Lukan narrative's "double message"; after a comprehensive treatment of gender in Luke-Acts, Seim concludes that the women:

> …are brought to silence and at the same time they continue to be given the right to speak…So it is not without irony that the picture is finally presented; the women are indeed good enough and well-qualified, but the men suspect and reject them.[716]

The details of the thorny debate over women in Luke's Gospel would take us too far afield here;[717] what matters most for this analysis is that Jesus' literal absence is mitigated

---

[713] See, e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 4.219 on rejecting the legal witness of women.

[714] Many scholars point out that this is exceptional in such a patriarchal context as the first century C.E., and consequently use the women's presence at the empty tomb to argue for the historicity of the account, and/or to support the ministry of women today. See, among many others, R.W. Pierce and R.M. Groothuis, eds., *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005); Loretta Dornish, *A Woman Reads the Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996); Leonard Swidler, *Biblical Affirmations of Women* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979); Eduard Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1961), 186-187.

[715] Thus, other scholars contend that Luke's narrative downplays the spoken testimony of the women and consequently does not support the ministry of women today. See, among many others, Ann Graham Brock, *Mary Magdalene, the First Apostle*; Esther de Boer, "The Lukan Mary Magdalene and the Other Women Following Jesus," in *A Feminist Companion to Luke* (ed. Amy Jill Levine; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 140-60; Barbara E. Reid, *Choosing the Better Part? Women in the Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996); Turid Karlsen Seim, *The Double Message*, esp. 97-163.

[716] Seim, *The Double Message*, 249.

[717] I would also point out that scholars on either side of the debate often focus on two distinct narrative levels. On the one hand, *within the story itself*, Jesus' absence creates an opportunity for the women to remember Jesus' teachings and then render Jesus present by speaking to others. On the other hand, the narrator describes the women's testimony using indirect discourse, which as we noted earlier, silences a character *on the level of the telling*, since his or her words are not expressly cited for the reader. Critics on

by the reminder of what he spoke when he was with the disciples physically, and this absence creates the opportunity for the women to be his witnesses – to speak on his behalf.

In addition to Jesus' absence, another implicit narratorial silence is operative in this pericope: several of the women at the tomb remain anonymous. Many commentators have discussed the fact that in Luke 24.10, three of the women who discover the empty tomb are named (Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James) and the others are simply dubbed "the rest of the women with them" (αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς). Generally, such discussions focus on the discrepancy between this and Luke 8.2-3, where Mary Magdalene, Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward Chuza, and Susanna are named (along with "many others"). Two main reasons for the naming of the three women in 24.10 have been proposed: 1) Just as three male disciples often are named to represent the larger group, so too three female disciples are named to represent the larger group;[718] and 2) These particular women would have been well known and well respected by early Christian readers.[719]

However, very few scholars consider the significance of the *un*named women at the empty tomb.[720] Adele Reinhartz's pioneering work on anonymity in biblical narratives is helpful in this regard. Reinhartz shows that anonymous characters often

---

each side of the debate assess the Lukan depiction of women by focusing on different narrative levels; until they realize and account for this discrepancy, they will talk at cross-purposes to one another.

[718] Seim says, "Such a presentation of an 'inner circle' within a larger group is a common phenomenon." *Double Message*, 31.

[719] Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 301.

[720] Scholars do discuss the textual question of whether the phrase "the rest of the women with them" (αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς) belongs syntactically with the first (they accompany the three named women), or whether it is the subject of the second half of the verse (they are the ones who do the reporting). See Marshall, *Luke*, 887; Bock, *Luke*, 1897.

contribute to the narrative plot, flesh out the portrayal of named figures, and validate the narrator's point of view by constituting both positive and negative paradigms of behavior.[721] Although Reinhartz focuses on Hebrew Bible narratives, her claims are valid for Luke's Gospel, as well. For example, in Luke, the criminals hanging beside Jesus on the cross fit Reinhartz's description of anonymous characters. Though they are unnamed, they nevertheless star with Jesus in this climactic narrative segment and constitute opposite paradigms of behavior: the first, who derides Jesus, is characterized negatively as one who does not fear God (23.40) and who has been justly condemned (23.41); he is the quintessential negative model for readers to eschew. The second criminal stands in contrast to this as one who – unlike the disciples – speaks up on Jesus' behalf, humbly recognizes his own sin, and asks Jesus to remember him in his kingdom (23.42); he is thus the ideal positive model for readers to emulate.

David Beck extends Reinhartz's work to explore the function of anonymity in the Gospel of John. Contrary to Reinhartz's view that anonymity distances readers from the unnamed character, Beck shows convincingly that, "the absence of a name can enhance a reader's potential for identifying with a character in the narrative."[722] According to Beck, a proper name evokes individuality and thus separates particular characters from other characters in the story and from the reader. In contrast, anonymity entails no such separation and thus can facilitate readers' identification with certain unnamed characters.

Drawing together Reinhartz's observation that anonymous characters can provide paradigms for behavior and Beck's point that anonymity facilitates readerly

---

[721] Adele Reinhartz, "Anonymity and Character in the Books of Samuel," *Semeia* 63 (1993): 117-42 and *Why Ask My Name? Anonymity and Identity in the Biblical Narrative* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

[722] Beck, *The Discipleship Paradigm*, 1.

identification, I suggest that the inclusion of unnamed female disciples in the empty tomb scene creates the space for readers to imagine that they, too, are witnessing Jesus' absence from the tomb and hearing the messengers' words. By extension, this means that such readers are similarly encouraged to speak about this revelation. Through this scene, the narrator presents readers with a paradigm of discipleship that entails remembering Jesus' words and rightly responding by using speech to proclaim the truth about him to others.

The Road to Emmaus (24.13-27). The converse effect to that of the empty tomb scene occurs when Jesus is physically present with two disciples journeying to Emmaus, but "their eyes were kept from recognizing (ἐπιγνῶναι) him" (24.16).[723] Many commentators have classified this scene as a post-resurrection "appearance story," with differing degrees of emphasis on Jesus' physical, bodily presence with the disciples.[724] And yet, the disciples' failure to recognize him renders Jesus effectively absent; they speak with him as though he is someone else entirely. Jesus' incognito absence-in-presence in this case has little to do with the plot. Rather, it functions to intensify the theological themes of correct versus incorrect perception that are so crucial throughout Luke's Gospel. Cleopas and his companion do not perceive correctly the one with whom they speak.

---

[723] This is a common trope in the ancient Greek novels. See, also, Kindalee Pfremmer De Long's comparison with the book of Tobit in *Surprised by God*, 244.

[724] For one comprehensive discussion, see J. E. Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1975). See, also, Octavian Baban, who argues that the Emmaus pericope ought to be understood in conjunction with Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8.25-40) and Saul's vision of Jesus on the road to Damascus (Acts 9.1-31). *On the Road Encounters in Luke-Acts: Hellenistic Mimesis and Luke's Theology of the Way* (Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster Press, 2006).

Further, I propose that the fact that Cleopas' companion remains unnamed facilitates readerly engagement in this scene. Similar to the anonymous women at the empty tomb, the lack of a proper name – which differentiates a character's personal identity and thereby distances readers from her or him – enables readers to imagine themselves on the road to Emmaus talking with Jesus. By leaving the name of Cleopas' fellow disciple unspoken, the narrator invites readers to consider what their own personal response to a resurrected Jesus might be.

At the same time, readers are not directly comparable to the disciples in this scene, since readers have more information than the disciples. Whereas the narrator has expressly revealed to readers that they are walking with Jesus, the disciples themselves remain ignorant of this fact.[725] In this way, the narrator portrays the disciples as undiscerning and simultaneously privileges the readers as those who are privy to the truth and perceive it correctly.

Indeed, the entire journey to Emmaus is fraught with dramatic irony, for Jesus repeats again what the reader knows he has already told the disciples (24.25-27):

> You foolish people–how slow of heart (καρδία) to believe all that the prophets have spoken (ἐλάλησαν)! Wasn't it necessary for the Christ to suffer these things and enter into his glory?

As the reader is well aware, Jesus himself is one of the prophets whom they are "slow to believe," and he has repeatedly told his disciples that the Christ would suffer; the narrator thus adds another layer of irony when the disciples tell Jesus that he had truly been a prophet (ἀνὴρ προφήτης, 24.19). The narrator implies that if they had actually believed that he was a prophet and not been slow to believe the words he spoke before his crucifixion, they would not be grieving at all.

[725] The Greek emphasizes that it is "Jesus *himself*" (αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς) who walks with the disciples (24.15).

Only when Jesus performs the silent, symbolic action of breaking and blessing the bread do the disciples recognize him: "At this point, their eyes were opened and they recognized (ἐπέγνωσαν) him" (24.31). Jesus' silent action communicates, sending the message, "I, Jesus, am with you." Then, just at the very moment when they understand that Jesus has been present with them all along, he disappears from their sight (24.31). What is the narrative significance of this disappearance? Why would the narrator depict Jesus leaving just at the point that the disciples perceive him correctly? I suggest that, just as Jesus' absence from the tomb prompts the women to speak about what they have experienced, so too does Jesus' disappearance from the table in Emmaus elicit speech from Cleopas and his companion. The narrator tells us that after Jesus vanishes, "that very hour" (αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ) they get up, find the other disciples, and "tell" (λέγω, 24.34; ἐξηγέομαι, 24.35) them what has happened (24.32-35).

This scene in which Cleopas and his companion tell the other disciples about Jesus' resurrection is yet another in which Jesus is rendered absent while present. As those who have seen him relate their story, Jesus appears again: "Jesus himself stood among them and said to them, 'Peace be with you'" (24.36). One would think that by now, the disciples would recognize that this is truly Jesus who has, as they themselves testify, "really risen" (ὄντως ἠγέρθη, 24.34). But again, they fail to discern Jesus' genuine presence and perceive him incorrectly as a "ghost" (πνεῦμα, 24.37). After demonstrating that he is indeed physically present by letting them touch his "flesh and bones" (σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα, 24.39) and by eating (24.43), Jesus then proceeds to remind them (and the readers) of his words: "These are my words (οἱ λόγοι μου) that I spoke to you while I was still with you" (24.44). It is significant that like the messengers'

reminder of Jesus' words at the empty tomb, here again, a reminder of Jesus' *words* stands as the clinching evidence of the truth. At this point in the narrative, the female disciples and some of the male disciples have spoken out about Jesus, but their understanding remains partial, and for the disciples as a group, the return to speech remains incomplete.

The Ascension (24.50-53). Ultimately, Jesus commissions the disciples to be his witnesses, then departs and is taken up into heaven. Jesus' departure appears to be a particularly Lukan emphasis; nowhere else in the New Testament is there an account of a visible ascension. As Jesus "departs" (διΐστημι) and is "taken up into heaven" (ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, 24.51),[726] the disciples "worship" (προσκυνήσαντες) him and return to Jerusalem, where they "continually" are "praising God" (εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν, 24.52-53).[727] We have here the final stage in the disciples' return to speech following Jesus' resurrection. Though the disciples failed to learn Jesus' speech-related lessons on the way to Jerusalem, and the male disciples take longer to understand than the female disciples, eventually they all are reminded of Jesus' words, which then prompt recognition of the truth, repentance, *and* the ready willingness to speak out in uninterrupted, unashamed speech as they praise God in the temple.

Just as the empty tomb and the road to Emmaus depict Jesus as simultaneously absent and present, so too does this final scene in the Gospel demonstrate the breakdown

---

[726] The bibliography on the Ascension is quite extensive. See the listings in Bovon, *L'évangile selon Saint Luc (19,28-24,53)*, 477-79. Note especially Mikeal Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

[727] The reference to the ascension is lacking in ℵ* D it sys, but it is found in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ and the rest of the manuscript tradition. Acts 1.2 also appears to allude to this scene.

of the binary opposition of presence and absence. Jonathan Knight calls the Ascension story "a pictorial demonstration" of the inadequacy of the presence-absence dichotomy, since Jesus' departure "is both a symbol of the absence of Jesus and a symbol of his future return."[728] Unlike what occurs at the empty tomb and on the road to Emmaus, however, the narrator implies that all the disciples finally perceive Jesus correctly, since they respond with "worship" and "praise." Over the course of the passion narrative, the disciples have shifted from using speech to deny Jesus explicitly and silence to protect themselves to worshipping Jesus and praising God continually, in public. Changes in speech behavior thus mark the disciples' transition from failing to embody the characteristics of true discipleship to perceiving Jesus rightly and responding with praise.

It is significant that none of the disciples is named in this final scene of the Gospel. The fact that the disciples are unnamed collapses the distance between character and reader that a proper name can evoke. Instead, the disciples' anonymity invites readers to imagine themselves with the disciples, worshipping and praising God. This reading runs counter to that suggested by Ute Eisen, who rightly points out that no characters are quoted in this scene: "The ascension story at the end of the Gospel according to Luke is *silent*."[729] Eisen claims that this silence (by which she means the narrator's use of summary instead of direct dialogue) facilitates narrative closure for readers by creating the impression that they are witnessing events *from a distance*. According to Eisen, through the story of the Ascension, "readers and hearers are aided in *leaving* the narrative

[728] Jonathan Knight, *Luke's Gospel* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 151.

[729] Emphasis original. Eisen contrasts this with the ascension story in Acts 1.9-11, in which the disciples (and readers) hear two men speak; Eisen argues that this aids the reader in easing back into the story. Ute Eisen, "The Narratological Fabric of the Gospels," in *Narratology Beyond Literary Criticism: Mediality, Disciplinarity* (ed. Jan Christoph Meister; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 206.

world."[730] However, characters' anonymity often creates the opposite effect: nameless characters can facilitate the readers' *entering into* the narrative world. Viewed in this way, the picture of unnamed disciples worshipping at Jesus' ascension encourages readers to participate in the story by "creating a gap readers are invited to fill with their own identity."[731]

Over the course of the entire Lukan Gospel narrative, discipleship has been portrayed as a delicate, yet dynamic balance of speech and silence. The rhetoric of the narrative establishes that true disciples listen closely to Jesus' words, obey him when he commands silence, and speak out boldly on his behalf even in the face of opposition. The narrative thus thematically underscores the importance of witnessing verbally to God's work in the world.

At the start of the passion narrative, the disciples do not understand this paradigm of true discipleship. However, their uses of speech and silence in the final chapters of Luke shift as they undergo a significant transformation: they move from being effectively absent and silent during Jesus' arrest and crucifixion, to the female disciples' correctly perceiving and proclaiming the empty tomb, to Cleopas and his companion telling the others, "The Lord has truly risen" (24.34), and finally, to all of them worshipping him and "blessing God" continually (24.52-53).

The Religious Leaders

At the end of the previous chapter, we noted that the religious leaders attempt to control

---

[730] Emphasis added. Ute Eisen, "The Narratological Fabric of the Gospels," 206. Adelbert Denaux agrees. *Studies in the Gospel of Luke: Structure, Language and Theology* (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University, 2010), 305. On Acts, see the nuanced discussion in Troy M. Troftgruben, *A Conclusion Unhindered*.

[731] Beck, *The Discipleship Paradigm*, 12.

the disciples' speech during the Triumphal Entry scene (19.39), but they are unsuccessful. In the discussion that follows, we will see that Jesus' opponents also exhibit various speech strategies that differ from those they have employed thus far in the narrative. The general progression is this: they first try to trap Jesus using their own speech by questioning and challenging him directly (10.25; 11.16, 45, 53-54; 20.2, 8), or by verbally outmaneuvering him through indirection (13.14; 20.1-8). When those tactics fail, they resort to the appearance of silence, but they simultaneously employ spies "who pretend (ὑποκρινομένους)[732] to be sincere" in order to "trap him by what he says" (20.20).[733] When even that approach is unsuccessful, Jesus' opponents finally embrace a two-pronged approach: they adopt a rhetoric of deceit, boldly proclaiming lies, and they pursue physical violence in order to silence Jesus forever through his death.[734]

Luke 20.1-8 provides a ready example of the opponents' strategies of direct challenge through questioning and verbal indirection. The chief priests, scribes, and elders take the initiative with a pointed question (which they preface with the imperative form of λέγω): "Tell us (εἰπὸν ἡμῖν): by whose authority are you doing these things? Who is it who gave you this authority?" (20.2). Jesus actively engages them, though with a question of his own (which he also prefaces with the imperative form of λέγω): "You tell me (εἴπατέ μοι): Did the baptism of John come from heaven, or was it of human origin?" (20.4). The religious leaders discuss their options amongst themselves (πρὸς

[732] This word is also used in 6.42, 12.1, 13.15 to describe the religious authorities.

[733] Of course, this concept is not unique to Luke. Isaiah 29.13 reads: "This people has drawn close to me with words, and honored me with its lips, but kept its heart distant from me"; Sirach 1.29 says those who praise God with their lips but not their hearts are "hypocrites."

