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I met Dr. Octavian Baban in Cambridge in 1999, when he was about to finish his doctoral thesis and I was enjoying my Sabbatical at Tyndale House. By late evenings, when we were tired of reading and writing, we walked along the streets of Cambridge, and discovered that we shared the same interest in how New Testament writers drew on Hellenistic philosophy and literature. It is, therefore, a pleasure to see that my Cambridge-friend has now revised his thesis and is making it available to the New Testament exegetes who share similar concerns and favour the literary approaches to the NT.

In the present work Dr. Baban approaches a well-known topic, that of Luke’s theology of journeying, in a new way. He argues that key passages in Luke-Acts have been “storied” according to certain Hellenistic models, some of them being found in Aristotle’s *Poetics*, where one can find a special focus on the ancient compositional patterns of mimesis. Baban shifts the perspective from the traditional view that Luke imitates the Septuagint to the NT mimesis of Hellenistic storytelling. Luke appears, thus, as an educated writer, a clever storyteller and an evangelistic theologian who “stories” the idea of meeting the risen Christ “in a life changing encounter, during one’s journey through life” (p. 279).

Karl Olav Sandnes,
*The Norwegian Lutheran School of Theology, Oslo*
*October 2005*
This book represents a revised form of my PhD thesis, submitted at The London School of Theology in the Spring of 1999. The idea of this research, focused on Luke’s theology of journeying and on his art of literary representation, has occurred first during a NT seminar with Dr. C. Gempf, at LST (LBC – at that time), when the main topic in discussion was Jesus’ appearances in Luke 24, and, in relation to it, the issue of Luke’s style and the meaning of the disappearance or appearance stories in the NT (appearances during a storm, walking on the sea, post-Easter appearances – or disappearances, missionary stories in Acts, etc.). The question arose, then, whether these narratives are a sort of ghost stories told for the sake of their own spectacular nature, or / and as a testimony for Jesus’ and his disciples’ ministry, or valued, as well, as good and meaningful literature, reflecting certain literary patterns of the time. The thought of referring to Aristotle’s Poetics and his views on mimetic composition, as influential for the NT authors, and, in particular, for Luke, has come considerably later, during a study weekend at Tyndale House, Cambridge.

In its attempt to answer these stylistic and theological issues, the present book focuses on three Lukan post-Easter encounters: the two disciples’ encounter with resurrected Jesus on the Emmaus road (Lk. 24:13–35), Philip’s evangelisation of the Ethiopian on the Gaza road (Acts 8:25–40), and Saul’s encounter with Christ on the Damascus road (Acts 9:1–31). In essence, it argues that the right context for interpreting Luke’s post-Easter ‘on the road’ encounters is Luke’s general motif of Journeying, rather than his series of post-Easter glorious visions of the resurrected Jesus. It suggests that one needs a different approach to Luke’s theology of the Way, as well, complementary to the common focus on Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem (Lk. 9-19). In order to make this need more clear, the first chapter reviews the main results and emphases of form-critical and redactional studies of Luke’s Journey motif.

Then, the second chapter looks at the Hellenistic perspectives on the art and the techniques of literary representation (mimesis), as seen in Plato’s works, in Aristotle’s treatises, and in the work of Hellenistic historians such as Duris, Theopompus and Phylarchus, which prove to be surprisingly relevant for understanding the composition of Luke’s ‘on the road’ paradigm.

The third chapter attempts and assessment of Luke’s paradigmatic redaction of the Synoptic journey stories, as a testimony of his more general compositional tendencies and choices in source representation. The relation between Luke’s and Mark’s journeying motifs is interpreted as a form of mimetic-redactional representation and a similar approach is attempted, as well,

in relation to Luke’s and Matthew’s motifs of the Way, although this would imply a more thorough and nuanced discussion of Luke’s possibility to interact with Matthew’s gospel in its final variant, and a more complex consideration of the Synoptic hypotheses, than this book format would allow. This assessment emphasizes in the end the evidence that Luke had his own theological agenda and literary preferences in many of these journey stories, especially so in his ‘journey within journey’ narratives, in Luke 9-19, and in the resurrection stories (Luke 24 – Acts 1).

Chapter four focuses on this journey paradigm, as such, in Luke-Acts, highlighting its narrative function and its literary ‘anatomy’. Through its characteristics and emphasizes this paradigm corresponds well to the literary and theological transition present in Luke 24 – Acts 1 and in Acts 8–9. Its literary structure corresponds to Aristotle’s plot model.

In conclusion, Luke’s post-Easter ‘on the road’ encounters reflect his artistic representation of sources or events displaying unity of action, of time and space, a special emphasis on recognition scenes (divinely ordained encounters), on ethical and theological choices (the theme of individual testing at the crossroads), on reversals of destiny in the context of suffering and restoration. Luke builds a complex plot in these stories communicating, thus, his interest for special revelations ‘on the road’, for a challenging and life-changing adventure of a journeying individual (a perspective that supplements the usual emphasis on a collective journeying paradigm in Luke-Acts).

On the whole, this book’s argument intends to add a new perspective to the current assessment of Luke’s theology and artistic skills, to the study of Luke’s style as a Hellenistic historian. It attempts to throw fresh light on the early transmission of the Easter kerygma, seen as a process that involved both the transmission of the apostolic message and the issue of the NT evangelists’ specific literary taste and narrative choices, of their representational philosophy. In particular, Luke appears to have presented his encounter stories not as an increasingly spiritualised type of divine man narratives or as ‘visions’ of Jesus’ heavenly glory, yet more as an early, fashionable and evangelistically effective, series of significant encounterings with Jesus while journeying amidst one’s own adventure in life.

Octavian Baban
The Baptist Theological Institute, Bucharest
The University of Bucharest, Romania
February 2006
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Introduction

The present study of Luke-Acts represents an attempt to understand Luke’s theology of journeying in relation to his literary style. One of the main issues in discussion is whether contemporary scholarship constructs Luke’s theology of the Way, or his Journey motif, in a comprehensive manner, by taking into consideration the entire variety of Luke’s journey accounts in Luke-Acts, not only the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem (Lk. 9-19, cf. Mk. 8-10). The reason for such an assessment is the observation that, in these accounts Luke’s stylistic and theological preferences betray a complex understanding of literary representation, a philosophical depth and literary awareness that seem to go deeper than is commonly acknowledged.


Surprisingly, although their literary correspondences have been noted by various commentators, these stories have not yet been assessed as three related journey accounts, nor as part of Luke’s general motif of the Way, or as evidence for Luke’s literary style. Therefore, the following introduction will present the significance of these correspondences, advocating the need for a more detailed assessment of Luke’s art of literary representation.

The Significance of the Hodos Settings
The hodos setting (ἡ ὁδός, ‘the way’) is a common, prominent feature of all these three accounts. It occurs in the double report of the Emmaus story, ὤς ἔλαλε ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (Lk.
Introduction

24:32) and ἐξηγοῦντο τά ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (Lk. 24:35), in the repeated reference to the encounter setting in the Ethiopian’s conversion story (Acts 8:26, ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν καταβαίνουσαν ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ εἰς Γαζαν, αὕτη ἔστιν ἐρήμως, 8:36, ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, 8:39, ἐπορευέτο γὰρ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαίρον), and in Saul’s conversion account, as well: the Way metaphor in Acts 9:2, ἐὰν τινὰς εὑρής τῆς ὁδὸς ὄντας (cf. also Acts 19:9, 23; 24:14, 22) in Ananias’ and Barnabas’ summaries of the event (Acts 9:17, ὁ κύριος ἀπέσταλεν με, ἵσοικον, ὁ ὄφεις σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἡ ἡγχοῦν, and Acts 9:27, διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πώς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐίδες τὸν κύριον καὶ ὁτι ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ). Such an emphasis has suggested the possibility of a Lukan ‘on the road’ paradigm and the need to study it further, the more only a few NT scholars have referred to it clearly, among them E. H. Scheffler and C. H. Lindijer, for whom the ‘way’ setting had a major hermeneutical value.5

These parallelisms, in particular the correspondences between the Emmaus account and the Ethiopian’s conversion, led to the conclusion that Luke is the source of this literary phenomenon, not his sources.6 Thus, Dupont writes that ‘ce n’est pas dans ses sources que Luc a trouvé le schème de ses récits, il les a construits lui-même’.7 For Dillon, as well ‘it would be hard to deny that the composing hand in both these passages is the same’,8 and, independently, J.-M. Guillaume points out that ‘les idées générales sont les mêmes dans les deux péricopes’.9 As Lindijer notes this series represents ‘a conception of Luke’.10

Therefore, the major issue is ‘how Luke came to creating this series of motifs’,11 and equally so, what are his particular emphases in these accounts, and how does he emphasize his interests, redactionally (in terms of literary art, or theological discussion).

Theological literature hosts a great variety of answers, in this respect, some of them favourable to a literary approach of Luke’s accounts, some dominated by other perspectives. For example, Dillon regarded this ἁδος pattern as a ‘topos of charismatic lore’ in the early Christian Church.12 Scheffler saw in them evidence of ‘fictitiousness, or at least heavy Lukan redaction’.13 For him, Luke relates history and theology in a relevant and transparent manner for his social context dominated by religious persecution, poverty, and ostracism.14

Lindijer argued that in the Emmaus encounter and in Philip’s evangelism of the Ethiopian, Luke highlights Philip’s creative continuation of Jesus’ ministry15 (Saul’s encounter is thought to reflect a similar concern).16 In particular, these two stories share several common features, such as

(a) a divinely planned meeting on the road
(b) a dialogue16
(c) the use of the proof from Scriptures19
(d) a turning point in the journey20
(e) the sight theme (as seeing, understanding, disappearing)
(f) a final sacrament.21

Lindijer wants to include Paul’s conversion in the post-Easter encounter series, as well, and regards this series as a general motif of particular significance in Luke-Acts

Another pericope written by Luke is related to our stories: the description of the conversion of Paul. The affinity between our stories and that of Saul’s conversion certainly fortifies the impression that the series of motifs was important to Luke.22

Despite this important insight, however, his article remains focused on two stories, only, that is, on the Emmaus encounter and on the Gaza ‘on the road’ encounter.23 This is a good illustration of an interesting, more general tendency in NT scholarship. These accounts have been studied rather as pairs of related stories and very rarely considered as a triad or as stories integrated in a larger motif of Luke – such as the Journey motif, the post-Easter appearance motif, the report to the apostles motif, etc. (among the few exceptions is J. Drury who does not elaborate more on his observations, though).24 This pairing up has remained the dominant approach to Luke’s post-Easter encounters and there could be adduced quite a number of examples.

R. C. Tannehill highlights, for instance, the similarity between Luke’s presentation of Philip’s ministry and that of Saul, in Acts.25 In Samaria Philip ‘was proclaiming (ἐκήρυσσεν) the Messiah’ (Acts 8:5), and in Damascus Saul ‘was proclaiming (ἐκήρυσσεν) Jesus as the Son of God’ (Acts 9:20). In both stories the final lines include the sacramental act of baptism (Acts 9:18; 10:47-48; 11:16-17). Both end with a report to the Twelve in Jerusalem (Acts 9:27; 11:1-18).

L. T. Johnson has found, in a further example, that the most similar sequence to the Emmaus episode is the story of Cornelius’ conversion (Acts 10-11) with its emphasis on community decisions (Acts 12-15).27 The two stories display the same marks of Lukan vocabulary and style (Lk. 24:13, ἡ ὀνομα Ἕμμαυ, 24:18 εἰς ὄνομα Κλέοφας, Acts 10:1, ὄνομα Κωνστιλίου; Lk. 24:19, ἀνήρ προφήτης δυνατός ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παντός τοῦ λαοῦ, Acts 10:1-2, Ἀνήρ δε... εὐσεβῆς καὶ φοβούμενος τοῦ θεοῦ, 10:22, ἀνήρ δίκαιος καὶ φοβούμενος τοῦ θεοῦ, etc.).

