# The 'Order' of the Lukan 'Interpolations'

## I. General Survey

B. W. BACON
YALE UNIVERSITY

OUR conception of the nature of the Second Source of Synoptic tradition must largely depend on what are called the Lesser and Greater 'Interpolations' of Luke; that is, the two masses of agglutinated material interjected into the course of narrative borrowed from Mark in Lk. 6 20—8 3 and 9 51—18 14 respectively; for in the two groups our third evangelist has massed by far the larger part of his Q[1] material. If therefore that material had the order of a narrative (διήγησις) in chronological sequence, or in fact even a topical order, we should expect to find the clearest traces of it here.

The striking phenomenon of the two agglutinations is that in spite of the evangelist's avowed effort to tell his story καθεξῆς, thus improving upon those who before him had "undertaken to draw up narratives (διηγήσεις)" his "order" is here so nearly indistinguishable from utter disorder. Is the Second Source to blame for this; or have Matthew and Luke interfered with the order of their common source, or sources?—Our answer will largely depend on the practice of Luke elsewhere.

[1] The symbol Q in this article is used in a strict sense, and not as identical with "the Second Source", still less the (theoretical) Logia. It means simply what is designated by some English critics "the Double Tradition", in other words that portion of Matthew and Luke which after subtraction of Mark is found to be coincident, and is therefore attributed to a 'Second' source—Mark being 'first'. By the use of the bare algebraic sign question-begging assumptions as to the nature of the source (or sources) of the Q material are avoided.

In the rest of the Gospel Luke follows Mark. There are supplementary chapters at beginning and end (Lk. 1—2 and 24), and there is one important omission, but otherwise Mark's outline is reproduced almost without interruption or transposition. The very massing of the non-Markan material looks in the same direction. For one of Luke's main objects in rewriting Mark is to give a more adequate idea of Jesus' teaching by drawing from the Second Source. Yet even the 'Interpolations', by combining nearly all the added material in two great blocks supplement the Markan narrative at the least possible cost of disturbance of its order. We may lay it down with great confidence as a first and important principle that Mark's order is for Luke of great authority.

The first agglutination is inserted at that point of Mark where the Twelve are set apart from the multitude of Jesus' followers, and are taught in parables "the mystery of the kingdom of God" (Mk. 3 7—4 34). But substituting the so-called Sermon on the Mount for the Markan chapter of parables (Mk. 4 1–34) Luke accomplishes a considerable part of his purpose of supplementation of the teaching factor. But teaching and anecdote are not intermingled as in the second agglutination. The Sermon is followed by a series of anecdotes exhibiting the nature of Jesus' ministry and its fruits. This series is somewhat similar to the series already given from Mark in Lk. 4 31—6 11 (= Mk. 1 21—3 6) which also has Capernaum for its starting point; but in its first part (Lk. 7 1—8 3) it is *wholly non-Markan*. Its latter part (Lk. 8 4–56) is simply a transcript of Mk. 4 1—5 43, and may therefore be dismissed from present consideration with the mere note that the evangelist cancels the parables which follow the first (The Seed on good Soil) and transfers the saying: "My mother and brethren are they that hear the word of God and do it" (Mk. 3 31–35) from immediately before to just after the parable, where the application of "hearing and doing" will be more obvious.[2] The succeeding series of faith-wonders (8 22–56) leads up to the Mission of the Twelve, as in Mk. 4 34 ff., but with better con-

[2] Note the change of reading from Mk. 3 35 and the constant recurrence of the phrase "hear the word" &c. in verses 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18 and 21. As to Luke's special emphasis on "hearing and doing", see below.

nection through the cancellation of the Preaching in Nazareth (Mk. 6 1–6), which Luke had already given in 4 16 ff. from another source. It appears thus as a second characteristic of Luke's order in his account of the Galilean ministry, that in his principal supplement to Mark he masses the non-Markan material, whether discourse or narrative, by itself (6 20—8 33), leaving the Markan (8 4 – 9 50) to follow without interruption.