[734] As Kingsbury puts it, "Unable to defeat Jesus in debate, the authorities will defeat him by killing him." Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke*, 72.

ἑαυτοὺς, 20.5) and finally decide that either way they answer, Jesus will catch them in what they say. In an effort to avoid indicting themselves, they plead ignorance (μὴ εἰδέναι) and refuse to answer his question (20.7); their prevarication leads Jesus to use their own tactic against them. He refuses to answer *their* original question: "Neither will I tell you by what authority I am doing these things" (20.8).

When they realize that they cannot trap Jesus with their own words, the scribes and chief priests try another approach: they send spies to "catch him in his word" (ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, 20.20). The spies deviously declare, "Teacher, we know that you are right in what you say and teach…and teach the way of God in accordance with truth" (20.21). Then, likely feigning true interest in his teaching, they challenge him with a trick question: "Is it lawful for us to pay taxes to the emperor, or not?"[735] As always, Jesus perceives their "craftiness" (πανουργία)[736] and gives them an answer that amazes and silences them ("they fell silent," ἐσίγησαν, 20.26).

A different subset of Jesus' opponents, the Sadducees, appears in the next pericope and challenges Jesus with a question about marriage in the afterlife (20.33). When they hear his response, some experts in the law who are present say he has "spoken well" (καλῶς εἶπας) and then "do not dare any longer to ask him anything" (οὐκέτι γὰρ ἐτόλμων ἐπερωτᾶν αὐτὸν οὐδέν, 20.39-40). David Lee writes that this section "traces the cumulative defeat by Jesus of those who are his controversialists. This sequence of narrative units concludes with a scribe conceding, 'Teacher, you have spoken

[735] The spies assume that with his answer, Jesus will either incriminate himself with the Roman authorities or with the Jewish people who oppose them. See Giblin, "'The Things of God' in the Question Concerning Tribute to Caesar (Lk 20.25; Mk 12.17; Mt 22.21)," *CBQ* 33 (1971): 510-27.

[736] This word, also translated "villainy," is always used negatively in the NT. See also 1 Cor. 3.19; 2 Cor. 4.2, 11.3; Eph. 4.14.

well' (20.39)."[737] Along the same lines, Kingsbury interprets their silence in 20.40 to mean that the religious leaders are "intimidated by Jesus [and] acknowledge this by falling silent."[738] However, I disagree with these assessments. Although in one sense, Jesus does defeat his controversialists through his rapier responses to their questioning, in another sense, this defeat is only temporary. In light of what follows, Jesus' opponents can hardly be described as being intimidated; their aggression toward him heightens, rather than wanes. Instead, I understand their silence to indicate that as they fail to control others' (especially Jesus') speech, and as their attempts to trap Jesus with his own words backfire, they must switch tactics in the war of words and use their own speech to indict him. Their silence here points toward their adoption of a new strategy as the story progresses.

The catalyst for Jesus' conviction at the trial before Pilate is the false testimony spoken against him by his detractors (23.2), together with the voices of the crowd, shouting, "Crucify him! Crucify him!" (23.21). The religious leaders' claim that Jesus was "forbidding us to pay the tribute tax to Caesar" (23.2) is an outright fabrication (see 20.20-26), and they even go so far as to allege that Jesus has said he is the Messiah (Χριστός), a title Jesus actually refused to claim in 22.67-71. Despite Pilate's hesitancy, despite his repeated protestations that he finds nothing blameworthy in what Jesus has said or done, in the end, he acquiesces to the deafening commands of the crowd. He bows to their shouting words, refusing to listen to Jesus' words and to his own inner

[737] Lee, *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 197.

[738] Kingsbury, "The Plot of Luke's Story of Jesus," *Interpretation* (1994): 376.

conscience.[739] Jesus' opponents' verbal altercations with him culminate in his wrongful conviction and brutal death on a cross, which ultimately legitimates Jesus' earlier warnings to the disciples about dangerous, untrustworthy language. Again, a change in speech behaviors functions to deepen the characterization of a key group in the narrative; Jesus' opponents move from using questions as weapons, to attempting to trap Jesus using his own words, to resorting to verbal deception. In the end, the religious leaders reveal their true nature, as Alter says, "through what they repeat, report, or *distort* of the speech of others."[740]

Jesus

As the speech practices of the disciples and of Jesus' opponents change, so too do Jesus' own patterns of speech shift over the course of this final section of the Gospel. At first, words are his protection:

> Jesus was teaching daily in the temple courts. The chief priests and the experts in the law and the prominent leaders among the people were seeking to assassinate him, but they could not find a way to do it, *for all the people hung on his words* (19.47-48)

Then, as we saw above, words become his undoing, as his opponents hurl lies and false accusations that lead to his conviction and death. The strange part of the story is that Jesus does not use his speech to best his opponents, as he has consistently up until now. Instead, he gradually moves from bold, powerful articulation of God's truth to qualified spoken engagement with his accusers, and ultimately, to utter silence.

---

[739] Contrast this with *The Gospel of Peter* 43-48, where Pilate implicitly admits wrongdoing when he commands the centurion and soldiers who have witnessed the empty tomb to say nothing so that the Jews will not stone them.

[740] Emphasis added. Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 76.

Jesus' trial before Herod (23.6-12) is one of the most discussed passages in the entire passion narrative; it is here that we find the most famous instance of silence in the Gospel of Luke: Jesus' silence in the face of Herod's questioning. Luke 23.9 tells us that Herod questions him "at considerable length" (ἐν λόγοις ἱκανοῖς), but Jesus "gave him no answer" (αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ).[741] Herod then mocks Jesus, dresses him in an elegant robe, and sends him back to Pilate. Here, the narrator inserts a curious note: he says that from that day on, the former enemies Herod and Pilate were friends (23.12).[742] A close reading of Jesus' trial before Herod, situated within its narrative context, will reveal Jesus' gradual shift in speech practices and will highlight several implications of this change.

---

[741] In Matthew 27.14, Mark 15.5, and John 19.9, Jesus is silent before Pilate, not Herod. Hans Conzelmann makes much of this Lukan difference in *Die Mitte der Zeit* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1957), 86. For a helpful table comparing the questions and answers exchanged in the trial scenes across all four Gospels, see Eckhard Schnabel, "The Silence of Jesus: The Galilean Rabbi Who was More than a Prophet," in *Authenticating the Words and Activities of Jesus* (ed. Craig Evans; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 230.

[742] The Lukan narrator provides no explanation for this newfound friendship. On this count, he remains silent. Many scholars have attempted to explain this strange narrative detail. Whereas Fitzmyer dismisses this as one of several Lukan "inconsequential explicative notes," Karris follows Soards in considering it evidence of Jesus' power to reconcile. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1482. Robert Karris, "The Gospel According to Luke," in *New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy; Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1990), 675-721. Bock and like-minded scholars explain the newly forged friendship based on historical events (Bock, *Luke*, 1821). However, none of these interpretations sheds light on how the ambiguity functions within the narrative, or how it might impact the reader's experience. Darr proffers a more fruitful possibility based on attention to readerly activity:

> Since neither a review of the extratext nor retrospection on the work itself provides a satisfactory explanation of the relationship between Herod and Pilate, the reader anticipates further insights to this 'open-ended' comment by the narrator in the upcoming narrative (*Herod the Fox*, 203).

Put another way, the lack of any narratorial justification for Herod and Pilate's friendship can be a flag for careful readers, maintaining readerly interest and prompting them to be alert to possible explanations that might emerge as the story continues. Of course, no such explanation emerges at all in Luke's Gospel; not until Acts is the reader given any further clue about Herod's relationship with Pilate. In Acts 4.25-28, the believers recite Psalms 2.1-2, and then interpret it as a reference to Herod and Pontius Pilate:

> 'Why did the Gentiles rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth took their stand, and the rulers have gathered together against the Lord and against his Messiah.' Yes, Herod and Pontius Pilate, along with the nations and the people of Israel, have gathered together in this city against Jesus, your holy servant whom you have anointed. Thus they have done everything your hand and your will have ordained.

Illustrative Pericope: Jesus' Trial Before Herod (Luke 23.6-12)

In Luke 23.6-12, when Pilate discovers that Jesus is a Galilean, he sends Jesus to Herod, tetrarch of Galilee, who has gone up to Jerusalem for the feast. Finally, the moment anticipated in 9.7-9 will occur: Herod has "wanted to see" (ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν) Jesus for a long time (9.9). When Jesus appears before him, Herod questions him at length. What, exactly, does Herod ask? The narrator does not say. At the same time, the chief priests and scribes are "vehemently accusing him" (εὐτόνως κατηγοροῦντες αὐτοῦ, 23.10). Of what do they accuse Jesus? We are not told.

These are but a few of several literary gaps in the trial scenes of Luke's Gospel that have long confounded biblical scholars.[743] To reiterate what I have said previously, on the level of the storytelling, the Lukan narrator himself often is silent, creating narrative gaps for readers to fill. Jesus' famous silence before Herod is one such gap. It is crucial to note that the narrator easily could have elucidated Jesus' silence. With just a brief clause, the narrator could have said, for example, "Showing disdain for his questioner, Jesus refused to answer…" The very lack of overt interpretive guidance is one reason that an interpretive consensus on this pericope has eluded gospel readers for centuries.

Multiple interpretive possibilities present themselves to readers who encounter Jesus' silence; the absence of a definitive explanation draws readers more deeply into the interpretive process, since they must fill this narratological gap themselves. Indeed, scholars have attempted to resolve the ambiguity of Jesus' silence before Herod in a wide variety of ways. One prominent proposal is set forth by redaction critics – namely, that

[743] See, e.g., Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 188. Marion Soards outlines several perplexing questions in, "Tradition, Composition, and Theology in Luke's Account of Jesus Before Herod Antipas," *Bib* 66 (1985): 344-364.

the presence of this extraordinary verse is simply due to a pre-existing tradition.[744] This diachronic explanation, of course, fails to explain its function(s) in the narrative. What follows is a Blitzkrieg overview of the most common synchronic interpretations.[745]

First, we have those who interpret Jesus' silence as a *reflection of something specific about Jesus' identity.*[746] For example, Christian tradition, including Acts 8.32, has often interpreted Jesus' silence before Herod as an indication of his Messianic identity, a fulfillment of the messianic prophecy found in Isaiah 53.7:

> He was treated harshly and afflicted, but he did not even open his mouth. Like a lamb led to the slaughtering block, like a sheep silent before her shearers, he did not even open his mouth.

Similarly, Acts 4.25-28 interprets Jesus' trial as a fulfillment of the Messianic prophecy in Psalms 2.1-2. In both Acts passages, Luke portrays early Christians explaining Jesus' trial before Herod as a fulfillment of God's divine plan for the Messiah.[747] These passages provide evidence of early Christian interpretations of Jesus' appearance before Herod. However, they do not explain the way readers of Luke's Gospel might interpret

---

[744] Karlheinz Müller, "Jesus vor Herodes: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23, 6-12," in *Zur Geschichte des Urchristentums* (ed. G. Dautzenberg, H. Merklein and K. Müller; Freiburg: Herder, 1979), 111-41, esp. 126, 127.

[745] See also the helpful overview of the basic interpretive options in Marion Soards, "The Silence of Jesus before Herod: An Interpretive Suggestion," *ABR* 33 (1985): 41-45. Other important contributions include: J. Schreiber, "Das Schweigen Jesu," in *Theologie und Unterricht* (ed. K. Wegenast; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969), 79-87; John Dominic Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), 174-87. JC O'Neill's article, "The Silence of Jesus," does not address Jesus' silence during his trial, but rather his general refusal to proclaim his Messiahship. "The Silence of Jesus," *NTS* 15 (1968-69): 153-67. James Breech, *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) concerns the quest for the historical Jesus, not the silence of Jesus during his trial.

[746] See, e.g., the work of philosopher Paul Gooch, *Reflections on Jesus and Socrates: Word and Silence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996). Gooch's comparisons between Jesus and Socrates on trial are intriguing, though he tends to rely on speculation about their respective internal experiences.

[747] Bovon sees Scriptures such as Psalm 2 as "permettait aux premiers chrétiens de donner un sens et même un sens providentiel à ce qui, au premier abord, abord profane, paraissait en être totalement démuni." Bovon, *L'Évangile Selon Saint Luc*, 4:321.

Jesus' silence when they encounter it *sequentially* in the narrative, nor do they relate Jesus' silence to the uses of speech and silence portrayed earlier in the Gospel.

Other scholars who consider Jesus' silence to indicate something specific about Jesus speculate that his silence tells us something about his *internal state*, or his *attitude*. Specifically, some say his silence indicates passive acceptance of God's divine will.[748] From this perspective, Jesus' silence denotes his abdication of control over his circumstances. Although in one sense, it is true that Jesus allows his captors to do with them what they will, this view obscures the fact that Jesus *chooses* to remain silent. This is not a silence of defeat. Paradoxically, his refusal to intervene on his own behalf marks both his authority and a concomitant refusal to exercise it.[749]

Some interpreters have argued that Jesus' silence should be understood in a Cynic or Stoic way – that silence personifies the ideals of self-sufficiency (αὐτάρκεια) and self-controlled boldness (παρρησία).[750] But this solution raises questions of its own, since it fails to account specifically for Jesus' *silence*. In other words, Jesus could be seen as demonstrating noble self-control throughout the entire passion narrative, *even when he is speaking*.[751]

A second option is to interpret Jesus' silence *as a reflection of ancient legal proceedings.* Many scholars have contextualized Jesus' silence before Herod by

---

[748] Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1124; Gundry, *Mark*, 886; Hagner, *Matthew*, 799. Lee interprets this as evidence of Jesus' reliance on God: "In his silence Jesus characterizes himself as the one who depends upon God alone." *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 289.

[749] Raymond Brown exploits the ambiguity of Jesus' silence by interpreting it as *both* "contempt" toward his accusers *and* "acceptance" of God's will. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:464.

[750] Fitzmyer holds that Jesus' silence shows that he is in command of the scene. *Luke*, 1480. See also Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 805.

[751] Eckhard Schnabel recognizes this, as well: "But self-control is a feature of the entire narrative of the trial, beginning with the arrest in Gethsemane and ending with his last words on the cross, and therefore not a specific quality of his silence." "The Silence of Jesus," 246.

comparing it to to analogous Greco-Roman and Jewish trial narratives. This strategy is fruitful in some regards, but produces wildly divergent results. For instance, William Campbell proposes that Jesus is actively employing what was an "uncommon but legitimate defense tactic in antiquity" by refusing to offer a defense.[752] He claims that Jesus' silence "reinforces the false and unsupported nature of the witness statements."[753] However, Campbell does not engage the alternative argument, namely, that in ancient legal proceedings, silence could also indicate capitulation.[754] As Cicero put it, "*taciturnitas imitatur confessionem*."[755]

Others who compare Jesus' trial to parallels in ancient trial narratives[756] insist that Jesus' refusal to respond to Herod's interrogation is in fact quite surprising.[757] Greco-Roman scenes in which a philosopher confronts a tyrant typically portray the philosopher besting his opponent with wit, logic, and reason. Similarly, in the LXX, confrontations between a prophet and a king conventionally include the prophet speaking an oracle of judgment and performing a miracle that corroborates the divine origin of his words.[758]

---

[752] William Campbell, "Engagement, Disengagement, and Obstruction: Jesus' Defense Strategies in Mark's Trial and Execution Scenes," *JSNT* 26 (2004): 286. Campbell cites other examples from antiquity in which defendants refuse to speak before the court. Campbell's comments on Mark apply equally to Luke.

[753] Campbell, "Engagement," 287.

[754] Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV).* Anchor Bible 28a. (Garden City, N.Y., 1985), 1041.

[755] Cicero, *De Inventione* 1, 32, 54.

[756] Darr notes a key difference between these Jewish and Greco-Roman type-scenes: Jewish prophets are entirely reliant upon God, whereas the Greco-Roman sage is completely self-sufficient. *Herod the Fox*, 132-36.

[757] One possible exception is Josephus' account of Mariamme's trial before Herod the Great in 29 B.C.E. (*Ant.* 15.7.4-5 §218-36). Accused of cheating on Herod with Soemus, Mariamme is said to have spoken "not a single word" (οὔτε λόγον, §235). However, Mariamme's silence is directed toward her mother, who is acting crazy, not toward her accuser.

Jesus does neither – and this, despite Herod's desire to see him perform a "sign" (σημεῖον, 23.8). Those readers familiar with the philosopher-versus-tyrant or the prophet-versus-king type-scenes would anticipate strong words of judgment from Jesus and possibly a final, climactic display of power. They would not expect him to simply remain silent.