There are certain correspondences, as well, between the Ethiopian’s encounter with Philip, on the Gaza road, and Cornelius’ evangelisation by Peter, in Caesarea. It has been suggested that at the root of this similarity is the fact that both had initially represented a ‘simple’, thus popular, account of a leader’s evangelistic exploits, a similar tradition of the first-ever God-fearer believer,28 an evangelistic story ‘innocent of any deeper meaning’.29 For the first Christians the Ethiopian represented a first-ever ‘symbolic convert’,30 and Cornelius represents a ‘prototypical “God-fearer” or “semi-proselyte,”’ a ‘most typical, and most likely kind of person to convert to the Christian faith’.31

In terms of sources, the similarity can be explained, in part, by the literary transmission of popular traditions.32 Story telling has selectively highlighted similar elements, many being picked up and even more emphasized by Luke, such as the presence of an angel as an initiator of the event (Acts 8:26; 10:3), the Spirit’s instruction concerning the encounter (Acts 8:29; 10:19-20), the similarity of Philip’s preaching to that of Peter, ἀνοίξας δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος [Πέτρος] τὸ στόμα (Acts 8:35; 10:34). In Acts 8:36 and 10:47 the baptism of the foreigner is introduced by a question phrased with the verb κολύω (what or who could prevent the baptism of the Gentiles?).33 The interpretation of Scripture plays an important role in the eunuch’s conversion (Acts 8:32-33), and also occurs in Cornelius’ evangelisation, although in a much shorter form (Acts 10:43). Both stories display a joyful, positive ending, a recurrent feature of Luke’s evangelistic episodes (Acts 8:39; cf. 8:8; 10:44-46).34

Insofar as journeying is concerned, while it is true that Peter travels to Caesarea with the messengers, at the prompting of the Spirit (οἴκοπορούντων, Acts 10:12, τῇ πόλει ἐγγίζουσαν, at 10:9; cf. ἐγγίζειν τῇ Δαμασκῷ, 9:3; at noon, 10:9, τῇ ἐτέσσαριν, cf. 8:26, κατὰ μεσημβρίαν), this account does not include any special revelation on the road. Accordingly, nothing special about journeying and no ἕωδος encounter appear in the final report (Acts 11:11-12). The vision feature retains its central place in the story, Luke’s interest in Gentile evangelism and in the post-Easter kerygma is present here as in other Lukan accounts, yet the road is no longer a locus of evangelism and revelation. Thus, despite all these narrative correspondences, Cornelius’ conversion cannot be seen as part of the post-Easter encounter series, the subject-matter of the present study, although it might be studied as part of Luke’s more general fondness for encounters and visions.

In his analysis of the influent role of the Emmaus story in Luke-Acts, B. P. Robinson has suggested that this account constitutes Luke’s model not only for Acts 8:26-40, but also for Acts 12:6-17,35 the account of Peter’s escape from prison (one should note how frequently the Emmaus story is mentioned as a first element of comparison in a series of stories, as a paradigm; its literary qualities seem to have inspired Luke to re-use its emphases). Robinson notes that in both cases the narratives are dated at Passover-time. Herod is involved and shares responsibility. The opening of the prison gates corresponds with the rolling away of the stone from the tomb on Easter morning. Just as Rhoda’s message is reckoned as madness (Acts 12:15), so the women’s story of the empty tomb is thought by the apostles to be nonsense (cf. λήψαν, Lk. 24:11). Both stories include recognition scenes (cf. Acts 12:14, 17), and refer to the action of a divine messenger. The joy of Rhoda (Acts 12:14) parallels the joy of the Emmaus disciples (Lk. 24:32) and of the Eleven (24:41). Both accounts end with a sudden departure of the messenger (Acts 12:17, cf. Lk. 24:31).36 Although it includes an encounter ‘in the jail’ (or a vision), and an appearance ‘at the door’, and makes good use of...
this element of surprise (recognition and reversal of fate), Peter’s escape from prison does not use the paradigm of journeying or of the *hodos* setting, in a clear manner, and its connection with Jesus’ resurrection is rather loose.

Summing up, several commentators have emphasized the existence in Luke-Acts of a number of narrative parallels based, to a degree, on the Emmaus story as a model. Although the vision motif itself is present in many of them not all share the *hodos* or the journey setting, the Easter connections and the ethical-evangelistic focus found in the Emmaus story, the Ethiopian’s conversion and the account of Saul’s call. Rather than pairing them up as separate cases of narrative parallelism, these three pericopes should probably be seen as a special coherent series integrated into Luke’s more general motif of the Way, which represents an overarching theme in Luke-Acts (cf. the Infancy narratives, the messianic preaching of John the Baptist, Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem, to his Passion; the missionary journeys of the Church, in Acts, Christianity seen as a Way, cf. Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23; 24:14, 22, etc.). At the same time, they are part of Luke’s geographical motif which includes theological connotations of localities, settings and movements.37

**The Significance of the Encounter Events**

If literary correspondences such as the common *hodos* setting, the teaching *in via*, the evangelistic dialogue and the sacramental ending play an unifying role for the three selected post-Easter accounts, the appearance event (appearance or disappearance, recognition, vision) led the NT scholars to different classifications and interpretations.

For example, Alsup and others chose to overlook the literary and theological prominence of the Emmaus encounter and suggest another perspective according to which the model for all the appearance reports in the NT was Saul’s encounter with the risen Jesus. Its δόξα emphasis was seen to pre-date the later emphasis on Jesus’ physical appearance (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3ff.) and, thus, all the NT appearances were considered to have been, at first, visions of Jesus’ heavenly glory, of his heavenly radiance.38 The rationale behind this hypothesis is that the initial testimony on Jesus’ resurrection was based on the ‘apocalyptic vision’ model which, later, was in danger of being misrepresented by pharisaic Judaism; thus, it was replaced by accounts which emphasized the physical aspect of Jesus’ resurrection and localized the appearance scenes in significant public places like Jerusalem (the ‘Jerusalem-type’ appearances).39 Christian apologetics, indeed, has developed in time a stronger stance in favour of Jesus’ bodily resurrection, yet the idea that early witnesses have labelled their accounts as mere ‘visions’, be they ‘objective visions’, at first, and only later thought of them as ‘appearances’ seems to lack internal NT evidence.40 The NT contrast is rather a stylistic one, not one of essence: Mark’s early emphasis on the disciples’ emotional reactions at the resurrection news (fear, haste, etc.) and his paucity of detail in favor of narrative dynamism, is contrasted with the elaborate, doubt-and-proof descriptions provided later by Luke, Matthew, and John.

For others, the Emmaus account seen as an appearance story highlights through its unique features its lack of connection with the other appearance accounts, and with Luke 24, in general. A. Ehrhardt argued, for example, that Luke 24 represents a fragmentary, composite work and it is ‘a serious error of modern theologians that they try to treat the recorded events of the first Easter as forming a coherent historical report’.41 In particular, he wanted to disengage the Emmaus story from all such collective studies, as well as from their OT theology, in favour of a general Hellenistic approach (whilst an early Hellenistic understanding of Christ is quite appropriate to consider, the thought of not acknowledging the literary and theological unity of Luke 24 and the narrative and theological centrality of the Emmaus account is rather unusual).42

The ‘vision’-based arguments have caused further damage to the unitary interpretation of Luke’s *hodos* series. From such a perspective C. H. Dodd pointed out that it is impossible to count Jesus’ appearance to Saul as belonging to the group of the resurrection appearances.

Outside the canonical Gospels there is little that we can bring into comparison [with the post-Easter appearances]. We have three accounts of the appearance of Christ to Paul, but none of the three constitutes a narrative unit comparable with those which provide the material of the Gospels. The narrative, in all its forms, resembles those of the Gospels in so far that the word of Christ initiates the transaction, that the recognition is the central feature, and that the scene ends with a command of Christ. But the whole situation is so different that the comparison is of little significance.43
He proceeded to divide the Easter appearances into two form-historical categories, one group of ‘concise’ accounts - the early kerygmatic stories (class I accounts), and a second group of later ‘circumstantial’ accounts, represented by better developed, more complex narratives (class II accounts). The kerygmatic accounts tend, according to Dodd, to be short, proclamative and indirect, while the circumstantial stories are longer, including debates, details, etc., and indicate a higher degree of interpretation. For example, passages such as Matthew 28:8-10; 28:16-20; John 20:19-21 would represent good illustrations of the concise class I resurrection narratives, and Dodd stresses that they have a similar literary format (their correspondences reminding of the hodos accounts).

A. The crisis situation: Christ’s followers bereft of their Lord.
B. The appearance of the Lord.
C. The Greeting.
D. The Recognition.
E. The Word of Commandment.

In particular, the Emmaus account stands out as an elaborate appearance story, of the second, circumstantial type of Easter accounts (class II)

The Walk to Emmaus is a highly-finished literary composition, in which the author, dwelling with loving interest upon every detail of his theme, has lost no opportunity of evoking an imaginative response in the reader.

Dodd, therefore, notes the paradigmatic nature of the Emmaus account, as well as its more complex composition.

It is clear, then, that we have no mere expansion of the general pattern, but a carefully composed statement, which, in the framework of a narrative of intense dramatic interest, includes most of what needs (from this evangelist’s point of view) to be said about the resurrection of Christ.

Specifically, and remarkably, he emphasizes, further, the importance of the recognition feature.

Here, as elsewhere, the story begins with the disciples feeling the loss of their Lord, that Jesus takes the initiative, and that the dramatic centre of the whole incident is the ὁράσις - for it seems proper in this case to use the technical term applied by ancient literary critics to the recognition-scene which was so often the crucial point of a Greek drama.

This acknowledgement that ‘Aristotle’s distinctions of various methods of recognition may be aptly applied to the New Testament material’, can be counted as one of Dodd’s major contributions to the later study of NT mimesis. He recommends Greek parallels as an important hermeneutical tool for the NT stories, along with rabbinic traditions and OT references.

For some other forms of tradition which enter into the Gospels the form-critics have been able to adduce analogies from other fields, as, for instance, the Epidaurus inscriptions for some of the healing-stories, and rabbinic aphorisms and dialogues for didactic pericopae.

It is more difficult to find any such analogies for the post-resurrection narratives. In certain respects the more circumstantial narratives recall accounts of theophanies in the Old Testament and in profane literature, especially those in which at first the Visitant is not recognized for what He is, but when recognized imparts some solemn instruction, promise or command (e.g. Gen. 18, Jud. 6, 13). But the points of difference are more numerous and striking than the points of resemblance. In particular, in theophany stories proof is usually offered of the supernatural or divine character of the Visitant: in the Gospel stories the proofs tend to show His real humanity (He has flesh and blood, bears wounds in His body, even eats human food). In some ways we might find a nearer analogy in the ὁράσις - scenes [recognition - scenes] of Greek drama, but again the analogy is by no means close.

This was a daring line of argument at a time when Hellenistic literature was not accepted as a primary resource for NT criticism. In fact, by and large, NT scholarship ignored Dodd’s suggestion and chose to consider the gospel appearance Gattung as first and foremost an imitation of the OT appearance accounts (an interesting case of an eminently Greek concept used exclusively with LXX connotations). In particular, the Emmaus story was seen as an illustration of an OT-inspired anthropomorphic theophany.
The alternative of Hellenistic influences from stories involving appearances or disappearances of a θείως ανάρ, and with it, the idea of NT parallels with Hellenistic drama, has been regarded as a cause of ‘inner tensions’, since it is impossible to consider these accounts as analogous in any essential sense. Alsup takes a firm stand that ‘contrary to popular opinion... the Hellenistic background offers little help in making precise the actual origins of the gospel story Gattung’.53

One consequence of this rejection was an increasingly firm exclusion of Saul’s encounter from any series of resurrection appearances of Jesus, on the grounds that it represents a post-Ascension appearance with parallels in the later Jewish Hellenistic stories of conversion (the legends of Heliodorus, 2 Macc. 3:8, 13; of Joseph and Aseneth, etc.), rather than in the OT material, proper.54 For such reasons, G. Lohfink wrote that the appearance on the Damascus road ‘simply does not belong to the Easter appearances of Jesus’.55 Alsup considers, as well, that there is a strong separation line between the gospel appearances of Jesus and the appearance to Saul (Acts 9) or, later, to Stephen (Acts 7)

Chapters 9, 22, 26 contain accounts of the appearance to Paul on the road to Damascus... its type as Gattung is that of the heavenly radiance appearance, not unlike Acts 7 noted above, and as such is to be held separate from the gospel type... The differences in concept and form existing between this type and that of the gospels are so categorical that two distinct traditional origins are undoubtedly to be sought... The gospel stories were formulated within the special context of the gospel genre, the heavenly radiance type by and large was not.56

The Ethiopian’s conversion, as well, has been regarded as an odd story, impossible to integrate with the other hodos accounts, since it corresponds only in part and superficially to the appearance paradigm illustrated by the Emmaus account,57 and tells the story of an unusual evangelistic encounter combined with a miraculous disappearance of a human, not divine, character.58

This emphasis on the appearance event, seen as an OT-related genre (OT epiphany), with a specific development from ‘visions’ to ‘appearances’ and from ‘concise’ to ‘circumstantial’, draws attention to the nature and history of the appearance stories at the expense of their form and literary relation, and places them in distinct, separate groups. In the process, the importance of the plot elements is disregarded, as well as the NT authors’ art of representation

Not isolated story elements gave rise to a more or less fixed pattern, but a unified story form with more or less constant motifs and themes appears to have been the warp and woof of this vehicle of expression from the very beginning. In short, they were stories and not story-constructs and as such they participated in a particular story Gattung.59

In conclusion, the history-of-tradition approach has encouraged a global NT perspective on the Lukan hodos stories, dismissing their correspondences and emphasizing themes or interests related to the larger context of the NT. In its attempt to counter-balance this perspective, the present study will focus rather on their own Lukan narrative context, where formal and theological correspondences are more meaningful as an expression of Luke’s authorial involvement. Instead of seeing them as post-Easter appearances, solely, they will be characterised as post-Easter encounter stories, stressing their common genre, structure, narrative and theological function, rather than their contrasting features.