Our present concern is with the series of anecdotes (7 1—8 3) which constitute the second part of this great supplement; the first of which (Centurion's Faith, 7 1–10) may be designated Q, for it is identical with that which in Matthew also (Mt. 8 5–13) stands next but one after the Sermon. Indeed the larger part of the series (7 18–35) consists of that Q pericope which contrasts Jesus' ministry with the ministry of John.

To students whose minds are not already committed to the current doctrine that the Second Source was a mere agglomeration of *logia* without narrative order, the fact should have some significance that not Luke alone but Matthew also had *narrative* material of greater or less extent to add from the Second Source, and that some of it was added by both evangelists at this particular point. The natural inference would be that in the Source also a transition was made at this point from an account of Jesus' teaching to scenes from his ministry of healing. Now this inference is borne out by the nature of the colophon which in both Gospels marks the close of the Sermon. The colophon employed by Matthew at the close of each of his five *pereqs* of teaching appears after that Sermon for the first time, and has the form *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους*. It thus marks a transition from *λεχθέντα* (*ἐτέλεσε τοὺς λόγους*) to *πραχθέντα*. But, as Sir John Hawkins has pointed out (*Oxford Studies*, p. 121) Mt. 7 28 is the equivalent of Lk. 7 1, Matthew having followed his favorite method of turning one of the phrases of the Source into a recurrent refrain (cf. Mt. 8 12 13 42, 50 22 13 24 5 25 30 with Lk. 13 28). Thus *the* Q *material itself* gives some indication of transition after the Sermon from discourse to narrative. To this extent we have reason to believe that the Second Source was a true *διήγησις*, however greatly its proportion of discourse to narrative may

Digitized by Google

have exceeded that of Mark. It had an order, and to some extent the order of a complete story of Jesus' ministry, however largely characterized (like the Book of Acts) by great bodies of discourse. The treatment of their Q material by both Matthew and Luke, so far as we have gone, is indicative of this; for the main difference between Matthew's group of the Mighty Works (Mt. 8 1—9 34) and Luke's (Lk. 7 1—8 56) is that Matthew draws nearly all his material from Mark placing it in an artificial order of his own; whereas Luke reserves the Markan material not already employed in 4 31—6 19 for 8 4–56, placing before it the non-Markan. Whether he has been as careful to preserve the original order of the Second Source as that of Mark is the question before us.

Of the non-Markan material (7 1—8 3) only 7 1–10, 18–35 is paralleled by Matthew and can therefore be designated Q. The remainder may, or may not, be derived from the Second Source; but the tendency already observed of both the supplementers of Mark to go slightly beyond the limits of purely teaching material, and to include at least one non-Markan narrative becomes the more noteworthy when we observe that *Mark also*, at the same point as Matthew (Mk. 1 9, 22 = Mt. 4 22 7 29), proceeds from his account of the beginning of Jesus' teaching to a series of anecdotes of Mighty Works (1 40—3 6). Supposing this common tendency to be due to influence from the Source we should naturally look first to the non-Markan series in Lk. 7 1—8 3 for indications of an underlying source order. Luke's general method falls first to be studied.

Apart from the two 'Interpolations' and some minor supplements (e. g. 4 16–30 5 4–9 19 1–28) Luke's order is, as already noted, substantially the order of Mark. Transpositions (so far as they exist) tend to 'prove the rule'. Lk. 3 19*f*. e. g. transfers an outline of the story of the Baptist's Fate (Mk. 6 14–29) to the point in the narrative where it comes nearest to chronological sequence. At the same time the actual death of the prophet is omitted, and the date of his imprisonment left undetermined. No obstacle therefore remains to the reader in Lk. 7 18*ff*. to understand that "John was not yet cast into prison". Indeed since it is only by an illegitimate side glance at Mt. 11 2 ("in