In addition to attending to what the silence tells us about Jesus, or asking what Jesus might have been doing in the context of a trial, a third interpretive option is to consider *what Jesus' silence might be calling readers to do in analogous situations*. Erwin Buck, for instance, posits that Luke's portrayal of Jesus' silence before Herod is essentially "paradigmatic," providing early Christians with an example for when they face persecution and martyrdom.[759] However, Buck does not address the fact that just one chapter earlier, when Jesus tells his disciples they will be "brought before kings and governors," he does not admonish them to remain silent (21.12). On the contrary, Jesus calls them to stand as verbal witnesses (ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον, 21.13), promising that he himself will give them "the words along with the wisdom that none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict" (21.15). Indeed, in the parallel passage in Acts 25-26, when Paul is on trial before the Roman and Jewish authorities, he does not imitate his Master's silence: he articulately and vehemently defends himself. Similarly, although early Christian martyrdom accounts differ widely on specific details of the martyr's responses to persecutors, they conventionally portray the martyr verbally declaring judgment upon the accusers and/or confessing her or his identity as a

---

[758] The most developed examples are Moses before Pharaoh in Exodus and Elijah and Elisha before King Ahab in 1-2 Kings. See Schnabel, "Silence of Jesus," 233 and Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 132-36.

[759] Erwin Buck, "The Function of the Pericope 'Jesus before Herod' in the Passion Narrative of Luke," in *Wort in der Zeit* (ed. W. Haubeck and M. Bachmann; Leiden: EJ Brill, 1980), 165-78.

Christian.[760] Early Christians did not appear to understand Jesus' silence on trial as a paradigmatic model.

Any one of these three interpretive approaches yields valuable, if limited, insights into the nature of Jesus' silence before Herod. Still, none of them *specifically* accounts for Jesus' refusal to speak. Jesus has shown noble self-control *and* attested to his acceptance of God's plan several times *with his speech*. He has fulfilled Messianic prophecies *while speaking*. He has also clearly taught his disciples what to do in similar situations, *and it involves their speech.*

Furthermore, none of the scholarly interpretations I described adequately attends to how this silence is a unique departure from Jesus' behavior *elsewhere* in Luke's Gospel. Thus far in the narrative, Jesus has powerfully wielded weapons of words, repeatedly using his speech to silence his opponents. As Schnabel clearly documents, Jesus has consistently answered the questions of all the various characters – disciples, demons, Pharisees and Sadducees – and he responds "whether [the questions] are genuine or deceitful, amiable or hostile, direct or indirect, religious or political in nature, innocuous or dangerous if answered."[761] Thus, Jesus' silence before Herod is an unexpected divergence from his previous practices.

I submit that attention to the uses of speech and silence up until this point in the narrative can shed further light on Jesus' silence before Herod and and help us to consider its contribution to the persuasive power of the Lukan narrative. Specifically, this

---

[760] Brian Beck recognizes this as a significant difference between early Christian martyrdom accounts and Luke's passion. Brian E. Beck, "'Imitatio Christi' and the Lucan Passion Narrative," in *Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament: Studies Presented to GM Styler by the Cambridge New Testament Seminar* (ed. William Horbury and Brian McNeil; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 44.

[761] Schnabel usefully establishes *that* Jesus responds to others' questions, but he does not nuance this by considering *how* Jesus responds to different people and to various types of questions. "Silence of Jesus," 215.

pericope ought to be seen in the context of all three trials, which occur in closely-knit succession to one another (22.66-23.12). In Luke, Jesus appears before three distinct entities: first, he appears before the Sanhedrin (22.66-71); then, he is taken to Pilate (23.1-5); last, he appears before Herod (23.6-12). Ultimately, he is sent back to Pilate for his final conviction and sentence, though he is not even explicitly described as present at this final stage (23.13-25). A closer look at Jesus' speech practices in these encounters reveals a gradual transition from qualified spoken engagement with his accusers, to a one-sentence statement of indirection, to utter silence; after demonstrating this, I will highlight several narrative implications of this change.

The Trial Before the Sanhedrin. In Luke 22.66-71, Jesus appears before the elders of the people. At first, the chief priests and scribes of the Sanhedrin attempt once again to control Jesus' speech, using the imperative form of λέγω: "If you are the Messiah, *tell us*" (εἰπὸν ἡμῖν, 22.66). Jesus takes his cue from his last conversation with them, recounted in 20.1-8 (which was discussed above). Recall that in that previous conversation, when Jesus refuses to answer the religious leaders' original question, he *tells them* that he will not answer them, rather than simply remaining silent: "Neither will I tell you by what authority I am doing these things" (20.8).

Similarly, in the Sanhedrin trial, which is Jesus' next direct conversation with the religious leaders (22.66-71), he again *tells them* that he will not answer their question. The Greek used here parallels the language the religious leaders used in 20.5-6. There, they reasoned amongst themselves, twice using the third class conditional construction, "If (ἐὰν) we say (εἴπωμεν) this…this will happen…" When Jesus responds to the

council's question at the trial, he twice uses the very same construction: "If (ἐὰν) I tell (εἴπω) you … this will happen…" (22.67) and "If (ἐὰν) I ask (ἐρωτήσω) you … this will happen…" (22.68). By employing the identical Greek construction, Luke portrays Jesus using the same speech tactic that his opponents used against him earlier. Jesus weighs two options and rejects them both, finally telling them that he will not respond to their question.

Significantly, however, Jesus does not refuse to answer their question in order to protect himself, as they had done. Rather, he makes it clear that either option is truly an exercise in futility. If he were to tell them the answer, they "would not (οὐ μὴ) believe," and if he were to ask them a question, they "would not (οὐ μὴ) answer" (22.67-68). The repetition of the double negative in Greek, οὐ μὴ, emphasizes that Jesus is correct about his accusers.

Not only this, but unlike the religious leaders in 20.1-8, after rejecting his two options, Jesus volunteers an additional, unsolicited claim: "From now on the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the power of God" (22.69). Opinions differ concerning the meaning and historicity of this statement. However, most concur that this as an allusion to Psalm 110.1, a messianic psalm to which Jesus also referred in 20.42-44. Most also agree that by saying this, Jesus is making a claim to some type of regal authority. What matters here is that the chief priests and elders in this scene are confounded. They remain unsure of the implications of Jesus' statement and must ask him a follow-up question (22.70). As Nolland writes, "In the larger story we are well aware that this is the destiny toward which Jesus has been headed since 9.51, but for Jesus' hearers all remains

ambiguous."[762]

Thwarted in their efforts to control his speech, his interrogators attempt to clarify the ambiguity of Jesus' Son of Man statement. Striving, as ever, to catch him in something he might say (cf. 11.54, 20.20), they inquire in a different way: "Are you, then, the Son of God?" Note that there are no direct accusations waged and no witnesses called in this trial scene; the council simply continues to use the same technique of questioning Jesus, even despite his stated refusal to answer their earlier probe. Jesus does answer this question, but indirectly: "You yourself say that I am" (ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, 22.70).[763] With this, Jesus undercuts their authority by making *them* responsible for the claim, and thereby shows himself to be the authority over speech even in a situation in which he is supposedly being judged. In the next verse, everything changes.

The assembly takes Jesus' refusal to explicitly deny that he is the Son of God to be a tacit admission, and they exclaim triumphantly, "We have heard it from his own lips" (22.71). In reality, however, they have not literally heard a confession from Jesus' lips. This reaction marks a key modification in the elders' speech strategies. As we have seen, rather than waiting, watching, listening, and questioning as they have done, they embrace a rhetoric of falsehood and deceit in their effort to destroy Jesus. Considering themselves armed with the weapons they need to convict him, the Jewish leaders take Jesus to Pilate (23.1).

---

[762] Nolland, *Luke 18.35-24.53*, 1112.

[763] Commentators have interpreted this statement in various ways, with some taking it to be a direct affirmation [Leon Morris, *Luke: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 348; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 493], and others considering it a "grudging admission" [Marshall, *Luke*, 851].

The Trial Before Pilate. In the second trial scene, the assembly immediately begins with disingenuous spoken accusations. They assert that Jesus has been subverting their nation, forbidding them to pay taxes to Caesar, claiming that he is the Christ (23.2), and inciting (ἀνασείει) the people throughout Judea (23.5) – all charges that are, according to the narrative, patently false. Here, the religious leaders embody Jesus' prior warning to his disciples that speech can be not only untrustworthy, but dangerous.

If the religious leaders are altering their strategies, does Jesus do the same? The answer is yes, though the shift is subtle and could easily be missed. In this trial scene, Pilate asks Jesus one direct question about his identity, "Are you the king of the Jews?" Jesus responds with a slightly briefer version of the reply he had given the chief priests, answering with two simple words: σὺ λέγεις ("You say so," 23.3).[764] Again, Jesus paradoxically maintains silence even as he speaks. This marks Jesus' general move toward speaking less, since he no longer engages the Jewish leadership, and makes no further claims about his identity. Pilate, in contrast to the Jewish leadership, finds Jesus innocent (23.4), and sends him along to Herod (23.7).

The Trial Before Herod. In light of the foregoing discussion of the previous two trials, we return to Jesus' appearance before Herod and that baffling instance of silence in 23.9. As I stated earlier, this silence cannot be fully explained by saying that silence indicates nobility in the face of suffering, or that Jesus was employing a useful legal strategy, since these views ignore the fact that Jesus speaks in the previous two trials. Instead, Jesus' silence ought to be understood as the culmination of his altered speech practices with

[764] Nolland considers this to be a question: "Do you say that I am?" *Luke*, 1111.

respect to his opponents. David Lee is right that over the course of the hearings, "Jesus takes leave of the Jerusalem establishment and what they represent."[765]

The transition from qualified spoken engagement with the Sanhedrin (22.66-71) to brief enigmatic response to Pilate (23.3) leads up to Jesus' absolute refusal to answer Herod. And this silence continues. In contrast to the war of words that has raged between Jesus and his opponents prior to this point, Jesus remains silent toward his opponents for the rest of the narrative. This is not for lack of their trying to engage him in speech. Indeed, they mock him (ἐξεμυκτήριζον, 23.35), ridicule him (ἐνέπαιξαν, 23.36), and challenge him to save himself (23.35, 37). Still, Jesus remains silent with respect to his opponents.[766] As Jesus' accusers adopt the new strategy of using false speech in deceitful and treacherous ways, Jesus himself makes a move in the opposite direction. He refuses to participate in what has become a corrupt discursive domain.

Of course, the question remains: why? What is the significance of Jesus' shift in speech practice? What does it mean that he does he not take up the weapons of words he has so powerfully wielded thus far in the narrative? I offer two related answers. First, Jesus' change in speech behavior over the course of the passion narrative constitutes a subtle but powerful rebuke against hard-heartedness of his opponents; on the level of the narrative rhetoric, this can be read as a cautionary tale for Luke's readers. Second, just as we discussed earlier with regard to Jesus' presences and absences, Jesus' gradual move toward silence creates the space and opportunity for his followers to remember his words and speak on his behalf; rhetorically, this functions as an encouragement and guide for

---

[765] Lee, *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 289.

[766] Luke's Jesus is not silent on the cross; my point is that he does not speak any longer *to his accusers*. He does speak to the criminals hanging beside him (23.39-43), and he speaks to God (23.46). Contrast this with *The Gospel of Peter* 10, which says that Jesus was "silent as if he had no pain."

Luke's readers regarding their own uses of speech and silence.

John Darr has drawn on the literary precedents prior to this scene to propose that Jesus' silence before Herod "be understood primarily in terms of the ubiquitous seeing-hearing-responding pattern" that Darr and others have identified in the Gospel as a whole.[767] As we have explored previously, Luke often uses the vocabulary of perception, linking the concepts of seeing and hearing with understanding (βλέπω, ὁράω, ἀκούω, συνίημι, γινώσκω). Along the way on the journey to Jerusalem, Jesus warns his disciples that some will, "See, but not see, and hear, but not understand" (βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν, 8.10).[768] He also connects this failure to perceive to the state of one's heart, which determines whether one will receive the word of God, Jesus, and/or the Holy Spirit. Jesus' shift in speech practices over the course of the trials is a narrative articulation of these earlier lessons: Jesus' accusers have hardened their hearts to the point that they will not correctly perceive the word of God – or the words of Jesus – even if those words are spoken with the utmost clarity. They have adopted instead a toxic rhetoric of falsehood and deceit, and Jesus therefore disengages with them altogether. On one level, then, Jesus' silence before Herod ultimately stands as a rebuke against his accusers.

Jesus' silence before Herod can also serve as a cautionary tale to Luke's readers, who – if the narrator is successful in his rhetorical aims – will distance themselves from

---

[767] Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 197. See also Richard Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24* (AnBib, 82; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978); Dennis Hamm, "Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke," *Bib* 67 (1986): 457-77; Stephen Moore, "Look-Acts: Seeing is Believing," in *Mark and Luke in Poststructuralist Perspectives*, 111-128; John Darr, "'Watch How You Listen'," 87-107.

[768] See also 10.24: "For I tell you that many prophets and kings longed to see (ἰδεῖν) what you see (βλέπετε) but did not see it (οὐκ εἶδαν), and to hear (ἀκοῦσαι) what you hear (ἀκούετε) but did not hear it (οὐκ ἤκουσαν)."

those characters who use speech duplicitously in opposition to the plan of God. The way the story is told elevates Luke's readers above those who only use words to enact a dishonorable agenda; through the rhetoric of the narrative, readers are subtly prompted to avoid disingenuous speech that counteracts the divine will and instead, to keep their hearts open to receiving, perceiving, and verbally reproducing the Gospel message.

This leads us directly to my second answer to the question: What is the significance of Jesus' shift from speech to silence? In addition to reflecting the hard-heartedness of Jesus' antagonists and thereby providing a counter-example for Lukan readers, I also propose that Jesus' move toward silence prompts his followers to remember his words and be his witnesses; rhetorically, this implicitly encourages Luke's readers to use speech similarly as Jesus' witnesses, as well.

Jesus' verbal silence parallels his impending ultimate silence: death. His silence during the trials prefigures his coming absence – both the short-term absence of death and the long-term absence following the ascension. Just as Jesus' earlier absence from the tomb prompted the women to remember his words and to speak for him, so too does this final silence provide the opportunity for the disciples to remember Jesus' words and testify to what he has taught them and what they have experienced. As we saw previously, after watching Jesus depart into heaven, all of the disciples are portrayed praising God in the temple (24.52-53).

Luke's readers, by extension, are encouraged to follow this model of outspoken discipleship: as the Lukan narrative ends, readers are implicitly put in the same position as Jesus' disciples. Luke's Gospel message – the "orderly account" to which the Lukan prologue refers – has come to an end, and those who have rightly perceived the word of

God will demonstrate the goodness of their hearts by speaking unabashedly on Jesus' behalf. As François Bovon notes in his commentary, John Calvin long ago made a similar observation, preaching that Jesus "said nothing…in order to open our mouths by his silence."[769] One might say that Jesus is still teaching – only now, he teaches with his mouth shut.

IN SUM: SPEECH AND SILENCE IN THE PASSION AND POST-RESURRECTION NARRATIVES

We are now ready to return to the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter: In what ways does Luke's ending create closure, and in what ways does it generate openness? How does the end of Luke's Gospel impact readers' experiences of the whole? How do speech and silence contribute to the narrative ending? In this chapter, I discussed how attention to speech and silence can illuminate Luke's end (in the dual sense of both purpose and cessation). Specifically, I noted that the narrator continues to depict speech as a cause of crucial plot developments. Jesus' spoken words – and his silence before Herod – ultimately bring him to the narrative climax: the cross. In addition, the narrator uses direct dialogue and summation (a form of silencing characters) to regulate narrative tempo and thereby emphasize not the climax of the cross, as one might guess, but rather, Jesus' teachings, both in the temple (19.47-21.38) and at the Last Supper (22.1-38).

As we also have seen throughout the Gospel, the narrator's uses of silences like literary gaps, delays, and open endings in the final segments of the story heighten the narrative tension and keep the reader engaged up until the very end. At the same time, the

[769] John Calvin, *A Harmony of the Gospels: Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (trans. AW Morrison; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 181-82; Qtd. in Bovon, *L'Évangile Selon Saint Luc (19,28-24,53)*, 313.

narrator's complex depictions of Jesus' absences-in-presence and presences-in-absence, combined with the anonymity of disciples in key post-resurrection scenes, facilitate readerly participation in the narrative by encouraging readers to see themselves as true disciples – as recipients of Jesus' final blessing, responsible to fulfill the commission to proclaim forgiveness of sins to all nations.

The narrative rhetoric of characterization depicts shifts in all the main characters' speech practices. Whereas Jesus' disciples finally learn to use speech correctly, the religious leaders resort to strategies of self-protective silence, disingenuous speech, and ultimately, physical violence to silence Jesus. Jesus' silence on trial before Herod is the pinnacle of his shift in speech practices with respect to his opponents. As such, his silence is a sign of the futility of spoken engagement with his accusers, and simultaneously an appeal to Lukan readers to avoid such obduracy and the violent speech that accompanies it. Correlatively, Jesus' silence before Herod points toward the disciples' – and readers' – responsibility to remember and follow his teachings, and to render him present to others by speaking his words on his behalf. In this way, the narrative advances the Lukan theme of verbal proclamation being a key component of true discipleship.