Hellenistic Literature and Luke’s Style

In order to interpret this series of formal correspondences in a more coherent way, one could suggest that these three post-Easter ‘on the road’ encounters of Luke-Acts need to be assessed more consistently from a Hellenistic literary perspective, with reference to the available literary theories and to the narrative models provided by both Jewish and Greco-Roman cultures. This will take the quest for Luke’s narrative paradigms into a more detailed consideration of Aristotle’s Poetics, where a key concept is μίμησις as literary imitation or narrative representation of life.60 Apart from such an elevated literary reference, by choosing to re-consider certain parallels between Luke’s accounts and the Greco-Roman appearance stories, of which some were, probably, too easily dismissed,61 this analysis argues that Luke’s style should be understood in a contextualized way, embedded in the popular literature of his time which used similar composition rules, addressed similar audiences, and bred
similar literary tastes. Mimesis needs, therefore, to be understood rather as cultural contextualization, as imitation of literary form and philosophy, as composition, an aspect less explored in the NT studies than mimesis as imitation of content and style (cf. Luke and LXX).\textsuperscript{62}

Two main objections can be raised in relation to such an approach, however. First, one should account whether literary theories such as Aristotle’s analysis of drama and poetry are compatible with the literary genre of the gospels; second, one needs to ask to what extent there is enough evidence that Luke was acquainted with Aristotle works and concepts.

Regarding the first objection, Aristotle himself provides an acceptable response. Although Luke does not write Greek drama, all arts including epic poetry and tragedy, as well as comedy, or music playing, etc., are equally, although in different ways, artistic representations of life, πάση της συμπλήρωσης ὧδει μιμήσει τὸ σύνολον.\textsuperscript{63} The study of epic imitation on the basis of Aristotle’s Poetics is conceivable for ‘epic matches tragedy to the extent of being mimesis imitation’ of elevated [serious] matters’ (μετὰ μὲν τὸν λόγον μίμησις ἐίναι σπουδᾶζ). Thus, ‘whoever knows about good and bad tragedy knows the same about epic, as epic resources belong to tragedy’,\textsuperscript{64} despite differences concerning length, metre, the existence of multiple sections, etc.\textsuperscript{65}

In relation to this observation, there is a subsidiary issue, however, namely whether Aristotle’s ideas were indeed known and applied to drama or epic works, in Luke’s time or after him, since, apparently, his Poetics was not much quoted for almost 18 centuries after its composition.\textsuperscript{66} As far as we know, the treatise entered its first period of major popularity, as an authoritative work complementary to Horace’s Ars Poetica, only after its recovery by the Renaissance scholars.\textsuperscript{67} One possible explanation of this limited interaction could be its lecture-notes character, its student-oriented origins.\textsuperscript{68}

Although direct confirmation of a general knowledge of this book in antiquity is missing, and arguments such as that of A. Rostagni who favours an early widespread influence are debatable,\textsuperscript{69} there are a number of indications that the Poetics, or its approach of the Greek drama, were still far from being unknown or unfamiliar. For example, Themistius (4th century A.D.) takes from it the reference to the origin of comic plots in Sicily (Oration, 27.337B, from Poetics 1449b6). Ammonius and Boethius (5th-6th century) quote chapter twenty on the “parts of speech” in their treatise On Interpretation.\textsuperscript{70} Olympiodorus (6th century A.D.) analyses the syllogisms present in Aristotle’s works (the demonstrative, the dialectical, the rhetorical, the sophistic, and the poetic) and for the last type he refers to the Poetics.\textsuperscript{71} Other early references are apparently provided by Heraclides of Pontus, Aristotle’s contemporary, whose treatise On Poetics and the Poets suggests an allusion to Aristotle.\textsuperscript{72} Another interesting testimony comes from a papyrus fragment of Satyrus’ Life of Euripides, that uses the Aristotelian concepts of ‘peripety’ and ‘recognitions’.\textsuperscript{73} Porphyrian, an ancient commentator on Horace (3rd century BC), informs us that Horace has put together the poetic precepts of Neoptolemus of Parum, and he in his turn was influenced by Aristotle’s Poetics.\textsuperscript{74} Similarly, it has been argued by K. von Fritz that Duris,\textsuperscript{75} and other historians of this school ‘could have adopted certain principles under the influence of the Poetics in a way not intended by Aristotle’.\textsuperscript{76} The role of poetry in the Greco-Roman city cannot be underestimated, and, for example, Aristophanes has Euripides saying that praiseworthy poets encourage their fellow citizens to be worthier people, and Aeschylus, that boys are taught by their teachers at school, while ‘poets are teachers of men’.\textsuperscript{77}

The possibility of an implicit wider influence of such a study on composition (or the idea that Aristotle’s compositional approach was itself a synthesis of a larger literary tendency) can be contemplated without major objections. This agrees with the fact that mimesis had come to involve, in time, an increasingly larger semantic area,\textsuperscript{78} and through its connotations and related terms this concept influenced much of the Greco-Roman discussion of dramatic representation.

At first, mimesis had to do with the intermediary character of artistic performance,\textsuperscript{79} and with the special participation of audience’s to the act of representation. This could involve a reaction of crying, fear and awe (κλαίοντας τε... φοβερὸν ἡ δεινὸν),\textsuperscript{80} or of pleasure (ηδονὴ) induced by the narrated fiction (ἀπάτη), the narrative being a source of enjoyment (ψυχαγωγία), an artistic media bringing together the useful (χρήσιμον) and the delightful (τερπινόν).\textsuperscript{81}

Even historians began to use this literary style. For Polybius, for example, reading history enables one ‘to make a general survey, and thus derive both benefit and pleasure’ (ἀμα καὶ τὸ χρήσιμον καὶ τὸ τερπινὸν ἐκ τῆς ἱστοριἀς...
Some commentaries on Acts acknowledge a similar rhetorical approach in Luke’s style, as well. With regard to the second objection, Luke’s access to Aristotle’s precepts and recommendations needs to be seen in relation to its cultural context and in relation to his own ability to identify the proper rules of composition, the literary forms that correspond to the literary taste of his audience. An interesting illustration is, for example, the way Dionysius of Halicarnassus defended the primacy of Demosthenes among the orators on the basis that he need not learn his skill from Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, but discovered and used, by his own genius, the rules of rhetorical excellence. Keeping the proportions and changing the perspective, the present mimetic approach of the ‘on the road’ encounters in Luke-Acts is based not only on Luke’s literary style as a reflection of Hellenistic standards, but also on Luke’s own gifts as a story-teller who finds himself in agreement with such rules, independently. He could have used the popular lore regarding the well-told story and the elements of a well devised plot, or equally so, he could have learnt these structures and literary standards from popular legends and novels, from the current works of philosophy, history and medicine, or from Greek drama on the stage. One way or another, his writing came to reflect many such subtle and persuasive figures of style. For example, in Luke 24:28, where Jesus draws near Emmaus, he is, surprisingly, portrayed in theatre-like language, as pretending or playing, or making-believe (προσεποίμασε) that he were journeying further...
The Journey Motif in Tales, Legends, Itineraries

Cadbury, in particular, has identified in Luke-Acts a number of popular literary forms (as distinct from proper and more skillful literary forms), such as tales of wonder and miracle, miraculous releases from prison (Acts 12:6-18; 16:16-25), public competitions between a true and a false prophet (Acts 8:4-25; 13:4-14), parables and various Christian memorabilia (tradition, memories, ὑμνήματα, ἀπομνημονεύματα). Among them one finds, as well, the travel tale which takes mainly two forms - the maritime adventure along the coasts (περίπλοιον), and the journey by land (usually in the form of journey notes or περίηγησις). In his analysis of Luke's journey stories, however, Cadbury tended to refer mainly to Paul's voyage to Rome, with its impressive shipwreck episode at Malta (Acts 28).

Dibelius' attention was captured by this adventure, as well, for 'the sea-voyage is one of the most literary sections of Acts', and he explicitly noted the influence of certain secular models here: 'a secular description of the voyage and shipwreck served as [its] pattern, basis or source'.

They did not discuss Luke's 'on the road' encounters specifically, only noted them in terms of NT legends, paradigms, and Novellen. For example, with the exception of Luke 24:21b, 22-24, the Emmaus story is labeled by Dibelius a legend in 'pure form'. Under Gunkel's influence, the formgeschichtlich school often perceived the Emmaus encounter as a legend imitating the OT stories of heavenly travellers (cf. the angels before Abraham, Gen. 16:2ff.; Gen. 18:1ff.; see also Judg. 13:3-21, and Manoah's sacrifice, in Judg. 23:1ff.), and following, as well, the model of wisdom stories. More recently, Guillaume confirmed such OT parallels and suggested a direct borrowing of themes from the LXX. As an alternative, however, Ehrhardt thought that its models are found in Hellenistic literature. In the same vein Betz saw in the Emmaus story a cult legend, similar to Hellenistic stories where not a god but a human being appears after his death (e.g. Aristaeas of Proconnesus, Zalmoxis, Peregrinus Proteus and Apollonius of Tyana, or the Romulus legend).

The legendary character of the recognition scene has been noticed by Kurz, also, and echoing Auerbach's comments, he stressed the similarity between the recognition of Jesus at Emmaus and Odysseus' disguised return, and the hidden identity of the one causing the plague in Oedipus the King. The recognition of Jesus' hidden identity is seen as prefigured, as well, in some LXX texts like Nathan's parable of the slaughtered lamb (2 Sam. 12:1-6) and the final recognition of the angel Raphael in Tobit ('Tob.' 12).

At its turn, the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch was characterised, as well, as a legend and 'on the whole without literary embellishment'. In terms of OT parallels, it displays certain parallels with the Elijah-Elisha narratives (1 Kgs 18:12ff.). However, its half-biographical, half-kerygmatic character allows, also, for a Novelle classification, since the Spirit of the Lord is the miracle working character.

Saul's 'on the road' encounter was discussed mainly as an introduction to Paul's story in Acts. In terms of genre, the account represents either a legend (an aetiological story of a famous missionary), or, for others, a resurrection novel centred on a post-Easter epiphany.

The literary genre of these hodos encounters is quite a volatile category, apparently. The Emmaus account, as a further example, can be characterized not only as a legend, focused on the wonders of Jesus, yet also as a paradigm (Dibelius), since Luke stresses the Easter kerygma and the proof-from-prophecy elements, and even as a Novelle (the divine Jesus is the character who causes the non-recognition and recognition miracles, the appearance and disappearance events).

The Idealisation of the Way Setting

An important landmark for the literary analysis of the Way metaphor has been, further, E. Repo's monograph, Der Weg als Selbstbezeichnung des Urchristentums, focused on the NT hodos passages in Luke, John, Hebrews, Matthew, etc. Starting from a unitary-canonical perspective, he tried to highlight the directional, geographical, legal, Christological, eschatological, and ethical connotations of the Way motif, setting the research agenda for quite a time. He succeeded in raising the issue of a cultural process of idealisation of the Way metaphor, that finally reached a high point in the NT...
understanding of the Way as a personified concept (Jesus, the Christians). Although it imposed a unitary and limiting view on this motif in the NT (for which he was rightly criticized), Repo's analysis has the merit of having raised the issue of cultural development of the Way's paradigms and meanings.