the prison") that we escape the natural impression from 7 18f. that the Baptist's work is still in uninterrupted progress, we should probably conclude with Spitta[3], that Luke himself (whether justly or unjustly), had received this impression from the Source. It is even possible that Lk. 3 20 (*καπέκλεισεν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν φυλακῇ*) here represents the original source, since Mk. 1 14 implies a knowledge of the facts not presupposed in 6 17. It is tempting to imagine, especially in view of the Johannine parallel, that Luke had documentary authority for this order. But Mk. 6 17–29 so obviously throws back the whole story of the Baptist's Fate to a date only vaguely indicated as later than 1 14 that the inference would scarcely be justified. Subsequent historians, if aiming to write *καθεξῆς*, would be driven, even without documentary authority, to do just as Luke has done. The case would then be simply that in Mt. 11 2 and Lk. 3 19f. we have respectively two divergent attempts to combine Mark with the Second Source. Mk. 1 14 made the imprisonment of the Baptist precede the beginning of Jesus' ministry. The Second Source (as understood by Luke) implied that John remained for some time thereafter at liberty. Luke therefore sets quietly aside as erroneous the statement of Mk. 1 14, and is followed herein by the fourth evangelist who makes the correction explicit.[4] Matthew on the other hand supports Mark. He interjects in Mt. 11 2 by a characteristic editorial touch the words *ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ*, thus harmonizing the chronology with Mk. 1 14, though at the expense of some incongruity with the context.

In this transposition of Lk. 3 19f., whether by conjecture only, or on source-authority, the first point to be noticed is the extreme slightness of Luke's improvement, or in other words the

[3] "Die Sendung des Täufer's zu Jesus", *Th. St. u. Kr.*, 1910, 534–51.

[4] Jn. 3 24. The fourth Gospel leaves of course no room for a Baptist who can be "stumbled" in Jesus or surprised at the character of a ministry which is precisely that of the Isaian "Lamb of God". Hence the "disciples of John" who report to him in "Aenon near to Salim" are merely enlightened by their master on the relation of the Bridegroom and his friends to the predecessor (cf. Mk. 2 18-20). Nevertheless Jn. 6 22-30 must be regarded as a 'Johannine' parallel to Mt. 11 2-19 = Lk. 7 18-35 standing between Q and Mk. 27 18-20.

great caution of hit attempt. This is curiously at variance with the very early tradition attested by Papias. Were the Elder's estimate of Mark's 'order' representative we should expect that Luke, in attempting to improve in this respect upon the *διηγήσεις* of the *διάκονοι τοῦ λόγου* who had preceded him, would have used great freedom. In reality he clings to Mark's order as though no other clew existed, his supplements being made with the least possible derangement, and his rare transpositions being usually made as it were on Mark's own suggestion.

This timidity of Luke is usually accounted for by the absence of chronological order in his sources. We must indeed recognize the *ultimate* dependence of the tradition upon disconnected sayings and doings. Papia's idea of the preaching of Peter must be *on the whole* correct. But whether the Second Source represented by our 𝔔 material had this totally incoherent character is another question, and can be determined only by its own internal evidence. For while Matthew and Luke have neither of them been guided by the order of 𝔔, but have regarded Mark as authoritative, this preponderance of Mark need not be so much due to real superiority in order, as to the tradition which connected it from very early times (though perhaps only based on 1 Pt. 5 13) with the leader of the Twelve. As matter of fact Mark's order is highly unchronlogical, but its supposed apostolic derivation might easily produce complete distortion of the much better order of some other source brought by later hands into combination with it.