At the end of Luke's Gospel, the characters' shifting speech behaviors, combined with the narrator's uses of speech and silence in telling the tale, paradoxically contribute to both closure and openness. On the one hand, certain threads are neatly tied up: the prophecies of Jesus' passion are triggered and ultimately fulfilled due to characters' uses of speech, the disciples stop using speech and silence inappropriately and instead praise God, and Jesus' final blessing accomplishes what Zechariah's silencing rendered him

unable to do outside the Temple in the beginning of the Gospel (1.21-22).[770] Thus, speech and silence enhance narrative closure by constituting conventional terminal markers themselves (i.e., Jesus' final words) and by enabling other closure techniques like the fulfillment of expectations (i.e., the fulfillment of Jesus' passion prophesied).[771]

On the other hand, as Parsons puts it, certain narrative threads "continue to dangle."[772] Speech and silence militate against a sense of closure at the end of Luke's Gospel insofar as unfulfilled prophecies create unfinished business for Luke's readers. Luke's loose ends provoke both review of what has gone before (the Gospel story), and anticipation of what might lie ahead (the book of Acts).[773] Additionally, narratorial silences like the anonymity of the disciples paradoxically invite readers to enter into the narrative world even as the text itself forces them to leave it.

---

[770] Raymond Brown, *Birth of the Messiah*, 281-282; Eduard Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1982), 251.

[771] Troftgruben identifies five closure techniques found in ancient literature: 1) circularity; 2) parallelism; 3) fulfillment of expectations; 4) representative scene; 5) summary of preceding events. *A Conclusion Unhindered*, 50-51.

[772] Parsons, "Narrative Closure," 219.

[773] For similar observations regarding the end of Mark's Gospel, see Camille Focant, "Un Silence Qui Fait Parler (Me 16,8)," in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (ed. A. Denaux; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 79-96.

CONCLUSION

This study began with the observation that silence and speech are mutually constitutive, not mutually exclusive. Silence is both multivalent and contextually-determined; it can be either external to a communicative act, or it can be a potent means of communication in and of itself. Given that silence is rhetorically powerful – and that it was recognized as being so in antiquity – I believe that approaches to ancient texts that focus exclusively on speech are inherently imbalanced. Thus, I have cast a wide net in my search for Lukan silences and their richly diverse interactions with speech.

In the foregoing chapters, I have proffered various ways of understanding the "not one but many" narrative interactions of speech and silence that "underlie and permeate" Luke's Gospel.[774] In these final pages, I will summarize the results of this study, highlight several implications of the work undertaken here, and briefly propose avenues for future research.

It is significant that Luke's instances of speech and silence occur in a *narrative*. In the work presented here, I have asked what it might mean to take silence seriously as a significant component of narrative. Narratives not only reflect a community's worldview; they also create and perpetuate the unique identities of those who tell them and those who hear them.[775] For this reason alone, it is important to understand how the Gospel of Luke, a foundational Christian narrative, not only *attests to*, but also *creates* social realities. In this study, I have demonstrated that silence and speech are of primary importance in such

---

[774] The quoted phrases allude to the citation from Michel Foucault that appears in the introduction to the dissertation: "[T]ry to determine the different ways of not saying [because] there is not one but many silences, and they are *an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses*." *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (ed. David Couzens Hoy; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 931. Emphasis mine.

[775] As Michael D. Jackson asserts, "Stories are a kind of theatre where we collaborate in reinventing ourselves and authorising notions, both individual and collective, of who we are." *The Politics of Storytelling: Violence, Transgression and Intersubjectivity* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 1998), 16.

an endeavor. Silence and speech give one another significance on different levels of Luke's narrative, including characters' spoken and unspoken utterances (on the level of the story), *and* the narrator's uses of words and silences (on the level of the telling).

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Throughout the dissertation, I have argued that speech and silence are significant matters of concern within the Lukan story *and* that speech and silence are significant tools used in its telling. Focusing on silences as well as speech can help delineate the complex interactions between plot, characterization, theme, and readerly experience in Luke's Gospel. We begin by summarizing how speech and silence function in the construction of the Lukan plot.

Plot

As discussed in the introduction to this study, a narrative's plot consists of three main elements: causality, temporality, and teleological purpose. Attention to the uses of speech and silence in Luke's Gospel helps to illuminate all three of these crucial plot elements, and also elucidates how the Lukan plot functions as *both* a series of discrete episodes *and* a unified storyline.

As we have seen, throughout Luke, one way in which speech contributes to unity is by establishing causality. Speech gives rise to crucial plot developments, including both conflicts (e.g., Jesus' verbal sparring with the religious leaders) and peaceful encounters (e.g., the women's encounter with the angels at the tomb). The spread of Jesus-news despite Jesus' commands for silence also demonstrates that the control of

others' speech is a subject of narrative tension. Jesus' spoken words – and indirectly, his silence before Herod – ultimately bring him to the narrative climax: the cross.

In addition to establishing causality and creating unity across discrete episodes, speech and silence impact the temporality of the plot. For instance, direct dialogue appears in an observable pattern in the famously enigmatic Travel Narrative of 9.51-19.44: speech, in conjunction with geographical or temporal references, signals narrative transitions along the journey to Jerusalem. The Lukan narrator also uses direct dialogue and summation (a form of silencing characters) variously to regulate the rhythm of the narrative and thereby achieve emphasis. At the end of the Gospel of Luke especially, we see how the relative uses of direct discourse and summative statements prolong the accounts of Jesus' teaching, in contrast to the account of his death on the cross.

Speech and silence figure prominently in the plot's teleological end. In one sense, they contribute to the plot's resolution, since Jesus' disciples finally learn the requisite lessons about speech and the state of one's heart. In the end, we witness them praising God "continually" in the temple (24.52-53), a faint but significant echo of the praises for God with which the narrative began.[776] At the same time, however, certain speech-related threads are not neatly tied up at the end of the Gospel. For instance, Jesus' directions to his disciples to speak boldly in situations of persecution do not come to fruition until the book of Acts.[777] Thus, speech and silence mutually contribute to the Third Gospel's

---

[776] Kindalee Pfremmer De Long insists that praise for God plays a major role throughout the infancy narratives and not simply in the hymns, as many scholars presume. *Surprised by God: Praise Responses in the Narrative of Luke-Acts* (BZNW 166; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 135-180.

[777] Recall that Jesus says, "Determine in your hearts not to rehearse ahead of time how to make your defense. For I myself will give you the words along with the wisdom that none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict" (21.14-15). Presumably, this occurs in Acts when Stephen is dragged before the synagogue to defend himself (6.9-12), and when Paul defends himself before various audiences (Acts 21-28), among others.

closure and, paradoxically, to the sense that the story has not yet ended.

Characterization

Most scholars recognize the importance of characters' spoken words for the construction of their respective narrative identities. Richard Thompson writes that speech in ancient narratives has a dual function:

> [S]peech and conversations…reflect the thoughts of the presented speaker, and they often function as vehicles through which the narrator may indirectly guide the audience's developing judgments and understanding.[778]

Indeed, this coheres with the common scholarly view that the public speeches in Acts, like their ancient historiographical counterparts, interpret significant events of the story for readers. In other words, a character's speech reveals key aspects of her or his identity and concomitantly cues the reader to judge that character and events in the story in particular ways. I have argued that silences ought to be conceptualized similarly: a character's patterns of speech *and silence* are key aspects of the narrator's rhetorical strategies—not incidental instances of language, but integral tools in the narrator's persuasive arsenal.

Scholars disagree about whether Luke's Jesus is primarily a prophet, teacher, or Messiah,[779] whether Luke's disciples are positive or negative paradigms for behavior, and whether Luke's religious leaders are portrayed negatively or positively. One reason that Lukan characterization has prompted so much scholarly debate is that our understanding

---

[778] Richard Thompson, "Reading Beyond the Text, Part II: Literary Creativity and Characterization in Narrative Religious Texts of the Greco-Roman World," *ARC* 29 (2001): 81-122; 93-94.

[779] David Lee points toward the centrality and indeterminate nature of Jesus' identity in Luke: "The reader is invited into a world in which different agents wrestle with and argue about the question of the identity of Jesus." *Luke's Stories of Jesus*, 329.

of Lukan characters directly impacts our view of the Gospel's attempts at persuasion. Taken together, the chapters of this study demonstrate that foregrounding the various uses of speech *and silences* as effective strategies of narrative characterization can help shed light on how the Lukan narrator attempts to guide the readers' judgments of these three main characters/character groups: Jesus, the disciples, and the religious leaders.

Jesus. As we saw in Chapter 1, the Lukan narrative begins by introducing Jesus through others' reliable speech, while Jesus himself remains relatively silent. This relative silence in the beginning of Luke, coupled with the reliable speech of divine (or divinely anointed) characters, allow the narrator to introduce Jesus as an authority, uniquely connected to and sent by God, while implicitly linking his own narratorial authority to theirs.

Aside from one childhood scene in the Temple (2.41-52), and citations of Scripture in the desert (4.4, 8, 12), Jesus himself does not speak until he embarks on his public ministry in Galilee. When he does begin to speak, the narrator explicitly says he does so "with authority" (4.32-36). During his ministry in Galilee, and on his journey to Jerusalem, Jesus consistently uses speech to heal, prophesy, exorcise demons, and even at one point, to raise a man from the dead (7.14). He also repeatedly demonstrates his knowledge of others' unspoken thoughts and exposes them in public as misperceptions. While his miraculous uses of speech to silence demons and heal the sick characterize him as powerful and authoritative over otherworldly things, his knowledge and disclosure of others' unspoken thoughts cast him in the role of prophet and judge.

Throughout the two middle sections of the Gospel, Jesus also links speech to the

state of one's heart, portrays words received from God as one's best defense against enemies, and aligns his own words with God's words. Each of these points contributes to Luke's characterization of Jesus. Not only is Luke's Jesus an authoritative teacher, prophet, and judge, but he also claims to have a unique status as God's messenger by speaking of his own words in terms normally reserved for God's words. Additionally, Jesus' parables and speech-related teachings are consistent with his uses of speech and silence throughout these parts of the Gospel, a fact which in itself creates a sense of his integrity[780] and successively reinforces other aspects of his characterization established earlier in the narrative.

Once Jesus is arrested and put on trial, however, his speech practices change. Rather than using speech to instruct his disciples, at the moment of Peter's denial, Jesus shoots him a silent look (22.60-61). Rather than using witty words to silence his opponents, Jesus refuses to answer questions before the Sanhedrin (22.66-71), answers Pilate with a two-word enigmatic statement (23.3), and finally stands before Herod in utter silence (23.9). Jesus' shift in speech practices points toward his opponents' hopeless hard-heartedness, and toward his disciples' impending role as his verbal replacements – they must witness to the gospel when he is gone. Indirectly, this contributes to his characterization as one who refuses to dialogue with those whose hearts are hard, and as one who has taught his followers but will soon be gone from their midst.

---

[780] Boris Uspensky has proposed four planes of expression by which characterization is communicated: 1) the ideological plane (values and beliefs); 2) the phraseological plane (speech); 3) the spatial/temporal plane (actions); 4) the psychological plane (motives). Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition: The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form* (trans. Valentina Zavarin and Susan Wittig; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 8. In Gospel studies, Mark Allen Powell has highlighted how consistency across multiple planes builds a sense of a character's integrity. See Powell, "Characterization on the Phraseological Plane in the Gospel of Matthew," in *Treasures New and Old: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies* (ed. David Bauer and Mark Allen Powell; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 161-77.

The Disciples. When they are first introduced into the narrative, Jesus' disciples rarely speak on their own authority; when they do speak, they reveal their imperceptiveness. Jesus even silences them several times. As the narrative progresses, however, the disciples appear to learn their lesson about speech; when they cry out in praise entering into Jerusalem, Jesus refuses to silence them (19.37-40). By the time they reach Jerusalem, the disciples have shifted from embodying misunderstanding to being defended by Jesus. This shift is indicated through their various uses and misuses of speech and silence.

The transformation that the disciples undergo on their journey from Galilee to Jerusalem is repeated again in miniature during the passion and post-resurrection scenes. This time, though, the stakes are higher: characters' uses of speech and silence become matters of life or death. Following Jesus' arrest, the disciples as a group are conspicuously absent from the story. They do not speak up on their leader's behalf; on the contrary, only Peter is left, and he verbally denies Jesus three times. After Jesus' resurrection, the disciples gradually move toward right verbal behavior (attesting to the empty tomb, worshipping Jesus, and praising God). Judging by the framework that Jesus establishes in his speech-related teachings, by the end of the gospel, the disciples have not learned merely to rehearse ready rhetoric; rather, their changed uses of speech point beyond their words to the changes that have taken place in their hearts.

The Religious Leaders. In Luke's Gospel, the religious leaders begin by simply observing Jesus, but quickly shift into their main role as verbal aggressors. As the narrative

proceeds, they move toward employing defiant, self-protective silence before Jesus and powerless speech subsequently. Jesus' silence on trial before Herod signals the futility of verbal engagement with those who oppose him; ultimately, the religious leaders resort to physical violence, silencing Jesus (once and for all, they think) through his death.[781] After the resurrection, the religious authorities notably drop out of the narrative completely. The sequential reading presented here supports the view that Luke's account of the Jewish leaders is more nuanced than many scholars suppose; through different employments of speech and silence, the narrator depicts the religious leaders as, in Darr's words, "caricatures of a morality to be avoided."[782]

Theological Themes

The dissertation has consistently highlighted how attention to silence and speech can advance and simultaneously complicate prominent theological themes in the Gospel of Luke.

The Divine Plan and Human Response. Speech and silence establish and hold in tension the key Lukan theological theme of the divine will and human response.[783] The "plan of God" (ἡ βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ) clearly governs the events of the narrative; its ubiquity has

[781] The biblical Psalms refer to death as silence: "If the Lord had not helped me, I would have laid down in the silence of death" (94.17); "The dead do not praise the Lord, nor do any of those who descend into the silence of death" (115.7).

[782] Darr, *On Character Building*, 92.

[783] Bovon puts the two possibilities this way: "Does Luke give too much to humanity by limiting God to heaven?...If this is so, we should underscore the word *history* in 'salvation history.' Or does Luke give too much place to God by making humans into puppets? The helping strokes of God in history would be intolerably imperialistic…" He rightly concludes that for Luke, the answer is somewhere in the middle: "The space of humanity…coexist[s] with and [is] not subjugated to salvation history." *Luke the Theologian*, 12-13.

led many scholars to conclude that Luke's human characters lack freedom of choice. Ernst Haenchen, for instance, describes the human responses in Luke's narrative as "very nearly the twitching of human puppets."[784] However, when patterns of silence are factored into the equation, Haenchen's conclusion falls apart. Throughout Luke's narrative, rather than eclipsing human freedom, God incorporates human responses into the divine plan and uses them to bring it to completion. As I demonstrated through a close reading of Gabriel's silencing of Zechariah (1.5-23, 57-65), Luke's characters respond in a variety of ways to the unfolding divine plan. Still, this is not to say that all responses are equally valid. On the contrary, the Lukan narrator employs speech and silence (among other rhetorical strategies) to establish an evaluative framework by which readers can judge the spectrum of human responses to God; the silencing of Zechariah, for example, leads the reader to judge negatively those who question God's plan and to contrast them with those who respond in faith like Elizabeth and Mary.

Jesus' use of internal monologue in two of the parables further deepens the Lukan exploration of divine-human interactions. In both the Parable of the Unjust Judge (18.2-5) and the Parable of the Owner of the Vineyard (20.9-16), Jesus portrays the main characters speaking to themselves, deliberating over the best way to respond to the other characters. Narratorial guidance makes it clear that the judge and the owner of the vineyard are meant to represent God; in both stories, Jesus' uses of internal monologue portray a God who personally wrestles over how to respond to humans, and who ultimately delivers justice "swiftly" (ἐν τάχει, 18.8) to both the faithful and the faithless.

[784] Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (trans. Bernard Noble et al. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 362.

In Luke, speech and silence help to illuminate how divine providence and human response are "cooperative motifs."[785]

Salvation to the Ends of the Earth. The Galilean ministry section of Luke's Gospel uses speech and silence to engender the prominent Lukan theme of salvation to the ends of the earth, especially through the motif of widespread Jesus reports throughout all regions and strata of society. At the same time, however, these rampant rumors also trouble the theme of universal salvation insofar as Jesus unsuccessfully tries to stop them. Though scholars have proffered many explanations for Jesus' enigmatic commands to secrecy, I have proposed that they are more important on the level of readerly interpretation than they are within the story itself. Paradoxically, they serve both revealing and concealing functions for the reader. On the one hand, the people's voiced testimonies about Jesus despite his own commands to silence actually highlight for readers what Jesus himself tries to obscure: his identity cannot be hidden. On the other hand, the exact reasons for Jesus' inability to quell the rumors remain ambiguous and thereby introduce tension into the narrative and pique readers' curiosity.