STAGES OF IDEALISATION

From an initial OT Wandering motif based on the geographical metaphor and on the importance of the divine presence and guidance for Israel (as in Genesis and Exodus, implying a *theologia viatorum*),

the Way motif underwent a process of idealisation gaining legalistic and ethical connotations as obedience or disobedience to Yahweh's commandments (cf. the typological interpretations of the Way of the Lord, with Deuteronomic nuances, as well as Isaianic, as a New Exodus, a new conquest, a restoration of the land, etc.).

As W. C. Robinson and H. Conzelmann have noted, this process of idealisation continued in NT times and has affected, in Luke's case, more than the Way metaphor: it transformed the geographical space into a faith symbol, the symbol of humanity's link with the spiritual world.

For Conzelmann, in particular, Luke has begun 'the process by which the scene becomes stylized into the “Holy Land”'.

At this point it is relevant to ask what is the stage of this idealisation process at the level of Luke's own work and time? Did he use the Way metaphor only as a reference to OT prophets, as the 'Way of the Lord', as an idealisation of the Exodus journey (Ps. 13:3, Is. 40:3, 58:9, etc.) or, also, as a Hellenistic paradigm? How did this idealization influence the 'way' metaphor in Luke-Acts, as a symbolical setting for important encounters, and as paradigm of transition?

On the whole, Luke had access to two different types of meanings for his journey and *hodos* paradigms: to internalised connotations of the Way (e.g., legalistic, ethical, personal) and to external symbols (related to itinerary, quality of path, journeying processes, destinations, type of leaders, etc.).

INTERNALISED JEWISH CONNOTATIONS OF THE WAY

The internalised connotations of the Way include the metaphors of the Way that apply to the spiritual, inner life of the believer and are shown outwardly in the form of obedience, behaviour, and character. Among these is the Way understood as the Law of God, and as ethical, personal achievement.

The Way as the Law and Obedience to the Law

Luke's use of ὁ δρόμος and ἡ ἁγνήσεως seems to indicate an already fixed usage of these terms, with certain community-related connotations. In Acts 22:4 ἡ ἁγνήσεως is used as 'a term for a manner of behaviour but also for those who adopted the behaviour', and the idiom ἐκκλησία ἄρης was used in a similar way at Qumran (from here Christians could have derived it through the agency of John the Baptist).

For example, one notes that the members of the Qumran community are characterised in relation to the Law as 'those perfect of the way', ἄρης ἔρημος, 1QS 8:18; 9:5, 9; or the chosen of the way', ἀρηστῶν, 1QS 1:20. The Master of the Community, a messianic figure, guides them 'with knowledge ... so that they may walk perfectly each one with his fellow in everything which has been revealed to them. This is the time to prepare the way to the wilderness', ἔφυλάξας ἀναφέρειν, 1QS 9:18-20. The perfect walking in the Way is related to the preparation of the Messiah's time, and Isaiah 40:3 is central to this paradigm.

They shall separate themselves from the session of the men of deceit in order to depart into the wilderness to prepare there the Way of the Lord (?); as it is written: 'In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make level in the desert a highway for our God'. This (alludes to) the study of the Torah which he commanded through Moses to do, according to everything which has been revealed (from) time to time, and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his Holy Spirit.

However, although Luke - as well as the other evangelists - has given special attention to Isaiah 40:3, as a major reference in the preaching of John the Baptist, the earliest Christian tradition did not retain this legalistic meaning of the Law.

The Ethical Significance of the Way

As a metaphorical, internalized concept, the Way contributed to the formation of numerous poetical constructs such as the 'way of light', ἔνεμος ἔρημος, the 'ways of true righteousness', ἀρηστῶν υπερβάλλων, the 'ways of truth', ἀρηστῶν γενήσεως, the 'way of wickedness', ἡ ἁγνήσεως, the ‘way of traitors’, ἀρηστῶν ἐξαγωγής, etc.
the 'ways of prostitutes', דֶּרֶךְ נְשָׁהָו, and the 'way of the people', דֶּרֶךְ גְּזַנִּים. In 4 Q434, 436 (the *Hymns of the Poor*), the Lord God directs 'their foot to the way' (פְּנֵיהֶם דֶּרֶךְ לְאֵל; Frg. 2, 1.4) and they walk 'in the way of His heart' (דֶּרֶךְ בְּרָאשִׁי). These ethical connotations of the Way seem to have encouraged a specialised use of the singular and the plural forms. Repo suggests that this semantic polarization between the negative ways (pl.) and the perfect way (sing.), reflects in a nutshell the historical process of progressive modifications.

Es ist möglich, dass im früheren Sprachgebrauch der Bewegung die Metaphor 'Weg', vor allem in der Bedeutung von Gebot und Gesetz, mehr im Plural als im Singular üblich war.

Such a distinction occurs, for example, in 1QS, the scroll of the Community Rule. The first part of 1QS (1.1-7.25) could be called 'The Ways of Light and the Ways of Darkness' (using mainly plural constructs), while, in contradistinction, its second part refers to the theme of The Perfect Way, using preponderently the singular.

The men of holiness are expected to 'walk perfectly', והם יֵלֶךְ בְּרָאשִׁי, and the rebellious members of the community need to turn back to 'the perfect way' (or 'perfection of the way', מַכֵּה בְּרָאשִׁי, 1QS 11:11)

I [the Master] do not hold anger towards those who turn away from transgression; but I will not have compassion for all those who deviate from the way. I will not console those who are being obstinate until their way is perfect.

The true perfection of the way, however, comes from God, and so the Master acknowledges his own shortcomings

For my way (belongs) to Adam [אֲוִרָת הָאֲדָם]. The human cannot establish his righteousness; for to God (alone) belongs the judgement and from him is the perfection of the way [הָאֲדָם אֲוִרָת, אֱלֹהִי].

This Essennian use of the singular has created an important precedent for Luke's reference to the Way in Luke-Acts. Christians’ claim to be seen as 'those belonging to the Way' would be the equivalent of an absolute claim for true, superlative obedience to the Law of God, and at the same time, a claim that the Church is the messianic community.

**EXTERNAL JEWISH CONNOTATIONS OF THE WAY**

As an external symbol, the Way includes several meanings, the connotations of itinerary, quality of path, journeying processes, destinations, even of types of leadership (overlapping here with the internalised connotations) and has provided important paradigms for the NT narratives, plot lines and historical references. All of these meanings allow, in Repo's analysis, for as many development lines of the concept of the Way.

For example, in terms of journey destination, the process of idealisation has started with the simple reference to walks or visits, pilgrimages or liberation and conquest journeys (cf. the Abrahamic journeys, the Exodus, the conquest of Canaan, etc.) and finally led to the idea of an existential journey to heaven, inspiring people to think of their eschatological restoration (Repo's 'der Gedenke vom himmlischen Ziel'). The final place of arrival could take the form of a heavenly house or of a heavenly city (cf. Jn. 14:2, 4, 5; and Heb. 11:14f.; 12:22; 13:14) and the journey there could turn into a symbolic, apocalyptic journey (one of Repo's merits is that he discusses a number of less common types of destinations, for example, the apocryphal journeys to Heavens or to Hell, or Hades, known in Greek literature as *nekyia*).

Destinations are important for this study, in particular, because Palestine - as the homeland, and Jerusalem and the Temple - as the major sites of Israel' religious and political life, are also the most important destinations in Luke-Acts. Jesus’ journeying is essentially related to his Passion, Ascension and the inauguration of the time of the Church.

**Jerusalem as Journey Destination**

Jerusalem as destination is a prominent compositional element in Luke’s narrative. The gospel’s journeys bring finally together ‘the two [main] participants in the drama of the Passion... Jesus and Jerusalem’. In order to stress this development Luke ignores all other traditional reports about Jesus’ journeys to Jerusalem and emphasizes only one, last journey that takes the Messiah to the Cross and for him ‘there is only one journey, one visitation, one supreme and decisive
The Jerusalem stage of this journey - as a destination announced through many Reisenotizen - is so prominent that it can overshadow the dynamics of journeying proper, favouring a static perspective. This effect is strengthened by the massive presence of teaching pericopes in Luke 9-19 (and for such a reason Luke’s Central Section has been called the ‘Jerusalem Document’). At the same time, the motif of Jerusalem’s centrality is so intense in Luke-Acts that it tends to obscure the specific contribution of Luke’s hodos accounts. In particular, however, for the careful reader, these accounts mount an effective challenge to Jerusalem’s centrality.

The Temple as Journey Destination
Luke’s gospel starts in the Temple (Lk. 1-2), and the journey and pilgrimage pericopes provide enough evidence for making a distinction between Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem and a separate journey to the Temple (Conzelmann, Miyoshi, Flender, Davies, etc.). While the core of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem (Lk. 13:33-35) brings a solemn judgement upon the city (cf. Lk. 13:35a: ‘your house is left to you [desolate]’), the end of the gospel presents the disciples continually blessing God in the Temple (24:53). Jerusalem and its Temple seem to illustrate two different types of destiny, although, in the end, both come under judgement for their failure to welcome Jesus as the Messiah.


The Way and the Deuteronomic Exodus
The idealisation of Jesus’ journeying confers a symbolical significance not only to its destination but also to the actual journeying itself. In this respect, Luke’s Central Section has Mosaic and Davidic connotations, a feature shared with the other Synoptic gospels, as well, especially with Mark. One can note, for example, the linguistic connection between Jesus and Moses in Luke 9:31 (Jesus and his έξοδος), while Luke 9:1-50 represents a parallel to Moses’ mediation on the Sinai mountain. C. F. Evans argued that the order and content of the teaching in Luke 10:1-18:14 corresponds passage by passage with Deuteronomy 1:26; this lectionary-type of correspondence was received with skepticism, however. Moessner suggested, in place, a rather loose correspondence, centred on two pivotal passages, Luke 9:1-50 and Acts 6:1-9:31.
The list above represents, in fact, an alternative structure for Acts, since each of these sections is a thematic whole and ends with a summary description (5:42; 9:31; 12:24-25; 15:35; 19:20; 28:30-31).\(^1\)

On the whole, this Mosaic reading of Luke-Acts based on Jesus-Moses parallelism and on the journey motif, raises a few issues. First, one could note that Luke’s *hodos* encounters come with various, different OT emphases, not only with Mosaic connotations: Jesus as the Servant of the Lord, Jesus the Suffering Messiah, the Davidic king, Jesus the Revolutionary, etc. Second, the journey perspective broadens in the Lukan narrative, in contrast to the OT perspectives: Jerusalem or Palestine as destinations are replaced by a more comprehensive agenda that takes the disciples ‘to the ends of the earth’ (Acts 1:8).

The Isaianic New Exodus and Jesus as the Davidic Messiah

As noted, Luke’s journeying theology reflects not only the Deuteronomic paradigm, yet, as well, the New Exodus patterns from Isaiah and the Prophets. This is a line that identifies Jesus not so much as the prophet like Moses, but as the Davidic Messiah.\(^2\)

From this perspective, Jesus’ messianic journey starts earlier than Luke 9:51 and this New Exodus encompasses the whole ‘way’ of Jesus (Lk. 1:76; 3:4; 7:27) ‘from the commencement of his public ministry, in Nazareth, to its climax in Jerusalem, including Jesus’ death, resurrection, ascension and exaltation’.\(^3\) At the same time, the New Exodus imagery goes even beyond Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem. For example, Boismard is confident that in the Ethiopian’s conversion, Acts 8:25-40, the themes of the road, the desert, the water, and the motif of rejoicing, are all imported from Isaiah 35:1-10. The fact that the story of the Ethiopian has three *hodos* mentions in Acts 8:26, 36 and 39c, is not by chance at all (‘pas un hasard’), for in Isaiah 35:8 the prophet uses it three times, as well.\(^4\)

One of the valid objections, however, against such a reading of Luke’s *hodos* encounters, is that seeing Jesus and understanding the Scriptures do not correspond entirely to all the details of Isaiah’s scheme of divine punishment-and-healing (apart from the account of Saul’s conversion). Thus, the Ethiopian finds himself in a full process of seeking understanding and finding meaning;\(^5\) he is a victim restored not a backsliding believer who regains acceptance in the people of God. Further, in the Emmaus story, the two despondent disciples, are not punished for leaving Yahweh, in any way, so that their recovery of sight could be interpreted as a reward for obedience; their journey is not described as a sinful journey that needs to be stopped and reversed, either. Apart from that, the veiling of the eyes, during the journey, coexists with the ‘opening’ of the *nou~v* and preceeds the full disclosure of Jesus’ identity at the table.