Thus Matthew in combining the Second Source with Mark displays no more of real independence than Luke. He does make up, as we have seen, an agglutinatination of Ten Mighty Works corresponding to the narrative part of Luke's Smaller Interpolation, employing for the purpose an order of his own, which is manifestly not intended to be chronological but topical. This may perhaps be considered to show as much boldness as Luke's omission of Mk. 6 45—8 26 in favor of a fuller and better treatment of the issue in his second treatise.[5] But where actual narrative is attempted by Matthew (as against mere tabulation)

[5] See Bacon on "The Treatment of Mk. 6 45—8 26 in Luke" in *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, XXVI 2 (1907), pp. 122—150.

there is little to choose between him and Luke. To both Matthew and Luke the order of Mark is practically inviolable. When, therefore, in his two 'Interpolations' Luke is suddenly freed from the control of Mark for a succession of no less than 434 verses the result naturally attracts the attention of critics. It seems to afford a glimpse at conditions as they were before Mark as first *authoritative* biographer took up the task of reporting the whole course of the ministry. But the result is very disappointing to our hopes. Little order is to be found whether chronological or topical. No wonder modern critics have despaired of recovering any order from Q, and maintained that the Second Source was "a heap of ruins", a mere agglutination of sayings destitute of narrative connection.

Still, as every critic will admit, there are abundant traces both in Mark and Q that not even these writers were first in the effort to agglutinate. Groups such as Wendt[6] notices in Mk. 2 1—3 6, and 12 13–37 and Bousset[7] in Lk. 10 13–16, 21 12 1–12 22–34 13 18–21, 24–30, &c. are survivals in their present editorial framework of still older attempts at *τάξις*. For the topical order, wherein subject matter (often mere catch-words) links saying to saying and anecdote to anecdote, marks a period antecedent to complete accounts of the ministry; whereas the chronological order (or the attempt at it) marks, of course, the later period of complete *διηγήσεις*—narratives of "all things which the Lord began both to do and to teach (*ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν*; cf. Papias: *ἢ λεχθέντα, ἢ πραχθέντα*) until the day that he was taken up."[8]

In studying Luke's 'Interpolations' the presumption must of course be that he has preserved (as in the case of Mark) the order of his source (or sources). But there will be much to qualify this presumption. The very exaggeration of his respect for the order of 'Petrine' Mark may have wrought havoc with the order of his Second Source. We may suppose that the Second Source as well as Mark had the *τάξις* of a full narrative of the ministry (*διήγησις*). But if Luke found in it material

[6] *Lehre Jesu*, Bd. I, p. 22 f.
[7] *Kyrios Christos*, 1913, p. 46.
[8] Acts 1 1 f.

Digitized by Google

duplicating, or appearing to duplicate, what he had already taken from Mark, it would inevitably be cancelled. The severed parts would thereafter be readjusted according to the evangelist's best judgment, not always with happy results. If Mark's order seemed to require transpositions of the Second Source, these too would be made; for they are made even in the Markan material. Unfortunately we cannot argue from the infrequency of Luke's transposition of his Markan material to a like treatment of the order of the Second Source. Rather the contrary. The greater his respect for the order of his principal narrative, the more unsparing would he be of any which to him appeared to conflict with it. New materials from extraneous sources both oral and written would surely require more or less readjustment when added. And what we can see would be inevitable for Luke, assuming him to have employed only the minimum number of sources, would confront every similarly placed evangelist. Matthew, we know, has sacrificed other 'orders' to that of Mark quite as completely as Luke, though with a different object. How many unknown predecessors of Matthew and Luke had tried their destructive hands at the same problem, inevitably, as respects 'order', subordinating the source mainly occupied with teaching to that which (besides perhaps enjoying a quasi-apostolic authority) was mainly given to the much-desiderated outline of the ministry? This we can only dimly imagine; but it will be well at least to reckon with the possibility that the Second Source had already undergone through the influence of Mark and other διηγήσεις various distortions of its original order, as well as additions and changes of wording, in the variant forms of it which came into the hands respectively of Matthew and Luke.

It is fortunate for our study of the 'Interpolations' that so large a part of the material is also given by Matthew; also that it is so generally agreed when his non-Markan material stands alone. This may be accounted for in one or all of three ways. Either (1) Luke has subtracted from his Second Source whatever seemed to him to duplicate material already given from Mark; or (2) he has added to it, disrupting its order; or (3) he has transposed. Perhaps all three processes concur. The alternative will be to admit that the material had no intelligible

order, in other words did not constitute an evangelic *διήγησις* in the proper sense of the word.