Discipleship and *Hearing and Doing.* We also saw that attention to speech and silence further nuances discussions of the related Lukan themes of discipleship and hearing vis-à-vis doing the word of God. The central section of Luke especially depicts discipleship as a journey involving the right reception of God's word. Few scholars have recognized, however, that this journey also entails proper speech ethics. Indeed, a salient feature of Jesus' ethical teachings is the importance of trustworthy *speech*. Using speech as the

[785] Campbell, *The "We" Passages*, 97.

paradigmatic example of "bearing fruit" (i.e., doing good deeds), Jesus asserts that speech reveals what is in one's καρδία: "Out of the abundance of the heart (καρδία), [one's] mouth (στόμα) speaks" (6.45). At the same time, speech can also conceal one's true character and thus typify hypocrisy (6.46).

This brings us to the familiar focus on "hearing and doing" in Luke's Gospel. The scholarly conversations around this issue often miss a key aspect of the relationship between hearing and doing in Luke: speaking. In the Third Gospel, using speech well depends not upon one's outstanding self-control (as in much of the Near Eastern wisdom literature),[786] nor upon one's formal, classical rhetorical education (as in many Greco-Roman treatises).[787] Rather, for Luke's Jesus, producing trustworthy speech depends first upon rightly perceiving and receiving the word of God. When one *hears* the word of God rightly, one *acts* accordingly; one of the paramount examples of doing the word of God is faithfully *speaking* the word of God.

The passion and post-resurrection sections of Luke further develop the theme that verbal witness is a constitutive component of true discipleship. Jesus' conspicuous absences – first from the empty tomb and then from earth through his ascension – create the narrative space for his disciples to render him present to others by speaking in his stead. The disciples gradually shift from being silent and virtually absent at the crucifixion, to speaking the truth about Jesus to one another (with varied success), to

---

[786] See, among many others, The Instructions of Ptah-Hotep, The Book of Ahiqar, Sirach, and the biblical book of Proverbs. For an insightful discussion of speech-related materials in Ancient Near Eastern literature, see Baker, *Personal Speech-Ethics*, 23-54.

[787] The ancient sources on this are too numerous to list here, but include key works like Aristotle's *Art of Rhetoric*; Cicero's *On the Orator*; the elder Seneca's *Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae, Divisiones, Colores*; Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*; Tacitus' *Dialogue on the Orators*. For a useful overview and analysis, see Thomas Habinek, *Ancient Rhetoric and Oratory* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).

finally praising God together in the temple. This shift marks the maturation process by which they begin to understand and enact Jesus' earlier speech-related lessons. Still, they do not fully assume the role of bold verbal witnesses until the book of Acts – a narratorial gap that leaves readers' work unfinished and ultimately invites readers to continue on to the Gospel's sequel.

Between Narrator and Reader

Because "the concern for the potential elicited response from the audience" was "central to ancient discussions on poetics and rhetoric," Richard Thompson asserts:

> One's readings and interpretations of texts from the Greco-Roman world, particularly religious texts, must move beyond the written texts themselves and account for what those texts may potentially do both among and within those who received them.[788]

In this work, I have given an account of what Luke's Gospel "may potentially do both among and within those who received [it]." Darr has argued that "the fundamental rhetorical thrust of Luke-Acts is the attempt to form its readers into *ideal witnesses*."[789] This study confirms and develops Darr's view by attending to the words and silences employed by characters and the narrator, and by asking what effects they might have upon readers.

I have suggested throughout that Luke's ideal witnesses obey Jesus when he commands silence (unlike those who spread rumors against his wishes); they will use silence in the preparatory stages of discipleship in order to listen to, receive, and perceive the divine word correctly; subsequently, Luke's ideal witness will use speech boldly to

---

[788] Richard Thompson, "Reading Beyond the Text, Part II: Literary Creativity and Characterization in Narrative Religious Texts of the Greco-Roman World," *ARC* 29 (2001): 81.

[789] Darr, "Narrator as Character," 56.

communicate the divine word with others and thereby render Jesus present in his absence. When they face opponents, true followers of Jesus will wait for God, Jesus, and/or the Holy Spirit to give them the words to speak (12.11-12, 21.15).

Conversely, Luke's ideal witnesses will *not* use silence in a self-protective way (as the religious leaders do explicitly before Jesus in 4.1-6, and as the disciples do implicitly during the crucifixion in 22.54-56). They will *not* use speech to question the divine plan (as Zechariah does in 1.18), or to deny Jesus (as Peter does in 22.54-62); nor will they use untrustworthy, misleading, or controlling speech (as the religious leaders do in Jerusalem in 19.36-23.25, and as Jesus warns will happen in the end times [17.23]). Neither will they try to control others' speech, since – as the narrative establishes repeatedly – that is the purview of God and/or Jesus.

It would, of course, be a mistake to argue that silence itself is esteemed as a ritual practice or a named virtue in Luke's Gospel as it is elsewhere in ancient literature.[790] Neither do we find warnings about the dangers of expressive excess, as we do in texts like the biblical Proverbs.[791] However, one does find, in the words of Baker, a "solid substratum of support for the ethical value of silence."[792] Why would Luke's Gospel support the ethical value of silence, but not commend it explicitly? I suggest that in Luke, the emphasis on verbally communicating the gospel takes ultimate priority. Here again,

---

[790] Paolo Scarpi writes, for example, that in the pseudo-Homeric hymn to Demeter, as in other ancient auspices, silence is "the privileged channel through which the gods transmit their will and it is with silence that, during the course of the rite, man [sic] can come into contact with them." "The Eloquence of Silence: Aspects of a Power Without Words," in *Regions of Silence: Studies on the Difficulty of Communicating* (ed. Maria Grazia Ciani; Amsterdam: Gieben, 1987), 19-40; 26. Also see the many relevant references in Luke Timothy Johnson, "Taciturnity and True Religion," 329-39.

[791] "The one who guards his words guards his life, but whoever is talkative will come to ruin" (Prov. 13.3); "Excessive speech is not becoming for a fool; how much less are lies for a ruler" (Prov. 17.7); "The truly wise person restrains his words" (17.27).

[792] Baker is discussing the New Testament as a whole, but the description applies to Luke's Gospel specifically, as well. Baker, *Personal Speech-Ethics*, 76.

Baker is right that in the context of discipleship, silence is portrayed not as an end in itself, but "as an aid in promoting the gospel with regard to non-adherents."[793] The Lukan disciples' journey from being told to remain silent (9.21) to being defended as they shout out in praise (19.40) implicitly commends silence in the preparatory stages of discipleship, when the would-be witness does not yet fully grasp the truth.

One way to influence readers is to depict characters using speech and silence in particular ways and then provide an evaluative framework by which readers can judge those characters. What I have argued is congruent with the way ancient rhetoricians envisioned speech and silence; they often noted that one way to influence readers positively is to employ strategic silences. For instance, Demetrius cites Theophrastus' teaching that identifies literary gaps as an effective means of shaping one's reader into one's *witness*:

> [N]ot all points should be punctiliously and tediously elaborated, but some should be left to the comprehension and inference of the hearer, who when he perceives what you have left unsaid becomes not only your hearer but your witness (μάρτυς σου), and a very friendly witness (εὐμενέστερος) too.[794]

Throughout the Gospel, the narrator's silences – including ambiguities, delays, and literary gaps – have directed readerly experiences by prompting surprise, raising curiosity, maintaining attention, increasing suspense, and tying otherwise disparate parts of the plot together into an integrated whole.

Every chapter of the dissertation has highlighted various kinds of silence that the Lukan narrator puts to especially strategic use in each respective section. At the

---

[793] Baker refers specifically to places in the New Testament epistles (e.g., 1 Thessalonians 4 and 1 Timothy 2) that commend silence (ἡσυχία, σιγή) in order to favorably impress outsiders. I argue that in Luke's Gospel, silence facilitates the sharing of the gospel message, but in a somewhat different way (discussed above). Baker, *Personal Speech-Ethics*, 76.

[794] Demetrius, *On Style* 4.222.

beginning of the Gospel, for example, we saw how the Lukan prologue and introductory materials inaugurate the narrator-reader relationship. First, Luke's beginning presents expository information that both orients the reader and raises expectations about the narrative. Second, the narrator attempts to assert authority using several different speech strategies: a first-person assertion of perspectival privilege, an appeal to shared values, and employment of distanced, omniscient third-person narration. We also saw how *unfilled literary gaps* can subtly direct readerly attention and corroborate earlier claims (as when the narrative skips over John the Baptist's childhood straight to the fulfilled prophecy of his preaching repentance, 2.52-3.1).

When discussing the Galilean ministry section of Luke, I noted that when the narrator *delays* crucial information (in stories like Jesus' anointing, for instance, 7.36-50), the delay can implicate readers in the task of correctly identifying Jesus and prompt them to reassess conventional assumptions. During the trip to Jerusalem, the narrator employs *ambiguous, unanswered questions* (like 13.31-35, where the Pharisees warn Jesus that Herod intends to murder him) that can engage readers in the story and prompt them to want to keep reading. In the final chapters of Luke, the narrator's implicit silences (like the complex depictions of Jesus' *absences-in-presence* and *presences-in-absence*, combined with disciples' *anonymity* in key post-resurrection scenes) facilitate readerly participation by encouraging readers to see themselves as true disciples.

LOOKING AHEAD: SPEECH AND SILENCE IN FUTURE RESEARCH

This has been an initial reading of the narrative intersections of speech and silence in one early Christian Gospel. Taken together, these chapters demonstrate three specific benefits

of focused attention on speech and silence: 1) This approach can open up new avenues for resolving interpretive difficulties; 2) It can lead us to a more fully orbed understanding of the famously complex dynamic between narrator, narratee, and narrative; and 3) It can nuance and deepen conceptualizations of Lukan plot, characterization, and theme.

I believe that there is enough promise in this approach to engage in fruitful explorations of other early Christian narratives, as well. The obvious next step is to explore the narrative representations of speech and silence in Luke's second volume, Acts.[795] How are speech and silence employed in Acts, and are those functions consistent with or different from those we find in Luke's Gospel? Other early Christian literature, both canonical and noncanonical, would benefit from similar inquiries, the results of which could be profitably compared to determine whether there are any underlying rhetorical patterns.

Scholars have recognized that, "The biblical writings place an emphasis on the ethical demand for faithfulness and speech ethics that is difficult to exaggerate."[796] However, to ignore the role(s) that *silences* play in that ethical demand is to flatten the contours of early Christian identity construction considerably. Karen King calls scholars of early Christian history to aim "to understand the discursive strategies and processes by which early Christians…produced various constructions of what it meant to be

[795] Acts explicitly mentions silence in 12.17; 15.12-13; 18.9; 21.40.

[796] Roger Lundin, Anthony C. Thiselton, and Clarence Walhout, *The Promise of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 235.

Christian."[797] Focusing on both speech *and silence* as discursive strategies in early Christian narratives can assist in this task, shedding further light on what was at stake for various early Christian communities as they wrestled over what it meant for them to live out Jesus' teachings.

The dissertation began with a quote from the prophet Simeon: "as a result of him [Jesus] the thoughts of many hearts will be revealed" (2.35). It is fitting, then, to end with a quote from the one in whom that prophecy was fulfilled:

Nothing is covered up that will not be uncovered, and nothing secret that will not become known. Therefore whatever you have said in the dark will be heard in the light, and what you have whispered behind closed doors will be proclaimed from the housetops.
- Luke 12.2-3

[797] Karen King, "Which Early Christianity?" in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David Hunter; Oxford Handbooks in Religion and Theology; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 73.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aletti, Jean-Noël. *L'art de raconter Jesus-Christ. L'ecriture narrative de l'evangile de Luc*. Paris: Seuil, 1989.

Alexander, Loveday. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Alexander, Loveday. *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: T&T Clark International, 2005.

Alsup, J. E. *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1975.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Alter, Robert. "How Convention Helps Us Read: The Case of the Bible's Annunciation Type-Scene." *Prooftexts* 3 (1983): 115-30.

Ambrose of Milan. *Exposition of the Holy Gospel According to Saint Luke.* Translated by Theodosia Tomkinson. Etna, Calif.: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1998.

Anderson, J.G. "A New Translation of Luke 1:20." *The Bible Translator* 20 (1969): 21-24.

Aune, David. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment.* Vol. 8. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Baban, Octavian. *On the Road Encounters in Luke-Acts: Hellenistic Mimesis and Luke's Theology of the Way*. Waynesboro, Ga.: Paternoster Press, 2006.

Bailey, Kenneth. *Through Peasant Eyes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Bailey, Kenneth. *Poet and Peasant: A Literary-cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1976.

Baker, William. *Personal Speech-Ethics in the Epistle of James*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.

Baldick, Chris, ed. *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Bar-Efrat, Shimon. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. Bible and Literature Series 17. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

Barnes, Jonathan, ed. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Barrett, James. *Staged Narrative: Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Barton, Carlin. *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans: The Gladiator and the Monster.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Bartsch, Shadi. *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Beck, David R. *The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Beck, Brian E. "'Imitatio Christi' and the Lucan Passion Narrative." *Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament: Studies Presented to GM Styler by the Cambridge New Testament Seminar*. Edited by William Horbury and Brian McNeil. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Bendemann, Reinhold von. *Zwischen ΔΟΞΑ und ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ: Eine exegetische Untersuchung der Texte des sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukasevangelium*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 101. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

Berry, D.H. and Andrew Erskine, eds. *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Best, E. *Disciples and Discipleship: Studies in the Gospel According to Mark*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation.* Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Betz, Otto. "Probleme des Prozesses Jesu." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultut Roms im Spiegel der neueren Firschung* 2 (1982): 565–647.

Bird, Michael. *Jesus and the Origins of the Gentile Mission*. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.

Black, Clifton C. *The Rhetoric of the Gospel: Theological Artistry in the Gospels and Acts*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2001.

Blinzler, Joseph. *The Trial of Jesus: The Jewish and Roman Proceedings against Jesus Christ Described and Assessed from the Oldest Accounts*. Translated by Isabel and Florence McHugh. Cork: Mercier Press, 1959.

Blodgett, E.D. and H.G. Coward, eds. *Silence, the Word and the Sacred*. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1989.

Blomberg, Craig L. *Interpreting the Parables*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 1990.

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Booth, Wayne. *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1988.

Borgman, Paul. *The Way According to Luke: Hearing the Whole Story of Luke-Acts*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006.

Boring, Eugene. *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Boring, Eugene. "Mark 1:1-15 and the Beginning of the Gospel." *Semeia* 52 (1991): 43-81.

Bovon, François. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950-2005).* Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Bovon, François. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Bovon, François. *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51-19:27.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

Bovon, François. "Jésus Fils de Dieu dans l'Évangile selon Saint Luc." *Revue biblique* 72 (1965): 185-209.

Bovon, François. "Le récit lucanien de la passion de Jésus (Lc 22-23)." Pages 393-423 in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by Camille Focant. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.

Bovon, François. "The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts." *New Testament and Christian Apocrypha: Collected Studies II*. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2009.

Bovon, François. "Israel, the Church and the Gentiles in the Twofold Work of Luke." Pages 81-95 in *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives*. Translated by J. Happiseva-Hunter. Pittsburg Theological Monograph Series 36. Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick Publications, 1995.

Bovon, François. "Parabel des Evangeliums — Parabel des Gottesreiches." Pages 11-21 in *Die Sprache der Bilder. Gleichnis und Metapher in Literatur und Theologie*. Edited by Hans Weder. Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1989.

Bovon, François. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 15,1–19,27)*. EKKNT 3/3. Düsseldorf: Benziger, 2001.

Bovon, François. "The Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15.11-32): Second Reading." Pages 441-66 in *Exegesis: Problems of Method and Exercises in Reading (Genesis 22 and Luke 15)*. Edited by F. Bovon and G. Rouiller. Translated by D.G. Miller. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978.

Braithwaite, Charles. "Cultural Uses and Interpretations of Silence." Pages 163-72 in *The Nonverbal Communication Reader*. Edited by Laura Guerrero, Joseph DeVito, and Michael Hecht. Prospect Heights: Waveland, 1999.

Brant, Jo-Ann. *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel.* Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.

Brawley, Robert. *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Breech, J. *The Silence of Jesus: the Authentic Voice of the Historical Man*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Brock, Ann Graham. *Mary Magdalene, the First Apostle: The Struggle for Authority*. Harvard Theological Studies 51. Cambridge: Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Brooten, Bernadette. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscription Evidence and Background Issues*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.