A number of details suggest, further, that Luke’s source in these stories was not the New Exodus paradigm, at least not exclusively. The sight motif suggests a Hellenistic influence, as well. Thus, the disappearance mentioned in Luke 24:31, *a!fantov* (a *hapax legomenon* in the NT) is unknown to the Septuagint, and as Ehrhardt notes ‘linguistically we are faced in our story with material which is alien to biblical diction’.\(^6\) Here, Luke’s Hellenistic environment (Asia Minor and Syria) seems to have encouraged him to use certain paradigms characteristic of the *theios anér* exploits.\(^7\)
Luke’s use of Isaiah seems to emphasise, as well, other messianic themes, distinct from the New Exodus, although associated with it. In the Emmaus ‘road’ encounter, for example, one notes the motifs of the Suffering Servant, as mentioned earlier, and very probably, that of a Maccabean Messiah (the Messiah as political and military leader). The Ethiopian’s conversion includes, similarly, the motif of the Suffering Servant (cf. Is. 53:7-8 in Acts 8:32-33). In Saul’s encounter one meets again the Davidic theme of persecution and salvation, and, as well, the Mosaic motif of receiving a divine revelation while being ‘on the way’ (cf. the burning bush scene, the Sinai revelation, etc.).

As a conclusion, even if the New Exodus theme shapes the heart of Isaiah 40-55 to an extent that would replace ‘the first Exodus as the saving event’, this does not imply that the ‘Exodus motif is the controlling theme of Luke’s work’, and, therefore, a more comprehensive assessment of Luke’s hodos stories needs to take into account other sources, as well.

Christ as the Way: the Emergence of a Hodos Christology

Repo’s analysis is well-known, in particular, for his suggestion of a comprehensive hodos Christology in the NT (esp. in Luke-Acts), which, according to him, reflects an early ‘urchristlichen Hodosdenken’. Coordinating the references where Jesus identifies himself with Christians who belong to the Way (Acts 9:1-2, 5; 22:4) with the texts where the Way and (or) Christ are denigrated - κακολογείον τὴν ὀδόν and κακολογείον με (i.e., Χριστῶν) - in Acts 16:17 (cf. Mk. 15:29; see οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὀδόν, Heb. 13:13), and, further, with texts where Christ is presented as the Way (Heb. 10:20, Jn. 14:4-6), Repo concludes that the whole of the NT displays an early Christian attempt to identify Christ as the Way, which implies an incipient ‘hodos - Christology’

Die Christologie jener urchristlichen Kreise, in denen die Wegmetapher direkt auf Jesus bezogen wurde, könnte man mit gutem Grund Hodoslogie bzw Hodos-Christologie (vgl. Logos-Christologie) nennen.

Despite the fact that a hodos Christology seems to cohere with the synoptic portrait of Jesus as a peripatetic Messiah who performs miracles and teaches ‘on the way’, as well as with Jesus’ own testimony in John 14:6, Repo’s suggestion of a developed hodos NT Christology, where Christians are the hodos-members of the hodos-Christ (Acts 9:2), has been regarded with skepticism. For example, S. Brown called it ‘pure fantasy’, and Bovon was not entirely convinced of his arguments. Repo’s study, however, has rightly pointed out that in its process of idealization the Way metaphor developed specific Christian connotations, which appear to coagulate in the form of a new Christology. Luke’s hodos encounters might, thus, be seen as integrated parts of such an emergent theology of the Way, based on both OT and Greco-Roman paradigms and on the specific connotations of the Christ-event.

Greco-Roman Connotations of the Way

There is a certain tendency among the NT scholars to consider the Essene use of the Way as the major source or background for Luke’s ‘way’ in Acts. The increasingly persuasive portrait of Luke as a Hellenistic writer, however, makes it plausible that the Greco-Roman use of the Way metaphor could have influenced him, as well. The Hellenistic imagery included external symbols such as roads, journeys, one’s course of life, adventure, and, as well, internalised symbols such as mystic initiations, wisdom, happiness, all being able to enrich and inspire Luke’s use of journey paradigms.

The Way as Solemn Procession

One of the interesting connotations of the Way, for a Greek mind, was the imagery of an initiatory procession, as in the Eleusinian celebrations. The sacred objects were brought from Eleusis to the Athens’ Eleusinium in a special procession on the first day of initiation. On the second day another special procession went to the sea for purification, followed by two days of sacrifices. The fifth day included a climactic procession starting from Athens in the early morning and bringing back to Eleusis the sacred objects (ἰπρα). In the sixth, the statue of Iacchus was solemnly carried from Ceramicus to Eleusis. The way they went out from the city was called the ‘sacred way’, ἱεος ὀδός, and the multitudes halted for a rest in the place called ‘of the sacred fig tree’, ἱεος Οὐκ. Finally, they entered Eleusis by a special entrance known as the μυστική Ἠθος. Such journeys were readily used by Christians as a parallel with the idea of a sacred journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, and of Christ as the true hierophant.
The Motif of the Honored, Journeying Hero

In the earliest examples of Greek literature, in Homer’s writings, the Way has various mundane meanings as ‘way’ or ‘street’, ‘course’, ‘journey’ or ‘military march’. However, there is a tendency towards metaphor, as well, especially in the description of heroes’ adventures. For example, journeying together brings ‘unity of thinking’, and successful heroes don’t delay their journeys yet embark on them under divine guidance. In Pindar the idea of journeying occurs in various forms, as well; thus, heroic virtues are sung in ‘kingly words and ways’ or in ‘authoritative speech’, as for the descendants of Aegina and Zeus, θρασύ μοι τόδ’ εἰπεῖν φανερῶς άρετάς οδόν κυρίαν λόγων οἰκοδομήν; or, shown to everyone to see them, as for the sons of Iamus, who, by honoring virtue, came to ‘pass along a shining road’, τιμώντες δ’ ἄρετας εἴς φανεράν οδὸν ἐρχόμεναι. Greek gods grant protection and reward heroes, so that, with them ‘there are many paths of prosperity’, πολλαὶ δ’ οδοὶ σὺν θεῶς εὑρημάτως, and ‘swift is the achievement, short are the ways of gods, when bent on speed’, ὥσεια δ’ ἐπειγομένων ἡπῃ θεῶν πράξεις οδοί τε βραχχεῖαι.

The Path to Ethical Ideals

Particularly worth noting is W. Jaeger’s suggestion that the Way represented a coherent religious concept in Hellenistic thinking. He built his argument on a general assessment of the Greek pairs of opposites in relation to the Way (e.g., the two ways of darkness and light, of truth and lie, etc.) and of Parmenides’ references to the way as a ‘way of inquiry’; ‘the right way to truth’ and ‘the way of god / goddess’, which is ‘the way [which] leads him who knows unscathed wherever he goes’, οδὸν βίσου πολύψηφον ἀγωνισά δαίμονες, ἣ κατὰ πάντ’ ἀστή φέρει εἰσόδα φώτα, κτλ.

Apart from that, Plato is known, as well, for a number of famous references to the way imagery, such as the philosopher’s journey to light. Christian Gnostic texts described later the human soul and life in similar terms as a journeying from pre-existence in heaven to earthly life, at birth, and from earth to God’s heaven, at death.

The way imagery and its links with immortality or death have, in fact, a long tradition in Greek literature. For example, Homer writes about the ‘road of the immortals’, θάνατων οδός, and Pindar uses similar metaphors such as ‘the way of truth known by the mortal man’, εἶ δὲ νόον τὸς ἔχει θνατῶν ἀλατείας ὄδον, or σοφίας ὄδον, ‘the way of wisdom’.

The common course of human life was described as a ‘way’ or ‘journey’ in various contexts. For Democritus, for example, ‘a life without leisure is like a long road without a place for rest’, θῖος ἀνεφριτοῦστος μακρὴ ὄδος ἀπανδόκετος. Thales of Miletus and Anacharsis, the Scythian, are said to have taught their pupils a Homeric way of life, οδὸν τινα παρέδοσαν βίοι ὁ Ὀμήρικος. Similarly, Isocrates writes about ‘those who travelled this life’s road’, ὥσι τοῦ βίου ταύτην τὴν ὄδον ἐπορεύθησαν.

The imagery of life as a journey or as a road was often accompanied by motifs of ethical choice. For many classical authors the ethical ideal in life was that the ‘middle way’ (μέση ὄδος). For example, one of Xenophon’s characters, Aristippus, favours explicitly such a middle way between living as a ruler (inclined to tyranny) and living as a slave (subject to lack of self-control): ‘There is, as I hold, a middle path’. The ideal of the ‘middle path’ is also characteristically present in Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics, who recommends it both in arts and in virtues.

The way as a setting for ethical choice (or as a manner of life resulting from an ethical choice) provides several parallels to the NT parables of the Two Ways, Two Gates or Two Doors (cf. Mt. 17:13-16, Lk. 13:24-25, see chapter three). For example, in the Cynic Epistles, Diogenes writes that just as we do toward philosophy, the masses hasten eagerly toward what they think is happiness, whenever they hear of a short cut leading to it. But when they come up to the road [ἐπ’ τὴν ὄδον] and survey its ruggedness, they draw back as though they were sick.

As illustrated by Plato, one of the recurring Hellenistic stories is that of a young person who has to decide as ‘a man who has come to a crossroads and is not quite sure of his way’ (καθάπερ ἐν τριφάδο τενίκον καὶ τὴν σφόδρα κατείχον ὄδον), be it that he journeys alone or with company (ἐὰν μόνος ἔστε μετ’ ἄλλων τυχόν πορεύμασιν), needing to question others or himself on what is the truly good direction in life (τῆς πορείας). This literary and philosophical topos was often visited by the Hellenistic authors, occurring, for example, in Prodicus’ fable of Heracles at the ‘crossroads’, and in other legendary moments in the life of Heracles. The Cynic
Epistles provide a number of interesting parallels, too. For example, in the letter to Hicetas, Diogenes presents Socrates as lecturing on the two ways to happiness, one short, steep and difficult, the other, smooth and easy (the two contrasting pathways to the Acropolis). In Diogenes’ letter to Monimus, the author meets ‘on the road’ (κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν) a certain Lacydes who invites him to his home, and among the subjects discussed at the table is the steep and rugged ‘road leading to happiness’ (μίαν ὁδὸν προσάντη καὶ τροχείσην), a road of choice and determination. In another letter to Monimus, Diogenes warns those who do not prepare themselves for death, that they would labour ‘a great deal along the way ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ’, journeying without a guide, exposed to great dangers.

**Redaction Criticism and Luke’s Reisenotizen**

In spite of such rich cultural connotations of the Way, redactional approaches focused mainly on Luke’s *Reisenotizen* in Luke 9-19. One of the main reasons for such an emphasis was Mark’s use of the Way motif and the prominence of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem in the theology of the third gospel.

**Mark’s Journeying Motif and Luke’s Reisenotizen**

The starting point in interpreting Jesus’ *Reisenotizen*, as intimated, is the synoptic context, specifically the gospel of Mark. Evolving from strict editorial criticism to a criticism of composition, redactional studies led to the conclusion that Luke also ‘reveals his theology by the way in which he organizes, arranges, or structures his gospel’. One of these major structural units is Luke’s Central Section, and as early as 1794 J. G. Eichhorn noted that it has a remarkable Lukan character. F. D. E. Schleiermacher was among the first to use the term *Reisebericht* as reference to its redactional, composite nature ‘das Ganze nicht ein ursprünglich zusammenhängender Reisebericht [ist]’. W. M. L. de Wette characterised it as a compositional journey, a non-chronological and non-historical theological discourse.

**MARK’S AND LUKE’S USE OF THE GEOGRAPHICAL MOTIF**

Regarded as a fundamental feature of his gospel, Luke’s editing of the Central Section (Lk. 9-19) into a major journey was interpreted as following the journey model of Mark’s corresponding section (Mk. 8-10). Mark is the first to give journeying a central place in the gospel narrative, and, in general, he makes extensive use of the geographical motif. For example, he presents Jesus’ ministry in a characteristic tree-part structure (the Galilean period - Mk. 1-8:26, Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem - Mk. 8:27-11:1, his Passion and Resurrection in Jerusalem - Mk. 11-16), and uses several *topoi* of Christological value, such as the desert - ἐρημός, the way - ὁδός, the mountain - ὁρός, the house - ὁίκος, the boat - πλοῖον, etc. Some of these symbols are borrowed and enhanced by Luke (like the mountain and the lake), others are given less prominence (e.g., the wilderness).