Let us return for a moment to the point already established. Our third evangelist is really desirous of writing *καθεξῆς*. And by this attempted order he means *chronological* sequence. This is shown not alone by the general structure of his work as a complete *διήγησις* of "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach until the day that he was taken up" (Acts 1 1), but from the nature of his dependence on, no less than his independence of, the *διήγησις* of his predecessor Mark. He seems to feel the need of "order" expressed by "the Elder" in the Papias fragment, which we know to be chronological because its absence is explained (*a*) by the fact that "Mark had not been himself a follower of the Lord", and (*b*) by the fact that Peter whom he did follow "had no design of giving a complete *σύνταξις* of the Lord's oracles" (or "discourses" *λογίων* var. *λόγων*). Reason *a* at least can only have reference to chronological sequence. Reason *b* might include reference to topical orders such as Matthew's; but to just the extent we admit this we strengthen the already cogent evidence that the statement reflects the ideas not of "the Elder", but of Papias himself.

The interest of Papias is in the "commandments given by the Lord to the faith" and handed down in their genuine meaning by "the elders"; whereas they have been perverted by "the false teachers", and the "teachers of alien commandments". These are the *κυριακὰ λόγια* of which he undertakes in his title to give an authentic *ἐξήγησις*. In supplementing "the Elder's" statement that Mark had been a *ἑρμηνευτής* of Peter, who put down in writing "some things as he heard them", but "not in order", Papias shows by the phraseology of his explanation that he himself is tacitly comparing Mark with Matthew. To Papias, as to all other ecclesiastical writers of the period, Matthew had furnished the standard, apostolic *σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων*, both complete and orderly. Mark had done the best that could be expected of a mere "follower", but relatively to Matthew was neither complete nor orderly.

We are by no means justified in assuming that "the Elder" cherished any such reverence for the authority of the Greek

Digitized by Google

Matthew as Papias exhibits in his comment. For "the Elder's" testimony ends with the words "not, however, in order". The explanatory supplement, beginning: "For he (Mark) was not himself a follower of the Lord, but afterward, *a I said*, of Peter" is shown to be Papias' own by the use of the first person ("as *I* said"). Why 'the Elder' disparaged the τάξις of Mark wo do not known. It may have been by comparison with the oral tradition of "the elders" represented by himself. It may have been from knowledge of the general lack of agreement on this point which a mere ἑρμηνευτὴς would have no means of correcting. It may be that he knew other διηγήσεις, whose order he preferred to Mark's. He may even have had a 'Johannine' tradition which showed that "John was not yet cast into prison" when baptism and the ministry of Jesus were brought into critical comparison. In short the Matthaean σύνταξις τῶν λογίων, so decisive for Papias, need not at all have been the type of τάξις with which 'the Elder' compared that of Mark. All we can be sure of is that even at 'the Elder's' very early date (*ca.* 110?) Mark's 'order' was already disparaged by some, however reverentially followed by both Matthew and Luke.

The fact remains that Luke, whether aware of this criticism, or only convinced of the need by a survey of earlier διηγήσεις, is clearly attempting like any other historian to put his material in chronological order. Only his attempts at improvement are noticeably weak, and rest (as we shall see reason to believe) very largely on inferences and conjectures of his own drawn from the material itself that he incorporates. We can account for this where the predominance of Mark overbore the τάξις of other narratives, and must allow for the removal of the narrative skeleton in much of the remainder by cancellation of anecdotes already given from Mark. Still the material of the 'Interpolations' may be expected to retain some evidence of its pre-canonical sequence, and to this enquiry we now address ourselves.