Brown, Schuyler. *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

Buck, Erwin. "The Function of the Pericope 'Jesus before Herod' in the Passion Narrative of Luke." Pages 165-78 in *Wort in der Zeit*. Edited by W. Haubeck and M. Bachmann. Leiden: EJ Brill, 1980.

Buckwalter, Douglas H. *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *History of the Synoptic Tradition*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Jesus and the Word*. New York: Scribner's, 1958.

Burkett, Delbert. *The Blackwell Companion to Jesus.* John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

Cadbury, H.J. "Four Features of Lukan Style." Pages 87-102 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Cadbury, H. J. "The Speeches in Acts." Pages 402-427 in *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1920-33.

Cadbury, H.J. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts IV: On Direct Quotation, With Some Uses of *hoti* and *ei*." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 48 (1929): 412-25.

Cadbury, H.J. "Commentary on the Preface of Luke." Pages 489-510 in *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Edited by J.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan, 1922-33.

Cadbury, H.J. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Cadbury, H.J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. London: Macmillan, 1927.

Cage, John. *The Charles Eliot Norton Lectures I-VI*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Callen, T. "The Preface of Luke-Acts and Historiography." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 576-81.

Calvin, John. *A Harmony of the Gospels: Matthew, Mark, and Luke.* Translated by A.W. Morrison. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Camery-Hoggatt, Jerry. *Irony in Mark's Gospel: Text and Subtext*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Camery-Hoggatt, Jerry. *Speaking of God: Reading and Preaching the Word of God*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995.

Campbell, William. *The "We" Passages in the Acts of the Apostles: The Narrator as Narrative Character*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

Campbell, William. "Engagement, Disengagement, and Obstruction: Jesus' Defense Strategies in Mark's Trial and Execution Scenes." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (2004): 282-300.

Carroll, John T. "The God of Israel and Salvation of the Nations: The Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles." Pages 91-106 in *The Forgotten God*. Edited by A.A. Das and F.J. Matera. Louisville: John Knox Press, 2002.

Carroll, John T. "Luke's Portrayal of the Pharisees." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 604-21.

Carson, D.A. and H.G.M. Williamson, eds. *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Carter, D.M. "Citizen Attribute, Negative Right: A Conceptual Difference Between Ancient and Modern Ideas of Freedom of Speech." Pages 197-221 in *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*. Edited by Ineke Sluiter and Ralph Mark Rosen. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2002.

Cassidy, Richard J. *Four Times Peter: Portrayals of Peter in the Four Gospels and at Philippi*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2007.

Cerfaux, L. “Le titre Kyrios et la dignité royale de Jésus.” *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 12 (1923): 125-153.

Chariton. “Chaereas and Callirhoe.” Pages 5-124 in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Edited by Brian Reardon. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Charles, R.H. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Discourse and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Chatman, Seymour. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Cheung, King-Kok. *Articulate Silences: Hisaye Yamamoto, Maxine Hong Kingston, Joy Kogawa*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Cicero. *De Oratore*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Cicero. *De Inventione*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Clair, Robin Patric. *Organizing Silence: A World of Possibilities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Clark, Gillian. “‘Can We Talk?’: Augustine and the Possibility of Dialogue.” Pages 117-18 in *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity*. Edited by Simon Goldhill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Biographia Literaria*. Edited by George Watson. London: Dent, 1965.

Collins, R. “Is the Parable of the Unjust Steward Pure Sarcasm?” *Expository Times* 22 (1910): 525-526.

Colson, F.H. et al. *Philo*. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-1953.

Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Mitte der Zeit*. Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1954.

Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber & Faber, 1961.

Cosgrove, Charles. “The Divine DEI in Luke-Acts.” *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 168-90.

Creech, R.R. "The Most Excellent Narratee: The Significance of Theophilus in Luke-Acts." Pages 107-26 in *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays on Acts in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders*. Edited by N. Keathley. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 1990.

Crossan, John Dominic. *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Crossan, John Dominic. *The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.

Crossan, John Dominic. *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography*. New York: HarperCollins, 1994.

Culpepper, Alan R. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983.

Culy, Martin, Mikeal Parsons and Joshua Stigall. *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010.

Daniel, Robert and Franco Maltomini. *Supplementum Magicum*. 2 vols. Opladen: Westdeutscher, 1990-1992.

Danker, Frederick W. *Luke*. Philadelphia: Proclamation Commentaries, 1987.

Danove, Paul. "The Narrative Rhetoric of Mark's Ambiguous Characterization of the Disciples." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 70 (1998): 21-38.

Danove, Paul. *The Rhetoric of the Characterization of God, Jesus, and Jesus' Disciples in the Gospel of Mark.* New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Darr, John. *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.

Darr, John. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Darr, John. "Narrator as Character: Mapping a Reader-Oriented Approach to Narration in Luke-Acts." *Semeia* 63 (1993): 43-60.

Darr, John. "'Watch how you listen' (Lk. 8.18): Jesus and the Rhetoric of Perception in Luke-Acts." Pages 87-107 in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Edited by E.S. Malbon and E.V. McKnight. Sheffield. JSOT Press; Valley Forge, PA. Trinity Press International, 1994.

Dauenhauer, Bernard. *Silence: The Phenomenon and Its Ontological Significance*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1980.

Davis, Lennard J. *The Disability Studies Reader*. Edited by Lennard Davis. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Dawsey, James. *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988.

de Boer, Esther. "The Lukan Mary Magdalene and the Other Women Following Jesus." Pages 140-60 in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*. Edited by Amy Jill Levine. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

de Jonge, Henk J. "Sonship, Wisdom, Infancy: Luke II.41-51a." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 317-324.

Delobel, J. "L'onction par la pécheresse. La composition littéraire de Lc., VII, 36-50." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 42 (1966): 414-475.

Delorme, Jean. *Les Paraboles evangeliques: Perspectives nouvelles*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1989.

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

Demetrius. *De Elocutione*. Translated and edited by W. Rhys Roberts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902.

Denaux, A. "L'hypocrisie des Pharisiens et le dessein de Dieu. Analyse de Lc 13,31-33." Pages 155-95 in *L'Evangile de Luc. Problèmes littéraires et théologiques*. Edited by F. Neirynck. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum loveniensum 33. Gembloux: Duculot, 1973.

Denaux, A. *Studies in the Gospel of Luke: Structure, Language and Theology*. Piscataway, N.J.: Rutgers University, 2010.

Denaux, A., Rita Corstjens and Hellen Mardega, eds. *The Vocabulary of Luke: An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Denova, I. R. *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts*. London: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Dibelius, Martin. "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography." Pages 138-85 in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by H. Greeven. London: SCM Press, 1956.

Dickman, Nathan. *Dialogue and Divinity: A Hermeneutics of the Interrogative Mood in Religious Language.* Ph.d. Diss.: The University of Iowa, 2009.

Dillon, R.J. "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1.1-4)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43 (1981): 205-27.

Dillon, R.J. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978.

Dionysius. *On Thucydides*. Translated by S. Usher. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Docherty, Thomas. *Reading (Absent) Character: Towards a Theory of Characterization in Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Dodd, C.H. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London: Nisbet, 1935.

Donahue, John. *The Gospel in Parable*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

Dornish, Loretta. *A Woman Reads the Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996.

Downing, Gerald Francis. *Doing Things with Words in the First Christian Century*. New York: T&T Clark, 2000.

Draper, Horsley and Foley, eds. *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark: Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.

Duff, Paul Brooks. "The March of the Divine Warrior and the Advent of the Greco-Roman King: Mark's Account of Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 55-73.

Dunn, Francis M. and Thomas Cole, eds. *Beginnings in Classical Literature*. Yale Classical Studies. Cambridge: Yale University, 1992.

Dunn, James, ed. *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Dutoit, E. "Silences, dans l'oeuvre de Tite-Live." Pages 141-51 in *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à J. Marouzeau*. Paris, 1948.

Dällenbach, Lucien. *The Mirror in the Text*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Earl, D. "Prologue-form in Ancient Historiography." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 1 (1972): 842-56.

Ebeling, Hans. *Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Marcus-Evangelisten*. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939.

Eco, Umberto. *The Role of the Reader*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.

Egelkraut, Helmuth. *Jesus' Mission to Jerusalem: A Redaction Critical Study of the Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke, Lk 9:51-19:48*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1976.

Eisen, Ute. "The Narratological Fabric of the Gospels." Pages 195-212 in *Narratology Beyond Literary Criticism: Mediality, Disciplinarity* Edited by Jan Christoph Meister. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005.

Elvey, Anne. "Earth as intertext: 'the stones would shout out' (Luke 19:40)." *Council of Societies for the Study of Religion Bulletin* 35 (2006): 27-30.

Esler, Philip. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lukan Theology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Euripides. *The War Plays: Iphigenia at Aulis, The Women of Troy, Helen.* Translated by Don Taylor. London: Methuen, 1990.

Evans, C. F. *Saint Luke*. London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International. 1990.

Evans, C.F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." Pages 37-53 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D.E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Field, Frederick. *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899.

Filson, F.V. *Apostolic History and the Gospel*. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and R. P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. "Biblische Grundlegung." Pages 32-38 in *Feministische Theologie: Perspektiven zur Orientierung*. Edited by M. Kassel. Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1988.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. "Breaking the Silence—Becoming Visible." Pages 3-16 in *Concilium: Religion in the Eighties.* Edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Mary Collins. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985

Focant, Camille. "Un Silence Qui Fait Parler (Me 16,8)." Pages 79-96 in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis.* Edited by A. Denaux. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.

Forbes, Christopher. *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995.

Forster, E.M. *Aspects of the Novel*. London: Edward Arnold, 1927.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books, 1973.

Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. Edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. *L'ordre du discourse*. Paris: Gallimard, 1971.

Foucault, Michel. *Foucault: A Critical Reader*. Edited by David Couzens Hoy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Franke, William, ed. *On What Cannot be Said: Apophatic Discourses in Philosophy, Religion, Literature and the Arts*, Vol. 1: Classic Formulations. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2007.

Fredrick, David, ed. *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Frei, Hans. *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Freytag, Gustav. *Freytag's Technique of the Drama: An Exposition of Dramatic Composition and Art*. Translated by Elias J. MacEwan. Chicago: Griggs, 1894.

Fuchs, Esther. "The Literary Characterization of Mothers and Sexual Politics in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 117-36 in *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins. Chico: Scholars, 1985.

Fuchs, Albert. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur Qullenkritik*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.

Funk, Robert W. *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Gager, John, ed. *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Gaston, Lloyd. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Gathercole, Simon J. *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Mathew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by Jane Lewin. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Genette, Gérard. *Figures of Literary Discourse*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Giblin, Charles. "'The Things of God' in the Question Concerning Tribute to Caesar (Lk 20.25; Mk 12.17; Mt 22.21)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33 (1971): 510-27.

Gill, David. "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages." *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970): 199-221.

Glenn, Cheryl. *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Glenn, Cheryl and Krista Ratcliffe. "Why Silence and Listening Are Important Rhetorical Arts." Pages 1-20 in *Silence and Listening as Rhetorical Arts*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 2011.

Gooch, Paul. *Reflections on Jesus and Socrates: Word and Silence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Gottlieb, Roger. *Thinking the Unthinkable: Meanings of the Holocaust*. New York: Paulist Press, 1990.

Goulder, M.D. "The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey." *Texte und Untersuchungen* 87 (1963): 195-202.

Gowler, David. *Host, Guest, Enemy and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts*. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

Grangaard, Blake R. *Conflict and Authority in Luke 19:47-21:4*. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.

Green, Joel. *The Gospel of Luke*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Green, Joel. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight and I. Howard Marshall. Leicester and Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.

Green, Joel. *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Greimas, AJ. *Maupassant: The Semiotics of Text*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1988

Grundmann, W. "Fragen der Komposition des lukanischen 'Reiseberichts.'" *Zeitschrift für die neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 50-51 (1959-1960): 252-270.

Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by Bernard Noble et al. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

Habinek, Thomas. *Ancient Rhetoric and Oratory*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Hahn, Ferdinand. *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 83. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.

Haines-Eitzen, Kim. "Imagining Sound and Silence." Unpublished talk at AAR/SBL, San Francisco, 14 November 2011.

Halliwell, Stephen. “Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character.” Pages 32-59 in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Edited by Christopher Pelling. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Halvgaard, Tilde Bak. “The Sound of Silence in Theology of Language *The Thunder Perfect Mind*.” Unpublished Paper. University of Copenhagen, 2010.

Hamm, Dennis. “Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke.” *Biblica* 67 (1986): 457-77.

Hansen, Mogens. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles and Ideology*. Oxford, 1991.

Harmetz, Aljean. *The Making of the Wizard of Oz: Movie Magic and studio Power in the Prime of MGM—and the Miracle of Production*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.

Harmon, Steven R. “Zechariah’s Unbelief and Early Jewish-Christian Relations: The Form and Structure of Luke 1:5–25 as a Clue to the Narrative Agenda of the Gospel of Luke.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 31 (2001): 10–16.

Harrington, Daniel J. “Major Lukan Themes.” Pages 154-57 in *The Synoptic Gospels Set Free: Preaching Without Anti-Judaism*. New York, N.Y.: Paulist Press, 2009.

Harrington, Jay M. *The Lukan Passion Narrative: The Markan Material in Luke 22, 54-23, 25. A Historical Survey: 1891-1997*. New Testament Tools and Studies 30. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Hays, Christopher. *Luke’s Wealth Ethics: A Study in Their Coherence and Character*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Alten und Neuen Testament 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Hedrick, CW. *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Heininger, Bernhard. *Metaphorik, Erzahlstruktur und szenischdramatische Gestaltung in den Sondergutgleichnissen bei Lukas*. Neuetestamentliche Abhandlungen 24. Münster: Aschendorff, 1991.

Hemp, Paul. “Presenteeism: At work – but out of it.” *Harvard Business Review* (2004): 1-9.

Henderson, Suzanne Watts. “Concerning the Loaves: Comprehending Incomprehension in Mark 6.45-52.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 83 (2001): 3-25.

Herzog, William. *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.

Hiers, Richard. “Friends by Unrighteous Mammon: The Eschatological Proletariat.” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 38 (1970): 30-31.

Homer. *The Iliad.* Translated by AT Murray. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge,

Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Homer. *The Odyssey*. Translated by AT Murray. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Hooker, Morna D. *Beginnings: Keys that Open the Gospels*. London: SCM, 1997.

hooks, bell. *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black.* Boston: South End Press, 1989.

Huckin, Thomas. "On Textual Silences, Large and Small." Pages 419-31 in *Traditions of Writing Research*. Edited by Charles Bazerman et al. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Hultgren, Arland. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Hultin, Jeremy. "Watch your mouth: The ethics of obscene speech in early Christianity and its environment." PhD diss., Yale University, 2003.

Hupe, Henning. *Lukas' Schweigen: dekonstruktive Relektüren der "Wir-Stücke" in Acta.* Wien: Passagen, 2008.

Hur, Ju. *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 211. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.

Hyland, Drew. *Finitude and Transcendence in the Platonic Dialogues*. Albany: SUNY, 1995.

Iamblichus. *On the Pythagorean Life*. Translated by Gillian Clark. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.

Ilan, Tal. *Integrating Women into Second Temple History*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader*: *Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1974.

Jackson, Michael D. *The Politics of Storytelling: Violence, Transgression and Intersubjectivity*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 1998.

James, William. "The Knowing of Things Together." Pages 372-73 in *Essays in Philosophy*. Edited by Frederick Burkhardt and Fredson Bowers. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Jaworski, Adam. *The Power of Silence: Social and Pragmatic Perspectives*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1993.

Jay, Martin. "In the Empire of the Gaze: Foucault and the Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought." Pages 175-204 in *Foucault: A Critical Reader*. Edited by David Couzens Hoy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Jensen, Vernon. "Communicative Functions of Silence." *ETCA Review of General Semantics* 30 (1973): 249–257.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. 2nd ed. Translated by S.H. Hooke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.

Jervell, J. *Luke and the People of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis, Minn.: 1972.

Jervell, J. "The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel. The Understanding of the Samaritans in Luke-Acts." Pages 113-32 in *Luke and the People of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1972.

Johanneson, Richard. "The Functions of Silence: A Plea for Communication Research." *Western Speech* 38 (1974): 25-35.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. "Taciturnity and True Religion." Pages 329-39 in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe.* Edited by David Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1991.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. SBL Dissertation Series 39. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977

Johnson-DeBaufre, Melanie. "'Gazing upon the Invisible': Archaeology, Historiography, and the Elusive Women of 1 Thessalonians." Pages 73–108 in *From Roman to Early Christian Thessalonikē: Studies in Religion and Archaeology*. Edited by Laura Salah Nasrallah, Charalambos Bakirtzis, and Steven J. Friesen. Harvard Theological Studies 64. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926-65.