However, Luke holds different views of geography than Mark. One example is his ‘Jewish particularism’ according to which he avoids mentioning Jesus’ miracles in Gentile sites such as Caesarea Philippi, Idumaea, Peraea, and puts aside any reference to Phoenicia and Decapolis, focusing only on Jesus’ ministry in the Jewish territory (cf. Lk. 7:31). On the one hand, he reserves Gentile evangelism for Acts, on the other hand, he is fond, indeed, of progressive presentations, on using discrete, meaningful geographical divisions in his history of the Church. Thus, Luke is characteristically ‘tidying up the story’ so that Peter ministers in Judaea (cf. Acts 9:32-11:18) and never crosses into the Paul’s area, and Paul’s mission itself is presented as progressively and circularly invading the ancient Greco-Roman world.

**CONZELMANN’S INTERPRETATION OF LUKE’S JOURNEY THEME**

Conzelmann’s assessment of Luke’s motif of the Way is indelibly linked to his views of Luke’s redaction of Mark and of Luke’s theological ‘centre’ in the gospel. Based on a careful interpretation of Luke 4:21; 16:16; 22:35-37, he built a static, famous three-stage picture of Luke’s history of redemption, divided in three distinct periods of time which are confirmed by a firm caesura between John the Baptist and Jesus: (a) the time of Israel; (b) the time of Jesus (characterised through a significant last journey to Jerusalem); and, finally, (c) the time of the ecclesia pressa (of the persecuted church). In the light of Conzelmann’s contribution, it became clearer that, if Luke did not create the Way motif but borrowed it from Mark, he was, however, ‘the first to develop it into a *scheme*’.225
Contradiction and Coherence in Luke’s Reisenotizen
An instrumental role in highlighting Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem and its traditional theology was played by Luke’s series of Reisenotizen (journey indicators), with its frequent use of πορεύομαι, ἀναβαίνω and ἕγγιξον or ἐρχομαι (cf. Lk. 9:51, 52, 53, 56, 57; 10:1, 17, 38; 13:22, 31-33; 14:25; 17:11; 18:31, 35; 19:1, 11, 28, 41).226

Based on such references, Conzelmann has built his reconstruction of Luke’s theology of the Way by emphasising the importance of Jesus’ last journey while the possible contribution of Luke’s hodos stories went largely unnoticed.227

Apart from obscuring the presence of the hodos stories, this common emphasis on the Reisenotizen in Luke’s Central Section had another, subtle effect. For example, on their account Luke was charged with a chronic lack of geographical precision.228 Conzelmann and others have argued that Luke’s journey indicators are (a) incoherent and contradictory; (b) infrequent, and hence unable to sustain a real sense of movement; and (c) vague and indefinite in their topographical detail.229

Such imprecision and difficulties,230 combined with Luke’s emphasis on static teaching scenes, enhanced the impression of a ‘discrepancy between the material and the scheme’ or of a ‘dissonance of form from content’ (Spannung zwischen Form und Stoff - in Conzelmann’s words),231 a feature that threatens to reduce the overall composition to a heterogeneous and ‘characterless’ collection of stories.232 The more impressive, therefore, is Luke’s success in presenting Jesus’ life in the shape of a teaching journey, a ‘piece of deliberate editorial work’, a meaningful pattern imposed on the biographical and traditional material.233

Thematic Support for Luke’s Journey Motif
Apparently, Luke’s journey scheme survives in the gospel through its conventional value as a literary framework for Jesus’ ministry, through its inherent appeal to the reader’s imagination, and, as well, through Luke’s ability to combine different motifs in order to strengthen the main line of the story.

Conzelmann drew attention, in this context, that Luke juxtaposes the journeying motif and that of the disciples’ misunderstanding of the Passion, strengthening the tension of Jesus’ destiny.234 Jesus’ own awareness of the coming Passion is presented by Luke ‘in terms of the journey’, as well, for Conzelmann (cf. Lk. 13:33).235 The discipleship motif is developed progressively, further, in connection with journeying, taking the disciples from a low ebb to a state where they are able to imitate their master’s way.236 And, finally, two other major narrative lines contribute to the coherence of the story, the theme of suffering and the theme of kingship.237

Lukan scholarship agreed to a great extent that Luke includes here a ‘massive’ portrayal of Jesus as king,238 and that the journey to Jerusalem has clear royal overtones, as der königliche Weg Jesu.239 Jesus is portrayed as a heir-apparent journeying to Jerusalem, rejected by his countrymen and deprived of his inheritance until his journey turns into a divine confirmation of his kingship, at the Ascension.240

In Acts, however, the journey paradigm is changed. The glory and the reward associated with Jesus’ kingship become more distant and Jesus’ disciples face persecution and trials. Journeying as following Jesus is replaced now by journeying as sharing in Jesus’ mission and persecution.241 According to Conzelmann, the Way in Acts moves in the direction of an ethic of suffering (cf. the mention of πείσματι, at the Last Supper, and the command to arms, cf. Lk. 22:35), communicating that ‘the Christian life is a way’ and it ‘inevitably leads through many tribulations (Acts 14:22)’, requiring patience and perseverance (ὑπομονή, Luke 7:15).242

New Ways of Interpreting Luke’s Reisenotizen
Conzelmann’s elaborate views on Luke’s theology of the Way raised a large number of issues and prompted several debates and responses. The scale of the response has confirmed that after Conzelmann’s study the issue was no longer whether Luke has a theology of the Way, but, instead, of what it stands for.243 The hermeneutical potential of this literary theme has been acknowledged; however, this achievement has come at the expense of a more comprehensive perspective on Luke’s journeying motif. For example, at the origin of these limitations are the key role given to the hypothesis of Markan priority (while a redactional comparison of Luke with Matthew might lead to further important insights on Luke’s purposes
with the Journey section) and a certain dismissal of Acts in interpreting the theology of Luke’s Journey motif.\textsuperscript{244}

According to the theological agenda of the time, NT scholarship has responded to Conzelmann’s reconstruction of Luke’s theology of the Way by stressing that journeying is an element of theological \textit{continuity} not of discontinuity (W. C. Robinson \textit{versus} Conzelmann’s three-stage view on redemption history), a theological vehicle for illustrating the change in the discipleship paradigms of Luke’s gospel and of Acts (S. Brown), and an elusive, dialectic and literary multiform metaphor that contributes to the general narrative coherence and openness of the text (H. Flender).\textsuperscript{245} Characteristically, all these responses have followed to an important extent Conzelmann’s own argument, focusing on Jesus’ \textit{Reisenotizen}.

\textbf{W. C. ROBINSON: THE CONTINUITY OF REDEMPTION HISTORY}

Robinson agreed that Luke has modified the geographical and chronological data of Mark,\textsuperscript{246} but was reluctant to accept Conzelmann’s classical scheme of a three part redemption history.\textsuperscript{247} Consequently, he reassessed Luke’s theology of the Way,\textsuperscript{248} and his influential analysis aimed at demonstrating the ‘theological \textit{homogeneity} of Luke-Acts’, the continuity between Jesus and the Church, and at re-assessing the significance of Luke’s geography, a trend picked up by many authors, afterwards.\textsuperscript{249} Therefore, he discussed Luke’s journey scheme in a more comprehensive, unified manner than Conzelmann, trying to rescue the \textit{geographical} meaning of the Way metaphor from the latter’s \textit{temporal} emphasis.


\begin{enumerate}
\item the Gospel goes into all of Judaea, κοίλησ τῆς Ἰουδαίας,
\item after it started in Galilee, ὁρκάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, and
\item prior to its arrival everywhere, ἐξ ὁδος ὁδεῖ. \textsuperscript{252}
\end{enumerate}

Even the temporal condition for apostleship (that of having been with Jesus \textit{ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ}, Acts 1:21) is expressed geographically, spatially, notes Robinson, as the condition of having participated in Jesus’ journey from Galilee to Jerusalem (Acts 13:31, ὦς ὀφθη ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους τοῖς συναναβαίνουσιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ).\textsuperscript{253} In Acts 1:2, Galilee, a spatial symbol, is a landmark for Jesus’ ministry, not John the Baptist (as Conzelmann emphasized).\textsuperscript{254} Although there is a temporal development in Luke-Acts, Luke uses rather the geographical dynamics of the journey motif.

Prefiguring the later literary analysis of Luke’s unity of composition (space, time, plot) Robinson noted that space and time cooperate dynamically in Luke-Acts in communicating the plan of salvation by the metaphor of the Way.\textsuperscript{255} The plan of bringing together Jews and Gentiles in God’s salvation is brought to fulfillment, dynamically, through a \textit{journeying} gospel, through a ‘geography on the move’

Die lukanische Geographie ist nicht primär statisch an spezifische Orte gebunden, wenn auch besondere Orte eine eigene Bedeutung haben, sondern sie ist eine ‘Geographie in Bewegung’; sie beschreibt eine Reise, die einem Zeitschema folgt, Gottes Plan entspricht und unter Gottes Leitung fortschreitet, eine Reise, auf der von Zeit zu Zeit das Reich Gottes naht, wenn Gott sein Volk heimsucht, einen Weg des Herrn, der zu den Heiden führt, ‘bis daß die Zeiten der Heiden erfüllt werden’.\textsuperscript{256}

In Acts, the Way of Jesus becomes a model for the Way of the Church, for her mission. Journeying with Jesus represents for the disciples the perfect obedience to God, both in Jesus’ lifetime and after his ascension, a divinely guided journey in contrast with the nations’ wandering on their own (Acts 14:16). Therefore, Luke’s vision of this stage of \textit{Heilsgeschichte} could deservedly be entitled \textit{the Way of the Lord} as a journey from Nazareth to Rome.\textsuperscript{257}

Robinson’s emphasis on the \textit{literary} and \textit{theological \textit{continuity}} of the Way motif and on its temporal and spatial dynamics has explored in greater depth Luke’s idealisation of the Way, turning this motif into a major premise for all subsequent literary analysis of Luke’s narrative frameworks.

S. Brown, however, went beyond this barrier of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem. First, he regarded the Way motif as a significant one for the whole of Luke-Acts. Then, for him it is Luke’s second volume which provides the ‘norm of interpretation’ since its author had ‘greater freedom of theological expression in Acts than in the gospel’. Brown, thus, embarks on a reverse approach to the Way theme starting from principles discovered in Acts.

S. Brown and the New Discipleship Paradigms

Characteristically, for Brown the ‘Way’ in Luke-Acts displays ‘unity in diversity’. Therefore, in contrast to Robinson’s understanding of the Way motif, he suggests the need for a greater emphasis on the salvation of the individual.

Robinson, it seems to us, has not devoted sufficient attention to the shifts in meaning within Luke’s Way theology. Furthermore he has treated this terminology almost entirely in connection with Luke’s representation of salvation history. We believe that the Way motif also has significance for the Lukan conception of the salvation of the individual and in particular for his notion of apostasy and perseverance.

To take further his observation, Luke’s motif of the Way is still in need of being assessed as an individual experience, for the majority of journey models have imposed a collective interpretation of the Way, often inspired from the experience of Exodus and from the book of Deuteronomy.

As regards Brown, however, he focused on a particular aspect of individual salvation, the aspect of personal faithfulness in following Christ and later, in following the apostles.

In his comprehensive discussion of peirasmos (temptation, perseverance, trials, apostasy) in Luke-Acts, he objected to Conzelmann’s ‘Satan-free Age of Jesus’ (Lk. 4:13-22:3) on the grounds that Satan’s temptations continued during all of Jesus’ ministry, since it is evident in the lives of his disciples. This is why during Jesus’ earthly ministry “standing by” Jesus on his Way represents the perseverance of the apostles in their faith in Jesus’ messianic dignity, and turning aside from Jesus’ Way signifies apostasy from discipleship.