We shall hold in our hands the most important means of disentangling the confusion of the Lukan 'Interpolations' if we clearly observe the distinction in type of τάξις exemplified in our canonical first and third Gospels respectively. The general

modes of procedure of these two later synoptists give us characteristic examples of two fundamentally different ideals, both of which were actually at work from a very early period for the grouping of the disjointed material. On the one side we see the process of topical agglutination adapted to the practical purposes of church teaching. It is already well developed in such groups of sayings as Mk. 4 1–34 Mk. 9 33–50 and Mk. 13. This kind of *τάξις* is carried to its completion in the five great *pereḳs* (as they have well been called) of Matthew. For these *pereḳs* are not taken over by the first evangelist from any source, but are framed by himself largely on the basis of Mark[9], and form, as is well known, the substance around which the evangelist has fitted Mark's narrative as a containing framework, much as the Mosaic codes are fitted into a framework, of older narrative by the Pentateuchal redactor. Pereḳ I is the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5—7); Pereḳ II the Mission of the Twelve (Mt. 10); Pereḳ III the Parables of the Kingdom (Mt. 13); Pereḳ IV the Rule of the Brotherhood (Mt. 18); and Pereḳ V the Coming of the Son of Man (Mt. 23—25). In these five agglutinations Matthew has given us his five books of Christian *Torah*, each subscribed with his formal colophon: *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτι ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, κτλ.*

Luke, on the other hand, exemplifies the effort a narrative (*διήγησις*). It is explicitly avowed in his preface and involves a *τάξις* of which we have Mark as an earlier example. In fact it is more fully exhibited in Mark than the topical agglutination of discourses. It attains, however, its maximum in the Gospel of Luke, characterised as this Gospel is by elaborate synchronisms and careful adjustment of the whole story to the general advance of the history of revelation. The internal evidence corroborates in general the early tradition of Peter's preaching. Anecdotes, like sayings, were at first grouped only according to subject-matter, as in Mk. 2 1—3 6. Ultimately the attempt was made to relate the whole story of the ministry in its true sequence.

Ancient tradition by classifying evangelic material as *λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα* (Papias) or *ὅσα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐποίει καὶ ἐδίδασκε* (Acts 1 1), and by admitting its difficulties with the "order",

[9] See the convincing demonstration by B. H. Streeter in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 241 ff.

thus places in our hands an invaluable key. We know that efforts had been and were still being made shortly after the publication of Mark to coördinate the material according to each of these two conflicting principles. The otherwise unintelligible order of the Lukan Interpolations becomes much easier to understand when we perceive that it rests upon the superimposition of one principle of coördination upon the other, and that the later τάξις is the τάξις of chronological sequence. In both the Smaller and the Larger Interpolation the *material* is largely agglutinated in masses which have only a topical connection. Particularly in the Larger the connection is often more verbal than real, as in the Markan agglutination on 'receiving' and 'stumbling' (Mk. 9 37–50). This we may probably regard as older in most cases. The editor, on the contrary, seeks (however timidly) a *chronological* sequence, though he seems to rely for this purpose on internal evidence of an obvious kind. We have seen how he does this in the case of Mark. In the Greater Interpolation a similar procedure is observable. Thus Lk. 9 51 gives the scenic framework for the whole. It seems to be a somewhat mechanical note of the mention of passing through "cities and villages" that serves to make up this "travel-document of the former treatise" (as Sir J. C. Hawkins has appropriately called it), rather than intrinsic connection of subject. So the theme "passing through" or "being received" in "cities and villages" controls from 9 48 ("whosoever receiveth me") on. But there is a marked difference after chapter 10, which can best be explained by the fact that Luke found 9 5—10 42 already grouped according to a somewhat similar theme (hospitality to the messengers of Christ), and simply extended it to cover the rest of his addition. Thus in 9 51–55 the *motif* is the "villages which received—or did not receive—him" and is of course suggested by the Markan complex on Stumbling *vs.* Receiving (δέχεσθαι) in 9 46–50 (= Mk. 9 33–40), especially in ver. 48 the clause: "Whosoever *receiveth me* (δέχηται), *receiveth* Him that sent me". The saying is used *by Mark* in the sense of Rom. 14 1, 3; but it is easy to see how Mark's employment of this saying, however different the sense he gave it, would tend in the case of Luke to draw in an ag-