Just, Arthur, ed. *Luke: Ancient Christian Commentaries on Scripture.* Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2003.

Jülicher, Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. 2. Teil. Auslegung der Gleichnisreden der drei ersten* Evangelien. Freiburg, 1899.

Kamen, Deborah. "Between Slavery and Freedom, Silence and *Parrhêsia*: The Case of the Freedman in Ancient Greece." Paper Presented at Classics Graduate Student Conference at Princeton University. Princeton N.J., March 2004.

Karris, Robert. *Luke, Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature*. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.

Karris, Robert. "Poor and Rich: The Lukan *Sitz im Leben*." Pages 112-25 in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978.

Karris, Robert. *The Gospel According to Luke: New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Kartzow, Marianne Bjelland. *Gossip and Gender: Othering of Speech in the Pastoral Epistles*. New York: de Gruyter, 2009.

Kassel, M., ed. *Feministische Theologie: Perspektiven zur Orientierung*. Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1988.

Kearns, Michael S. *Rhetorical Narratology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

Kelber, Werner. *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Bloomington, Ind.: University Press, 1997.

Kennedy, George. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1984.

Kermode, Frank. *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Kern, Stephen. *A Cultural History of Causality: Science, Murder Novels, and Systems of Thought*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Kilgallen, J. "Luke 2.41-50: Foreshadowing of Jesus, Teacher." *Biblica* 66 (1985): 553-59.

Kim, J. Joseph. *"What is this Word?": An Early Christian Narrative of the Universal Spread of the Spirit-Accompanied Word.* Ph.D. Diss., Harvard University, 2009.

Kim, Kyoung-Jin. *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 155. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Kindt, Tom and Hans-Harald Müller. *The Implied Author: Concept and Controversy*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.

King, Karen. "Hearing, Seeing, and Knowing God: *Allogenes* and the *Gospel of Mary*." Pages 319-332 in *Early Christian Voices in Texts, Traditions, and Symbols: Essays in Honor of François Bovon*. Edited by David H. Warren, Ann Graham Brock, David W. Pao. Boston: Brill, 2003.

King, Karen. "Prophetic Power and Women's Authority: The Case of the Gospel of Mary (Magdalene)." Pages 21-41 in *Women Preachers and Prophets through Two Millennia*

of Christianity. Edited by Beverly Kienzle and Pamela J. Walker. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

King, Karen. "Which Early Christianity." Pages 66-84 in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Edited by Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David Hunter. Oxford Handbooks in Religion and Theology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

King, Karen. *The Secret Revelation of John*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

King, Karen. "Mystery and Secrecy in *The Apocryphon of John*." Pages 61-85 in *Mystery and Secrecy in the Nag Hammadi Collection and Other Ancient Literature: Ideas and Practices.* Edited by John Turner, Ismo Dunderberg, Christian H. Bull and Liv Ingeborg Lied. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2011.

Kingsbury, J.D. *Conflict in Luke*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991.

Kingsbury, J.D. "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts." Pages 1497-1512 in *The Four Gospels: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.

Kingsbury, J.D. "The Plot of Luke's Story of Jesus." *Interpretation* (1994): 369-78.

Kinman, B. "'The Stones Will Cry Out' (Luke 19, 40) – Joy or Judgment?" *Biblica* 75 (1994): 232-235.

Kinman, B. *Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem in the Context of Lukan Theology and the Politics of His Day*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Kistemaker, Simon. *The Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.

Klutz, Todd E. *The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading.* Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 129. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Knight, Jonathan. *Luke's Gospel*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Korn, Manfred. *Die Geschichte Jesu in Veranderter Zeit: Studien zur bleibendend Bedeutung Jesu im lukanischen Doppelwerk*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 51. Tübingen: Mohr, 1993.

Kuhn, Karl. *In Their Own Words: Character Speech in the Gospel of Luke*. PhD. diss., Marquette University, 1999.

Kuhn, Karl. "The Point of the Step-Parallelism in Luke 1–2." *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 38-49.

Kunz, Claudia. *Schweigen und Geist: Biblische und patristische Studien zu einer Spiritualität des Schweigens*. Freiburg: Herder, 1996.

Kurz, William. "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 (1980): 171-95.

Kurz, William. *Reading Luke- Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

Kümmel, W.G. *Einleitung in das neue Testament*. 13th ed. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1964.

Laertius, Diogenes. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers.* Loeb Classical Library. Translated by R. D. Hicks. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. *Evangile selon saint Luc*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1948.

Laird, Andrew. *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Lak, Chun Yung. *"The Word of God" in Luke-Acts: A Study in Lukan Theology*. Ph.D. diss., Atlanta: Emory University, 1995.

Lampe, G. W. H. "The Lucan Portrait of Christ." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1956): 160-175.

Landry, David. "Narrative Logic in the Annunciation to Mary (Lk 1.26–38)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 (1995): 65–79.

Lardinois, André and Laura McClure, eds. *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Laurentin, R. *Jésus au temple*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1966.

Laurentin, R. *Structure et theologie de Luc I-II*. EtB. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, Gabalda, 1957.

Laurentin, R. *Les Évangiles de l'Enfance: vérité de Noël au-delà des Mythes*. Paris: Desclee, 1982.

Leaney, A.C. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke.* Harper's Commentaries. New York: Harper, 1958.

Ledbetter, M. "Telling the Other Story: A Literary Response to Socio-Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament." *Semeia* 64 (1993): 289-301.

Lee, David. *Luke's Stories of Jesus: Theological Reading of Gospel Narrative and the Legacy of Hans Frei*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Legrand, Lucien. *L'annonce a Marie [Lc 1,26-38]: Une apocalypse aux origins de l'Evangile*. Paris: Cerf, 1981.

Letourneau, P. and M. Talbot, eds. *Et vous, qui dites-vous que je suis? La gestion des personnages dans les recits bibliques*. Montreal/ Paris: Mediaspaul, 2006.

Levine, Amy-Jill, ed. *"Women Like This": New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Lindijer, C.H. "Two Creative Encounters in the Work of Luke (Luke 24.13-35 and Acts 8.26-40)." *Miscellanea Neotestamentica* 48 (1978): 77-85.

Livy. *Ab Urbe Condita*. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1919.

Loevlie, Elisabeth. *Literary Silences in Pascal, Rousseau, and Beckett*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Lohfink, G. *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts – und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas*. Munich: Kosel, 1971.

Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. New York and London: Garland, 1987.

Lord, Albert. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Lotman, Jurij. "The Problem of Plot." Pages 231-39 in *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1977.

Lucian. *Demon. Life of Demonax in Vol. 3 of Lucian. Works of Lucian.* Translated by A. M. Harmon. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1913.

Lundin, Roger, Anthony C. Thiselton, and Clarence Walhout. *The Promise of Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Luz, U. "The Secrecy Motif and Marcan Christology." Pages 75-96 in *The Messianic Secret.* Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982.

Maile, J. F. "The Ascension in Luke-Acts." *Tyndale Bulletin* 37 (1986): 29-59.

Maland, J. Charles. *Chaplin and American Culture: The Evolution of a Star Image*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers and Adele Berlin, eds. *Characterization in Biblical Literature*. *Semeia* 63. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "Fallible Followers: Women and Men in the Gospel of Mark." *Semeia* 28 (1983): 29-48.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "The Christology of Mark's Gospel: Narrative Christology and the Markan Jesus." Pages 135-58 in *Who Do You Say That I Am? Essays on Christology*. Edited by Jack Dean Kingsbury, David Bauer, and Mark Allen Powell. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "Ending at the Beginning: A Response." *Semeia* 52 (1991): 175-84.

Malina, Bruce J. and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Malina, Bruce J. and Jerome Neyrey. "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World." Pages 25-65 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models of Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome Neyrey. Brockton, Mass.: Peabody, 1991.

Manser, Martin, David Barratt, Julius Steinberg and Pieter J. Lalleman. *Critical Companion to the Bible: A Literary Reference*. New York: Facts on File Inc., 2009.

Marcus, Joel. "Identity and Ambiguity in Markan Christology." Pages 136-40 in *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*. Edited by Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard Hays. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Marcus, Joel. "Blanks and Gaps in the Markan Parable of the Sower." *Biblical Interpretation* 5 (1997): 247- 67.

Marguerat, Daniel and Yvan Bourquin. *Pour lire les récits bibliques*. Paris: Cerf, 1998.

Marguerat, Daniel. "The End of Acts (28,16-31) and the Rhetoric of Silence." Pages 74-89 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup, 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Marguerat, Daniel. "Luc, Metteur en Scène Des Personnages." Pages 281-95 in *Analyse narrative et Bible: Deuxième colloque international du PRENAB*. Edited by C. Focant and A. Wènin. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium* 196. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.

Marguerat, Daniel. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the "Acts of the Apostles."* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Marshall, Howard I. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1988.

Matera, Frank. "Plot of Matthew's Gospel." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 233-53.

Matera, Frank. "The Incomprehension of the Disciples and Peter's Confession (Mark 6,14-8,30)." *Biblica* 70 (1989): 153-72.

Matera, Frank. "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (9.51-19.46): A Conflict With Israel." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 51 (1993): 57-77.

Matera, Frank. *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through their Passion Stories*. New York: Paulist, 1986.

Maxwell, Kathy. *Hearing Between the Lines: The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu*. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

Mazzei, Lisa. *Inhabited Silence in Qualitative Research: Putting Poststructural Theory to Work*. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.

Mazzeo, Joseph. "St. Augustine's Rhetoric of Silence." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 23 (1962): 175-96.

McClure, Laura and André Lardinois, eds. *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.

McCown, C.C. "The Geography of Luke's Central Section." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57 (1938): 51-66.

McFague, Sallie. *Speaking in Parables: A Study in Metaphor and Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

McKeon, Richard, ed. *The Basic Works of Aristotle*. New York: Random House, 1941.

Menoud, Philippe. "Remarques sur les textes de l'Ascension dans Luc-Actes." *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954.

Merenlahti, Petri. *Poetics for the Gospels? Rethinking Narrative Criticism.* Study of the New Testament and Its World. London: T & T Clark, 2002.

Metzger, Bruce. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Meeus, X. de. "Composition de Lc, XIV et genre symposiaque." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 37 (1961): 847-70.

Meynet, Roland. *L'Evangile selon saint Luc. Analyse rhétorique*. 2 vols. Paris: Cerf, 1988.

Miller, John. *Convinced That God Had Called Us: Dreams, Visions and the Perception of God's Will in Luke-Acts*. Biblical Interpretation Series 85. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Miller, J. Hillis. "The Problematic of Ending in Narrative." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 33 (1978): 3-7.

Minear, Paul S. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." Pages 111-30 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Mirecki, Paul and Marvin W. Meyer, eds. *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 141. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Mirguet, Françoise. *La Représentation du divin dans les récits du Pentateuque: Médiations syntaxiques et narratives*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 123. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Moessner, David. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Montiglio, Silvia. *Silence in the Land of Logos*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Moo, Douglas. *The Letter of James.* TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.

Moore, Stephen. *Literary Criticism and the Gospels.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989.

Moore, Stephen. *Mark & Luke in Poststructuralist Perspective: Jesus Begins to Write*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.

Moore, Stephen. "Things Not Written in This Book." Pages 253-58 in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*. Edited by Tom Thatcher and Stephen Moore. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Morales, Helen. "Musaeus' *Hero and Leander*." Pages 41-69 in *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Richard Miles. London: Routledge, 1999.

Morales, Helen. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge Classical Studies. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Mortley, Raoul. *From Word to Silence: The Rise and Fall of Logos*. Bonn: Hanstein, 1986.

Muers, Rachel. *Keeping God's Silence: Towards a Theological Ethics of Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Musaeus. *Hero and Leander*. Translated by E.H. Blakeney. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Myers, Ched. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988.

Müller, Karlheinz. "Jesus vor Herodes: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23,6-12." Pages 111-41 in *Zur Geschichte des Urchristentums*. Edited by G. Dautzenberg, H. Merklein and K. Müller. Freiburg: Herder, 1979.

Nadella, Raj. *Dialogue Not Dogma: Many Voices in the Gospel of Luke*. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.

Nasrallah, Laura. *An Ecstasy of Folly: Prophecy and Authority in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Theological Studies, Harvard Divinity School, 2003.

Neher, André. *L'exil de la parole: du silence biblique au silence d'Auschwitz*. Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1970.

Neyrey, Jerome. "Questions, *Chreiai*, and Challenges to Honor: The Interface of Rhetoric and Culture in Mark's Gospel." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (1998): 657-680.

Neyrey, Jerome. *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology*. New York: Paulist, 1985.

Nünning, Ansgar. "Narratology or Narratologies? Taking Stock of Recent Developments, Critique and Modest Proposals for Future Usages of the Term." Pages 239-276 in *What is Narratology?: Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory*. Edited by Tom Kindt and Hans-Harald Müller. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

O'Fearghail, F. *The Introduction to Luke-Acts. A Study of the Role of Lk 1,1-4 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work*. Analecta Biblica 126. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991.

O'Neill, J.C. "The Silence of Jesus." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968-69): 153-167.

Ong, Walter. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London and New York: Methuen, 1982.

O'Reilly, Leo. *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles: A Study in Lucan Theology*. Rome: Editrice Pontifica Universita Gregorians, 1987.

Origen. *Homilies on the Gospel of Luke, Fragments on Luke*. Translated by Joseph T. Lienhard. Fathers of the Church 94. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.

O'Toole, Robert. *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1984.

Pao, D. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.

Parsons, Mikeal and Richard I. Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Parsons, Mikeal. *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Parsons, Mikeal. “Reading a Beginning/Beginning a Reading: Tracing Literary Theory on Narrative Openings.” *Semeia* 52 (1991): 11-31.

Parsons, Mikeal. “Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel: The Sense of an Ending in Luke 24:50-53.” Pages 201-23 in *SBL Seminar Papers 1986*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1986.

Parsons, Mikeal. *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987.

Patte, Daniel. *Structural Exegesis for New Testament Critics*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1990.

Pelling, Christopher. “Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography.” Pages 213-44 in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Edited by C. Pelling. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Perkins, Pheme. *Jesus as Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Perret-Clermont, Anne-Nelly, Maria-Luisa Schubauer-Leoni and Alain Trognon. “L’Extorsion des Reponses en Situation Asymetrique.” Pages 3-32 in *Verbum Conversations Adulte/Enfants*. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1992.

Perrin, Norman. *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Perrine, Laurence. *Story and Structure*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovonovich, 1959.

Perry, Menakhem. “Literary Dynamics: How the Order of a Text Creates its Meanings.” *Poetics Today* 1 (1979): 35-64.

Petracca, V. *Gott oder das Geld. Die Besitzethik des Lukas*. Tübingen: Francke, 2003.

Phelan, James. *The Nature of Narrative: The Fortieth Anniversary Edition*. Edited by Robert E. Scholes, James Phelan, Robert Leland Kellogg. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Picard, Max. *Die Welt des Schweigens*. Zurich: Rentsch, 1948. English trans.: *The World of Silence*. Translated by Stanley Goodman. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952.

Pierce, R.W. and R.M. Groothuis, eds. *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.

Pilgrim, Walter E. *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.

Plato. *The Republic*. Translated by Paul Shorey. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Plevnik, J. "The Eyewitnesses of the Risen Jesus in Luke 24." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 90-103.

Plummer, A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Plutarch. *Moralia.* Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956-69.

Polybius. *The Histories.* Translated by W. R. Paton. 6 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1922-27.

Powell, Mark Allen. "Expected and Unexpected Readings of Matthew: What the Reader Knows." *Asbury Theological Journal* 48 (1993): 41-51.

Powell, Mark Allen. "Characterization on the Phraseological Plane in the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 161-77 in *Treasures New and Old: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies*. Edited by David Bauer and Mark Allen Powell. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Price, Robert. *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts: A Feminist-Critical Scrutiny*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Prince, Gerald. *Narrative as Theme: Studies in French Fiction*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.

Prince, Gerald. "The Disnarrated." *Style* 22 (1988): 1-8.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. Translated by H.E. Butler. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Rabinowitz, Peter. *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

Rajchman, John. "Foucault's Art of Seeing." *October* 44 (1988): 89-117.

Ramsey, George W. "Plots, Gaps, Repetitions, and Ambiguity in Luke 15." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 17 (1990): 33-42.

Räisänen, Heikki. *The "Messianic Secret" in Mark*. Translated by Christopher Tuckett. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990.

Räisänen, Heikki. "Messianic Secret." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Reardon, Brian, ed. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Reicke, Bo. "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative." *Studia evangelica* I. Edited by K. Aland. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959.

Reid, Barbara E. *Choosing the Better Part? Women in the Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996.