In Acts, the spatial relation of ‘standing by’ Jesus (διαμένω, which expressed the relationship of the apostles to Jesus, Lk. 22:28) is replaced by a devotion to the apostles, instead, as representatives of the Way (Acts 1:14; 2:42, 46; 6:4; 8:13; 10:2). This transition in the forms of discipleship and in the understanding of the Way reflects the increasing spiritualisation of the Way metaphor, a ‘higher encoding’.

Now that Jesus is removed from the ordinary laws of time and space, salvation can no longer be associated with a spatial relationship to him, as to an historical personality. Instead it is associated (temporarily) with an historical place, with the city of Jerusalem, where alone the disciples can experience the crucial events of the resurrection and the coming of the Spirit. During the period between crucifixion and Pentecost the perseverance of the disciple is visually represented by remaining in Jerusalem.

The two disciples travelling to Emmaus are, for Brown, two ‘runaways’ brought back by Jesus, in contradistinction to the steadfastness of the apostles. His discussion of the Interregnum sets the Emmaus account in a comprehensive static scheme, the journey emphasis or the internal literary motifs being given a secondary place. The Emmaus encounter illustrates, thus, the need for perseverance, for obedience, and highlights Jerusalem’s centrality.

As regards the changes in the meaning of the Way metaphor, for Brown this is ‘no longer connected with an historical person or place’, and ‘no longer signifies a geographical journey made by a human individual, even though the spatial imagery may still be present’. The participation in the geographical journey of Jesus (‘the Way of the Lord’) is replaced in Acts by the proclamation of ‘the Way of the Word’.

Founding his reading of the Way motif on Acts, Brown highlights the tension between Jerusalem’s centrality at Jesus’ resurrection and Ascension (apart from the Emmaus story, the rest of Jesus’ appearances take place in Jerusalem), the initial command to wait in Jerusalem, for the bestowing of the Spirit, and the later missionary change of the journeying pattern.

The new perspective on mission and on Jerusalem changes the journeying paradigm, according to Brown, and this turns from a simple linear expansion to become ‘a radiation in many directions’. After functioning as a destination and a scene for
Jesus’ ἐξοδος, Jerusalem’s centrality is ‘transfigured’, turning into a source of missionary journeys (although this role will be challenged by later by Antioch). For this reason, Brown argues that concomitantly, the Way takes a more independent and metaphorical meaning in Acts.

The Way of the Lord starts to be used more and more in the absolute: the connection with external geographical movement, still present in the metaphorical usage (Acts 1:8) is abandoned.

The Way of the Lord becomes now Christianity itself. On the whole, Brown’s analysis raised the issue of a more literary assessment of Luke’s motif of the Way. To the interpretative role of well-known series of Reisenotizen, he added the importance of Jerusalem and of the Interregnum period as the place and time when journeying paradigms are changed.


Aimed, as well, at providing a theological response to Conzelmann’s historicism, H. Flender’s approach to the Way theme is characterised by a special emphasis on Luke’s use of contrasting perspectives. According to him, Luke-Acts displays a ‘dialectical structure’ and ‘contains a great many parallels of individual texts but also correspondences which run all through the work’.

In principal, his thesis is that Luke has a ‘two stage Christology’, and Jesus’ existence oscillates between two main modes, the heavenly one and the earthly one. As a consequence, against Conzelmann, ‘history cannot be treated objectively’. For Flender ‘history’ and ‘salvation’ are two opposite concepts and Luke distinguishes between ‘a human history’ open to observation and the same ‘history in its eschatological aspect’, which eludes observation.

These two modes of Jesus’ existence are reflected in the multivalent meaning of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem. Flender emphasizes that Jesus journeys towards his Passion as well as towards ‘his heavenly exaltation’. There is, furthermore, an earthly messianic journey of Jesus to the temple; an ‘earthly’ and a ‘heavenly’ journey of his disciples (one, with Jesus, to his Passion; another one to salvation, continuing after Jesus’ resurrection). Following or imitating Jesus’ journeying has its limitations, however, for Jesus’ manner of death is for him alone. The disciples’ journey to salvation continues in Acts through ‘unconditional surrender’ joined with ‘new involvement in the secular order’, two things which ‘co-exist in tension’.

This review of traditional, mainline Lukan scholarship indicates that, apart from considering the ‘way’ metaphor, the main discussion of Luke’s Way motif has tended to focus on Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem and its journey indicators, on its messianic paradigms (the royal Davidic type, the prophet like Moses, the Isaianic New Exodus, the Deuteronomic model, etc.), on the history of redemption and its continuity, on the multiplicity of journeys and the change of journey paradigms (from convergent to Jerusalem to divergent journeying). On the one hand, this points out that the Way motif is a versatile and complex motif, with many nuances to account for. On the other hand, this review emphasized the need to extend the textual basis of the present assessment of the Way motif by considering the whole of Luke-Acts, and to take into account, as well, the shorter journey stories among which are the hodos encounters themselves, with their refined literary style and pervasive Hellenistic intertextuality.
In a perceptive note on Luke’s style, E. Haenchen emphasized that Luke has a specific way of reporting stories, reflecting his ‘conception of the narrator’s calling’. According to him, a narration is, in fact, an interpreted account of events.

A narration should not describe an event with the precision of a police-report, but must make the listener or reader aware of the inner significance of what has happened and impress upon him, unforgottably, the truth of the power of God made manifest in it.\(^{281}\)

Such an understanding represents an implicit reference to selective and interpreted representations of reality, known as *mimesis* (Grk.), or *imitatio* (Lat.), which has been regarded in antiquity as an art involving special techniques and specific philosophies, various trends or fashions, from drama and novels to history, from songs and musical interpretation to painting, sculpture, architecture.

Contemporary NT scholarship has explored surprisingly little how deeply mimesis was ingrained in Hellenistic storytelling, and, hence, in NT writings. As regards the relevance of mimesis for Luke’s style, it is essential to ask, with Steyn, not only what kind of stories could have inspired Luke in his accounts (in terms of content and style, as literary sources) but also what narrative models he followed (in terms of form, plot, type of literary representation).\(^{292}\)

### Mimesis and Its Alternative Meanings

Since mimesis and its cognates are recurrent terms in classical philosophy and in art theories (Plato, Aristotle, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Longinus, etc.), as well as in Hellenistic history writing (Polybius, Theopompus, Ephorus, Duris of Samos, etc.), a first step towards using it in Lukan studies would be to ensure a comprehensive definition of the term. Then, mimesis will be considered from the two main complementary perspectives used in NT studies, as mimesis of *content* or *source* (Luke’s imitation of the LXX style; cf. Brodie, Cadbury,
Definition and Different Types of Mimesis

A complex, versatile term whose precise connotations may vary according to context, mimesis has been translated as "imitation", "representation", "image-making", "reproduction", "expression", or, equally so, as "fiction", "emulation", "make-believe", "impersonation", or even "deception", etc. Historically, the first meaning of mimesis derives from μίμως, a word with cultic connotations, referring to the enacting of a myth through dancing or play, often at the Dionysius' celebrations. The second meaning, as the ending in -μίσις suggests, is that of an action, a process. Phenomenologically, mimesis (μίμησις) is the production of "representations", μίμημα, and indicates a relation between something which is and something made to resemble it.

The concept itself has an in-built reference to 'repetition', yet modern literary theorists have often emphasized that mimesis implies both similarity and difference as fundamental traits. According to M. Heidegger and H.-G. Gadamer, for example, mimesis should not be simply understood as 'primitive imitation' (Nachbilden) but rather as a 'production which comes after' or follows the initial subject in form and (or) content (Nachmachung) involving similarity as well as distance between the imitated model (the 'truth', or the source) and its imitation (the representation).

LINGUISTIC AND STYLISTIC MIMESIS

The contemporary discussion of Lukan mimesis has to do rather with a diachronic approach, for NT scholarship has focused mainly on Luke's imitation of the Septuagint, in style, story and vocabulary, emphasizing Luke's interest in giving his volumes a 'respectable biblical flavour'. Thus, according to Cadbury, the massive presence of semitisms and archaisms in Luke-Acts is a case of 'biblical imitation' which is understandable for 'Luke belonged to a setting in which imitative style was not uncommon'. Septuagintal mimesis has been one of the main emphases of E. Plümacher's studies in Luke's style, as well.

In fact, the presence of Semitisms allows for a rather nuanced interpretation, since there are three possible sources for these Semitisms: direct translation from Semitic, the use of Semitised Greek translations from Semitic (reflecting his own sources), (and) or his conscious imitation of the Septuagin. As Luke's Semitisms in Acts seem to appear in groups or 'pools', N. Turner has argued that such accumulations might indicate that Luke's own language was itself a variant of Semitic Greek. For this reason it was relatively easy for St. Luke 'to write in what merely looks like a LXX style, because it was Jewish Greek; this was his natural speech, and he was expert enough to make it sound quite classical at times'.

This classical, at times, quality of Luke's language and composition, even if marred by inconsistency, is that of a 'conscious artist', 'the most versatile of all NT writers', and this is evident both in Luke's style and his vocabulary. For example, the author removes Aramaic and Latin loan words from his accounts, words which good Hellenistic literary taste would consider barbaric, such as διάβολος for σατανάς, δίδασκαλος for ῥαββί or ῥαββουνί, φόρος for κήρυγς (census), ἐκατοντάρχης for κεντυρίων (centurio). Luke's vocabulary complies well with Aristotle's requirements, thus, since excellence of diction meant for the latter clarity and avoidance of banality and of barbarisms.

Luke-Acts displays, in fact, many other marks of an educated language. He often uses the enthymeme (a syllogism with one of the premises implicit), particularly in Jesus' speeches. He conserves certain classical phrases, 'un certain nombre de tournures classiques, qui avait plus ou moins complètement disparu de la koïnî non littéraire'. And, interestingly, his vocabulary is not so far removed from the literary style of the Atticists' to be beyond comparison with them. In fact, according to Mealand 'Acts is especially close to Attic prose'. Such a comparison with the Atticists, however, has its limits. Phrynichus' list of standard Atticist
vocabulary shows that Luke has a rather mixed style, for whereas he followed many of the Atticist choices, he also used terms of which Phrynichus disapproves.  

In view of such mixed evidence, Luke-Acts was considered to belong to ‘popular’ Greek literature. NT scholars such as A. Wifstrand and L. Rydberg argued that Luke’s language does not aspire towards ‘Atticism’ or ‘Classicism’, although it is an educated language distinct from the every day idioms. According to them, Luke’s prose an intermediary one, a Zwischenprosa, well-used, yet popular written language, a Schreibtischprodukt distinct from the literary Greek of that period.  

L. Alexander has argued in a similar vein, suggesting that the discrepancy between Luke’s style in the preface and that of the rest of his work reflects the fact that his prologue had been composed according to the literary ‘convention of autopsia’, a style used in technical and scientific manuals.

Such arguments emphasize a broad linguistic ‘middle zone’ to which Luke-Acts might belong as literature, avoiding the extremes of seeing Luke’s writing as simply an uneducated Volkssprache or as high literature, Hochliteratur. His imitative style and representational principles would therefore reflect the extent to which classical mimesis permeated the popular culture of the Mediterranean oikoumene.

THEMATIC MIMESIS

T. L. Brodie has specifically developed the argument that Luke’s imitation of LXX vocabulary has been accompanied by an imitation of LXX themes and narrative structures, as well. Characteristically, he sees Luke as a Greco-Roman author who employs rhetorical conventions and as a Christian theologian who interprets the Jewish Scriptures for his own post-resurrection community. He explores in particular Luke’s internalization and appropriation of OT texts as Christian spirituality. Thus, in contrast with Talbert or Barr, Brodie considers that ‘however much the evangelists drew inspiration from various Greco-Roman literary models, they were particularly indebted to the biblical histories’.

For this reason Brodie’s analysis has a certain hybrid look about it. Luke is supposed to have interacted mainly with the OT, yet formally this interaction is best described in terms of Greco-Roman mimesis. What is being omitted here is the idea of a Lukan Greco-Roman imitation of Greco-Roman models, that is, Luke’s mimesis of Hellenistic standards and literary paradigms.

G. Kennedy has justified the OT-oriented approach by arguing that rhetorical mimesis, according to which ‘one studied an author and tried to reproduce his style’, tended to overshadow the earlier Aristotelian meaning of imitation. Where Plato and Aristotle meant ‘imitation of reality or of nature’, the rhetoricians meant ‘imitation or emulation of a classical literary model’. One can cite, for example, Longinus’ emphasis in his treatise On the Sublime where the road to sublimity is ‘zealous imitation of the great historians and poets of the past’ and in their mimesis of the past masters writers contend like athletes to win the crown of excellence. Resting his case on linguistic arguments, Cadbury acknowledges a similar parallel between Lukan biblical imitation and Greek Atticist perfectionism.