Digitized by Google

glutination on 'receiving' (δέχεσθαι) wandering evangelists. Thus in 9 57–62 the theme continues with the *Homeless Wandering of Jesus*. In 10 1 *ff*. it is the *reception* of the seventy "in *every city and place* whither he himself was about to come". Next there is attached to the direction to denounce "whatsoever *city receives* you not" (10 10–12) the Denunciation of the *Cities* of Galilee which "*received not*" Jesus (10 13–15). Finally in 10 38–42 the travel-theme is resumed after some paragraphs on the authority of the disciples' teaching (10 17–37) with "a certain village" where "Martha *received him* into her house", here the Travel-theme reaches a temporary conclusion. But it is not forgotten. After a long interruption of material fundamentally unrelated it reappears at 13 22. The new form of the *motif* ("went on his way through cities and villages") is borrowed (according to the constant habit of redactors) from adjoining source-material (cf. ver. 33). For the travel-*motif* in 13 33 shows in another way how it has caught the editor's attention. At 11 49–51 and 13 34*f*. Luke introduces in two separate fragments what Mt. 23 34–39 clearly proves to have been in the Source a single quotation from some unknown 'Wisdom' writing. Why, then, does Luke break it into two parts? The motive for introducing in 11 49–51 the charge against "this generation" of "killing the prophets" is of course the mention of the "killing of the prophets" in ver. 47*f*., though the interpolation destroys the symmetry of the third 'Woe'. But the motive for indroducing the Appeal to Jerusalem guilty of the blood of the prophets (Lk. 13 34 f.), is obviously Jesus' answer to the threat of Herod: "I must *go on my way* . . . for it cannot be that *a prophet should perish out of Jerusalem*" (Lk. 13 33). It is this latter verse which we have just recognized as source for the editorial setting of the section (13 22): "And he *went on his way* through cities and villages, teaching and *journeying on to Jerusalem*".

The travel-*motif* is again interrupted at 14 1 ff. by one wholly different—the Banquet of the kingdom—which begins in 13 23–30 and is continued in 14 1–24. "Eating bread" "eating bread in the kingdom of God", "marriage-feast", "making a feast", are phrases which occur from beginning to end. Many critics have observed how inappropriately 13 23–30 is broken off from its

sequel in 14 16–24. But the banquet-*motif* is subordinate. The travel-*motif* has been superimposed. It dominates in 13 22. It dominates in 31–35. It reappears lightly in 14 25, and again at 17 11, where "Samaria" seems to be inferred from the context (Samaritan Leper). Here the Great Interpolation rejoins the thread of Mark at 18 15 without further indication of place, and is is apparent that such as are thus given are far from adequate. Thus the editorial scheme of Luke's Greater Interpolation, while it does not explain all, is itself sufficiently clear. Moreover it is certainly artificial, superimposed upon an underlying order more primitively topical in character. We may also say with confidence in view of the disruption and transposition of Q material in the quotation from "the Wisdom of God" that it is *certainly later than that of the Second Source.* As a device of our third Evangelist it serves well to bring in a large part of the non-Markan discourse material with the least possible disruption of Mark's outline. How much disruption it has entailed of the Second Source we cannot say. Much of the interpolated material is scarcely adapted to the travel-framework at all. It may have been affected in its order by (*a*) subtraction, or (*b*) addition, or (*c*) transposition; or by all three. This remains to be determined. At all events the order this material now occupies in Lk. 9 51—18 15 is not a truly geographical or historical order. This has been forced upon it. The material itself quite overflows the narrow limits of the editorial framework. This preliminary survey of the Greater Interpolation of Luke should pave the way for a more careful study of the Smaller in Lk. 6 20—8 3.

(To be continued.)