Reinhartz, Adele. "Anonymity and Character in the Books of Samuel." *Semeia* 63 (1993): 117-42.

Reinhartz, Adele. *Why Ask My Name? Anonymity and Identity in the Biblical Narrative*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Rese, Martin. *Altetestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. Bonn: Rheinische Friedrick-Wilhelms-Univ, 1965.

Rese, M. "Einige Überlegungen zu Lukas XIII, 31-33." Pages 209-12 in *Jésus aux origines de la christologie*. Edited by J. Dupont. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum loveniensum 40. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975.

Resseguie, James. *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Resseguie, James. *Spiritual Landscape: Images of the Spiritual Life in the Gospel of Luke*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004.

Rhoads, David and Kari Syreeni, eds. *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Rhoads, David and Donald Michie. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Richardson, Brian, ed. *Narrative Beginnings: Theories and Practices*. Lincoln, Neb. and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2008.

Richardson, Brian. "Beyond the Poetics of Plot: Alternative Forms of Narrative Progression and the Multiple Trajectories of *Ulysses*." Pages 167-80 in *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Edited by James Phelan and Peter Rabinowitz. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2005.

Ricoeur, Paul. "The Text as Dynamic Identity." Pages 175-86 in *The Identity of the Literary Text*. Edited by Mario J. Valdes and Owen Miller. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Biblical Hermeneutics." *Semeia* 4 (1975): 27-138.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Listening to the Parables of Jesus." *Criterion* 13 (1974): 18-22.

Rilliet, F. "La louange des pierres et le tonnerre. Luc 19,40 chez Jacques de Saroug et dans la patristique syriaque." *Revue theologique et de philosophie* 117 (1985): 293-304.

Robbins, Vernon. "The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Prefaces to Luke and Acts in Light of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Strategies." Pages 63-83 in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*. Edited by David Moessner. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1999.

Robinowitz, Christina Johansson and Lisa Werner Carr. *Modern-day Vikings: A Practical Guide to Interacting with the Swedes.* Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, 2001.

Robinson, James M., ed. *The Nag Hammadi Library*. 3rd ed. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1990.

Robinson, W.C. "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960): 20-31.

Rohrbaugh, Richard L. *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2001

Rolland, Philippe. "Jésus connaissait leurs pensées." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 62 (1986): 118-21.

Rowe, C. Kavin. *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Ruge-Jones, Philip. "Omnipresent, Not Omniscient: How Literary Interpretation Confuses the Storyteller's Narrating." Pages 29-43 in *Between Author and Audience in Mark: Narration/Characterization/Interpretation*. Edited by Elisabeth Struthers Malbon. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.

Rumelhart, D.E. "Schemata: The Building Blocks of Cognition." Pages 33-58 in *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*. Edited by R. Spiro, B. Bruce, and W. Brewer. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980.

Rumi, J. *The Essential Rumi*. Translated by C. Barks. San Francisco: Harper, 1995.

Saenger, Paul. *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading*. Palo Alto: Stanford University, 1997.

Said, Edward. *Beginnings: Intention and Method*. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Sanders, James A. "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts." Pages 141-88 in *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*. Edited by D. Groh and R. Jewett. New York: University Press of America, 1985.

Sanders, James A. "A New Testament Hermeneutic Fabric: Psalm 118 in the Entrance Narrative." Pages 177-90 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. "The Place of Silence in an Integrated Theory of Communication." Pages 3-18 in *Perspectives on Silence*. Edited by Deborah Tannen and Muriel Saville-Troike. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1985.

Scarpi, Paolo. "The Eloquence of Silence: Aspects of a Power Without Words." Pages 19-40 in *Regions of Silence: Studies on the Difficulty of Communicating*. Edited by Maria Grazia Ciani. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1987.

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Schaberg, Jane. *Women's Bible Commentary*. Expanded Edition. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

Scheffler, E.H. "Emmaus—A Historical Perspective." *Neot* 23 (1989): 251-67.

Schlant, Ernestine. *The Language of Silence: West German Literature and the Holocaust.* New York: Routledge, 1999.

Schmidt, Darryl. "Rhetorical Influences and Genre: Luke's Preface and the Rhetoric of Hellenistic Historiography." Pages 27-60 in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*. Edited by David Moessner. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1999.

Schmitz, Ulrich. "Beredtes Schweigen – Zur sprachlichen Fülle der Leere. Über Grenzen der Sprachwissenschaft." *Osnabrücker Beitrage zur Prachtheorie* 42 (1990): 5-58. January 23, 2012. Online: http://www.linse.uni-due.de/linse/publikationen/silence.html.

Schnabel, Eckhard. "The Silence of Jesus: The Galilean Rabbi Who was More than a Prophet." Pages 203-56 in *Authenticating the Words and Activities of Jesus*. Edited by Craig Evans. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Schneider, Tammi. *Mothers of Promise: Women in the Book of Genesis*. Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2008.

Scholes, Robert and R. Kellogg. *The Nature of Narrative*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Schreiber, J. "Das Schweigen Jesu." Pages 79-87 in *Theologie und Unterricht*. Edited by K. Wegenast. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969.

Schulz, Siegfried. "Gottes Vorsehung bei Lukas." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 54 (1963): 104-16.

Schulz, Siegfried. *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.

Schurmann, H. *Das Lukasevangelium: Erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1.1-9.50.* Freiburg: Herder, 1969.

Schwáb, Zoltán. "Mind the Gap: The Impact of Wolfgang Iser's Reader–Response Criticism on Biblical Studies—A Critical Assessment." *Literature and Theology* 17 (2003): 170-181.

Schweizer, Eduard. *Church Order in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1961.

Schweizer, Eduard. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1982.

Scott, Bernard Brandon. "A New Voice in the Amphitheater: Full Fidelity in Translating." Pages 101-117 in *Fidelity in Translation: Communicating the Bible in the New Media*. Edited by Robert Hodgson and Paul Soukup. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1999.

Scott, Bernard Brandon. *Hear then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Seamon, Richard. "The Price of the Plot in Aristotle's Poetics." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 64 (2006): 251-258.

Seccombe, David Peter. *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*. Linz: A. Fuchs, 1982.

Seim, Turid Karlsen. *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

Sellew, Philip. "Interior Monologue as a Narrative Device in the Parables of Luke." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 239-253.

Seneca. *Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae, divisiones, colores.* Edited by Lennart Håkanson. Leipzig: Teubner, 1989.

Senior, Donald. *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989.

Shepherd, William Henry, Jr. *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

Shiner, Whitney. *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 2003.

Shiner, Whitney. "Creating Plot in Episodic Narratives: The Life of Aesop and the Gospel of Mark." Pages 155-76 in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*. Edited by JB Chance and J. Perkins. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Sider, John. *Interpreting the Parables*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.

Siker, Jeffrey. "'First to the Gentiles:' A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 69-86.

Simmel, Georg. "The Sociology of Secrecy and of Secret Societies." *American Journal of Sociology* 11 (1906): 441-98.

Siniscalo, P. “La parábola del figlio prodigo (Lc 15, 11-32) in Ireneo.” *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 38 (1967): 536-53.

Sloan, R.B. *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubilary Theology in the Gospel of Luke*. Austin, Tex.: Scholars Press, 1977.

Sly, Dorothy. *Philo’s Perception of Women*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990.

Smith, D. “Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 613-638.

Soards, M. “The Silence of Jesus before Herod: An Interpretive Suggestion.” *Australian Biblical Review* 33 (1985): 41-45.

Soards, M. *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 14. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.

Soards, M. “Tradition, Composition, and Theology in Luke’s Account of Jesus Before Herod Antipas.” *Biblica* 66 (1985): 344-364.

Sontag, Susan. *Styles of Radical Will*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1983.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *Gossip*. New York: Random House, 1985.

Spencer, Patrick. *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories of the Lukan Galilean Ministry Speeches: Hermeneutical Appropriation by Authorial Readers of Luke-Acts*. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” Pages 271-313 in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988.

Squires, John T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Staley, Jeffrey. “Narrative Structure (Self Stricture) in Luke 4:14-9:62: The United States of Luke’s Story World.” *Semeia* 72 (1995): 173-213.

Steele, E. Springs. “Luke 11:37-54: A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984): 379-394.

Steiner, George. *Language and Silence*: *Essays on Language, Literature and the Inhuman.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Sternberg, Meir. "What is Exposition? An Essay in Temporal Delimitation." Pages 25-70 in *The Theory of the Novel: New Essays*. Edited by John Halperin. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Sternberg, Meir. *Expositional Modes and Temporal Ordering in Fiction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Stock, Augustine. "The Structure of Mark." *Bible Today* 23 (1985): 293-294.

Strauss, M. L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke–Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Streeter, Burnett. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: Macmillan, 1924.

Strobel, August. *Die Stunde der Wahrheit: Untersuchungen zum Strafverfahren gegen Jesus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuschungen zum Alten und Neuen Testament 21. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980.

Swidler, Leonard. *Biblical Affirmations of Women*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979.

Tacitus. *Dialogus de Oratoribus*. Edited by Roland Mayer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Taeger, J.W. *Der Mensch und sein Heil: Studien zum Bild des Menschen und zur Sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1982.

Talbert, Charles. *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2002.

Talbert, Charles. "Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5-4:15." Pages 129-41 in *The Divine Helmsman*. Edited by James L. Crenshaw and Samuel Sandmel. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1980.

Talbert, Charles. "Prophecy and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology." Pages 91-103 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

Tannehill, Robert. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1986.

Tannehill, Robert. "Beginning to Study 'How Gospels Begin.'" *Semeia* 52 (1991): 185-92.

Tannehill, Robert. "Israel in Luke-Acts." *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1985): 69-85.

Tannehill, Robert. "Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role." *Journal of Religion* 57 (1977): 386-405.

Tannehill, Robert. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Vol. 1 of *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Tannen, Deborah. *Gender and Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Taylor, Vincent. *Behind the Third Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926.

Taylor, Vincent. *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation*. Edited by O. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Tennyson, Hallam Lord, ed. *The Works of Tennyson*. 9 vols. London and New York: Macmillan, 1907-1908.

Thatcher, Tom. *Jesus the Riddler: The Power of Ambiguity in the Gospels*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Revised by A.C. Coxe. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Théberge, Paul. "Almost Silent: The Interplay of Sound and Silence in Contemporary Cinema and Television." Pages 51-67 in *Lowering the Boom: Critical Studies in Film Sound*. Edited by Jay Beck and Tony Grajeda. Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 2008.

Theobald, M. "Die Anfänge der Kirche: Zur Struktur von Lk. 5.1-6.19." *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 91-108.

Thiemann, Ronald. *Revelation and Theology: The Gospel as Narrated Promise*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985.

Thiselton, Anthony. "Christology in Luke, Speech-Act Theory, and the Problem of Dualism in Christology after Kant." Pages 453-72 in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ. Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Theology*. Edited by Joel Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994.

Thompson, Richard. "Reading Beyond the Text, Part II: Literary Creativity and Characterization in Narrative Religious Texts of the Greco-Roman World." *ARC* 29 (2001): 81-122.

Thurston, Anne. *Because of Her Testimony: The Word in Female Experience*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1995.

Tiede, David. *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Tiles, J.E. *Moral Measures: An Introduction to Ethics West and East.* London: Routledge, 2000.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *Grammaire du Décaméron*. The Hague: Mouton, 1969.

Todorov, Tzvetan. "The Categories of Literary Narrative." Trans. Joseph Kestner. *Papers on*

Language and Literature 16 (1980): 3-36.

Todorov, Tzvetan. "The Correlations of Tense in the French Verb." Pages 205-15 in *Problems in General Linguistics*. Edited by Émile Benveniste. Coral Gables: University of Miami, 1959.

Toker, Leona. *Eloquent Reticence: Withholding Information in Fictional Narrative*. Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky, 1993.

Toker, Leona. *Towards the Ethics of Form in Fiction: Narratives of Cultural Remission*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2010.

Tolbert, Mary Ann. "How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character." *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 347-57.

Tolbert, Mary Ann. *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Troftgruben, Troy M. *A Conclusion Unhindered: A Study of the Ending of Acts Within Its Literary Environment*. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2010.

Trompf, G.W. "La section médiane de l'évangile de Luc: I'organisation des documents." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 53 (1973): 141-154.

Tseng, Ming-yu. "The Representation of Silence in Text: Examples from Two Selected Koans." *Dong Hwa Journal of Humanistic Studies* 2 (2000): 103-23.

Turner, J. *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*. Québec: Le Presses de l'Université Laval, 2001.

Turner, N. "The Quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts." Pages 387-400 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*. Edited by J.K. Elliot. NovTSup 44. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

Twelftree, Graham H. *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1993.

Twelftree, Graham H. "Jesus the Exorcist and Ancient Magic." Pages 57-86 in *A Kind of Magic: Understanding Magic in the New Testament and its Religious Environment*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Bert Peerbolte. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Tyson, Joseph. "The Birth Narratives and the Beginning of Luke's Gospel." *Semeia* 52 (1991): 103-20.

Tyson, Joseph. "Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts: Reading as a Godfearer." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 19-38.

Tyson, Joseph. *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*. Edited by W. Farmer. Macon, GA: Mercer, 1983.

Tyson, Joseph. "The Opposition to Jesus in the Gospel of Luke." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 5 (1978): 144-50.

Tyson, Joseph. "Blindness of the Disciples in Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 261-68.

Tyson, Joseph. *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1986.

Tyson, Joseph. *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.

Uspensky, Boris. *A Poetics of Composition*. Translated by Valentina Zavarin and Susan Wittig. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

van der Horst, W. Pieter. "Silent Prayer in Antiquity." *Numen* 41 (1994): 1-25.

van Iersel, Bas. *"Der Sohn" in den synoptischen Jesusworte. Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbst-bezeichnung Jesu?* Leiden: Brill, 1961.

van Iersel, Bas. "Failed Followers in Mark: Mark 13.12 as a Key for the Identification of the Intended Readers." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996): 244-63.

van Tilborg, Sjef and Patrick Chatelion Counet. *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

van Unnik, W. C. "Luke-Acts, a Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship." Pages 15-32 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Edited by Keck and Martin. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

van Unnik, W.C. "Once More St. Luke's Prologue." *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973): 7-26.

Verheyden, Jozef, ed. *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.

Vernant, Jean-Pierre. *La Mort dans les yeux, Figures de l'Autre dans la Grèce ancienne*. Paris: Hachette, 1985.

Virgil. *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid.* Translated by H. R. Fairclough. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, 1916.

Völkel, M. "Der Anfang Jesu in Galiläa: Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch and zur Funktion Galiläas in den lukanischen Schriften." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 64 (1973): 222-232.

Walaskay, Paul W. *'And So We Came to Rome': The Political Perspective of St. Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Walters, Patricia. *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*. Cambridge, UK and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Wang, Youru. "Liberating Oneself from the Absolutized Boundary of Language: A Liminological Approach to the Interplay of Speech and Silence in Chan Buddhism." *Philosophy East and West* 51 (2001): 83-99.

Wegner, Judith Romney. *Chattel or Person: The Status of Woman in the Mishnah*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Weiss, Konrad. "Der westliche Text von Lc 7,46 und sein Wert." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirchen* 46 (1955): 241-45.

White, Hugh, ed. *Speech-Act Theory and Biblical Criticism*. Decatur: Scholars Press, 1988.

Whitmarsh, Tim. *Ancient Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004.

Wiefel, Wolfgang. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas.* Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1988.

Wiesel, Elie. *Night*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2006.

Wilckens, U. *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form-und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.

Williams, Bernard, ed. *Theaetetus*. Translated by M. J. Levett. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1992.

Williams, J.G. "The Beautiful and the Barren: Conventions in Biblical Type-Scenes." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 17 (1980): 107-119.

Wilson, Stephen. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Wink, Walter. *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1968.

Winter, Paul. *On the Trial of Jesus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961.

Witherington, Ben. *The New Testament Story*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Wolpe, David. *In Speech and In Silence: The Jewish Quest for God*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1992.

Wolter, Michael. *Das Lukasevangelium.* HNT 5. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2008.

Wolter, Michael. 'Wann wurde Maria schwanger?' Eine vernachlässigte Frage und ihre Bedeutung für das Verständnis der lukanischen Vorgeschichte (Lk 1-2)." Pages 405-22 in

Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien. Edited by R. Hoppe and U. Busse. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.

Wrede, Wilhelm. *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901.

Yen, Maria Do Thi. *The Lucan Journey: A Study of Luke 9:28-36 and Acts 1:6-11 as an Architectural Pair*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2010.

Zahn, Theodor. *Das Evangelium des Lucas*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1913.

Ziesler, J. "Luke and the Pharisees." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978): 146-57.

Zumbrunnen, John. *Silence and Democracy: Athenian Politics in Thucydides' History*. University Park, Pa.: Penn State University Press, 2008.