Archaism had certainly affected Jewish literature before him. The apocryphal books, the Wisdom of Solomon and First Maccabees... represent an archaizing manner. Indeed all late use of Hebrew was an artificial return to an obsolete language comparable to the tour de force involved in Greek Atticism [...] imitation, of definite authors became a rhetorical practice for young students that finished authors never outgrew. It is therefore not improbable that some of the more obvious Semitisms of the speeches in Acts are Biblical imitation.

It does not seem realistic, however, to restrict the studying of Luke’s style only to the issue of LXX imitation.

COMPOSITIONAL MIMESIS AND SOURCE REPRESENTATION

As a new direction of research, compositional mimesis is more easily to follow now, when narrative approaches to the NT focus on theology as a ‘discourse about God in the setting of a story’, at the centre of this theology being the ‘depiction of reality, ultimate and penultimate, in terms of plot, coherence, movement, and climax’. From Auerbach, Frye, Burke, and Wilder, decisively influential authors on this subject, there ‘has emerged a general concept of the “fictive” representation of “reality” whose scope is broad enough to be applied to history writing as well as to fiction’.
A discussion of the literary representation of reality, in the context of the first century AD, involves from the beginning the need to assess the contrasting concepts of Plato and Aristotle. While Platonic mimesis has to do mainly with image-creating, with copying reality, and with imitation and dramatic impersonation, Aristotle’s is defined by mythos and praxis, story and action, stressing compositional creativity and the narrative re-creation of facts. Plato’s rejection of impersonation as popular and vulgar, his preference for the indirect style creates an interesting context for evaluating Luke’s style, since Luke so often represents speeches and dialogues.

More relevant for the present study of Luke’s literary paradigms, however, seems to be Aristotle’s discussion of mimesis. He emphasizes the paradigmatic nature of plot as an important factor of literary coherence, defining it as the mimesis of an action ‘complete, whole, and of magnitude’, the ‘whole’ (ὅλον) having ‘a beginning, a middle, and end’, so that ‘well-constructed plots [συνεστῶτας εὐ μῦθους], therefore, should neither begin nor end at an arbitrary point, but should make use of the patterns stated’. Aristotle’s definition is both simple and fundamental in its observations, and it has been used almost unchanged in modern narrative studies. For example, W. S. Kurz defines narrative criticism as the study ‘of the plot of any narrative, including history, with a beginning, middle, and end’. Consequently, as D. Tracy explains it, one should not limit in NT studies the Aristotelian reference to his Rhetorics, but instead, ‘we must turn... to the Poetics and its insistence that... form and matter are indissoluble, that the disclosive and transformative power and meaning of the story are grasped only in and through the narrative itself.

Thus, one can note among NT scholars an increasingly emphatic turning to an Aristotelian assessment of NT narratives. For example, according to Dan O. Via ‘the primacy of plot in the parables makes the Aristotelian literary approach especially pertinent’. Hedrick also favours the use of mimesis as defined in Aristotle’s Poetics for the study of Luke’s stories, especially if the plot line involves such themes as journeys, miracles, escapes, arrests, etc. Specifically, he applies Aristotle’s categories in the analysis of the Good Samaritan parable seen as a mimetic illustration of real life. For Hedrick the plot imposed on the story data is a major compositional feature, characteristic for novels as well as for history-writing. Reminding one of Luke’s style, and implicitly of Aristotle’s recognitions and reversals of plot, Ricoeur notes that ‘no story without surprises, coincidences, encounters, revelations, recognitions, etc. would hold our attention’. A comprehensive analysis of a NT text from a composite Platonist-Aristotelian mimetic perspective can be found, in another example, in S. Lücking’s study on Mark 14:1-11. Starting from a literary parallel between one passage in Plato’s Republic and Mark 14:3, i.e. the anointing of a foreigner’s head as a sign of respect for his talents, Lücking introduces the Markan Jesus as a μισός τῶν ἀτιμητῶν, one who identifies himself with the destitute and the inferior.

If his starting point is a Platonic text, reflecting the philosopher’s dislike of actors and foreign performers, in his actual mimetic analysis of Mark 14:1-11 Lücking turns soon to Aristotle’s concepts of diction (λέξις), thought (διανοια), character (ήθος), and plot (μῦθος), affirming the essential literary unity of this text, its compositional structure, its narrative function (Schlüsselfunktion) in the Markan narrative and its historic significance (Mark’s historische Motiv). In an interesting generalisation, Jesus’ Passion, even the whole argument in Mark, represents for him the equivalent of a great messianic recognition (anagnorisis). Such examples as those mentioned above show that compositional mimesis is at present both a necessary and a fashionable perspective in the NT studies, so that a more complex assessment of Luke’s theology of the Way from this point of view, will be, probably, more than welcome.

LITERARY DETAILS AND HISTORICAL REFERENCE

Apart from compositional perspectives on mimesis, an important issue in the debate concerning the forms of representation in the NT is that of historical realism or ‘representational reference’, that is, the reflection in the NT of its historical environment, of life as lived in the first century AD. The issue as such is quite complex. In a way, representational analysis lies in the background of all literary and rhetorical approaches and it allows a ‘critical recovery of the traditional conviction that the text and its interpretation deal with the truth and reality of a world of value that can, however imperfectly, be known’.

In
particular, the quality of this correspondence between narrative and the reality it narrates is the foundation of Luke-Acts as a historical document. At this level, mimesis is a window for testing the author's links with his world, as well as his compositional interests.

Specifically, as regards journeying, Luke-Acts abounds with details highlighting their author's familiarity with journeys in the Hellenistic world, with their customs and itineraries, or with their literary models. The text includes realistic features like journey omens (cf. the symbol of the Dioscuri, Acts 28:11), revelations and dreams at the beginning of journeying (Peter’s Confession and the Transfiguration before Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem, Peter’s vision prior to his visit to Cornelius, Paul’s vision of a Macedonian before his journey to Europe, the prophecy of Agabus before Paul’s journey to Jerusalem, etc.), sailing details. From this perspective Acts as a record of travel and sea-voyage should be given ‘a careful and thorough reading, keeping an eye on the patterns and experience of travel in antiquity’.

The importance of such a realistic reflection of life, thus, seems to reside not only in the assessing of Luke’s credibility yet, as well, in the actual selection of events and in their arrangement in the literary plot, in their symbolic value, in the role they play in communicating the author’s intention.

**Figural Mimesis and Psychological Mimesis**

As a cultural phenomenon, mimesis can take different forms and illustrate various principles. Contemporary studies highlighted, for example, that in terms of techniques and perspectives, one could use two major approaches to mimesis: there is a figural, compositional representation of events, which reflects and reconstructs reality at the narrative level, and, also, a philosophical, psychological type of representation which unveils patterns of social behaviour and deeply-rooted inner motivations.

As regards figural mimesis, E. Auerbach is one of its major and most famous literary theorists who provided an excellent and exquisite excursus in the history of literature, emphasizing the differences between the Greco-Roman and the Biblical representational styles. Auerbach’s historical and figural analysis of mimesis has been taken further by authors such as G. Gebauer and C. Wulf, and, by turning the subject into a fashion, the way was soon paved for a second major discussion of literary mimesis, the psychologising approach of R. Girard, often used in Pauline studies.

For R. Girard, mimesis is a complex phenomenon placed at the intersection of several planes: ethical, philosophical, and literary. Reminiscent of Aristotle’s views, Girard’s mimesis deals with a deeply-rooted human tendency to unconsciously imitate one another, a tendency which leads, according to him, to a culture of discontent and violence. One of the most recognisable patterns of this type of mimesis is the motif of the substitutionary victim sacrificed by a murderous collectivity for the sake of general peace or atonement (the ‘scapegoat’ motif), a pattern largely reflected in myths and early religious literature, as well as in modern novels. In view of this sacrificial emphasis, Girardian mimesis has been regarded with much interest by many NT scholars. Apart from the obvious illustrations that can be found in Paul’s epistles, the Lukan corpus includes, as well, a number of relevant passages and interests. For example, Luke is a keen observer of the social behaviour of large groups as well as of individuals, and of the way the Gospel stirs passions and fears, opposition or enthusiasm, in its journey to ‘the ends of the earth’ (cf. his description of trials, of crowds psychology, etc.; cf. reactions provoked by Paul’s addresses in Acts 16:20, 18:12-17, 19:32-33).

Although the present study is not trying to avoid this Girardian type of insights into Luke’s stories, and is coming quite close, actually, to such an analysis during the assessment of Plato’s social aspects of mimesis and in the study of Luke’s use of the suffering motif, pathos (discussed at length by Aristotle), it will focus, however, more on the stylistic and compositional significance of mimesis in the NT. This approach is closer to Auerbach’s views than that of Girard.

In particular, Auerbach’s discussion provides many inspiring observations for the current study of Luke-Acts. For example, he emphasizes the specific roles of ‘recognition’ in the OT, NT and in the Greek and Latin narratives. To this end he compares, in one famous instance, Odysseus’ recognition by the old Euryclea (Homer, Odyssey, 19.415-505) with the story of Isaac’s sacrifice (Genesis 22:1-20). He highlights there the presence of a high dramatism in the OT accounts versus a peaceful, idyllic representation of reality, in Homer (this contrast is helped, however, by Auerbach’s own selection, for
Isaac's sacrifice takes place in an unfamiliar context, while Odysseus' story takes place in the familiar surroundings of his home). His further observations on Mark's mimetic style play an important role in contextualizing Luke's manner of literary representation, as well. Thus, he argues that the mimetic style of the NT is popular and unsophisticated, impressive through sincerity and personal witness (cf. Fortunata's portrait in Petronius, Satyricon, 37-38, and Percennius' speech in Tacitus, Annals, 1.16-18, versus Peter's repeated denial of Jesus in Mk. 14:67-72). If Petronius and Tacitus display a highly descriptive art, using with great effect the eye-catching details of human life and its predicament, famous retorts or impressing speeches, Mark's style is entirely different betraying 'neither survey and rational disposition, nor artistic purpose', only a natural vivid imitation of reality, the narrator being 'at the core of what goes on; he observes and relates only what matters in relation to Christ's presence and mission'.

The dramatic presentation of Peter's betrayal, in Mark, fits thus 'no antique genre' being placed in an intermediary position: 'too serious for comedy, too contemporary and everyday for tragedy, politically too insignificant for history'. Its form is one of 'such immediacy that its like does not exist in the literature of antiquity'. Its 'seriousness' is not planned or consciously pursued, but rather comes as a consequence of God's own dramatic intervention in history, similar to the dramatism of the Incarnation. By contrast, however, Luke's narration seems closer to Hellenistic mimesis, since his rhetoric is often characterised by eye-catching descriptions or impressing retorts and speeches, or by elaborate dialogues that have no place in Mark, by a careful mis-en-scéne of the story. A closer look at the mimetic concerns of Greek literary theorists such as Plato, Aristotle and Hellenistic historians, could help us understand better the features of NT mimesis, as well as Luke's own, specific style.

**Plato's Mimesis and Its Social Effects**

Plato's discussion of art theories (poetry, music, painting, as mimesis) is characteristically placed in the context of his interest in politics. He is not interested simply in stylistic matters but, concomitantly, in the ethical implications of arts, in their social and political role.
recitation, finds itself, thus, in great danger. Mimesis becomes for Plato a problem of life and death, and behind the rejection of mimetic poetry there is a fear of a ‘loss of self’ and ‘of character’, the minimum poets could do, as a safeguard, is to use more of the plain narrative, and less of impersonation.

To these ethical objections against mimesis Plato adds further philosophical arguments. He rejects it entirely, in the end, especially as image-making: since mimesis mirrors reality (the ideal, divine form, to ἐιδός) only superficially, it deceives its audience with a superficial impression of depth of knowledge.

MIMESIS AS A REFLECTION OF TRUTH

Plato imagines two types of creators: οὐτοργός, the divine creator of essences, ἱδέαι, and ὑλοσυνεργός, who, like a workman, creates three dimensional images of these divine essences. By comparison, painters, as well as poets or any other artists, belong to a third category, as μιμήτες, the imitators of images, whose object of imitation is itself an imitation of something else, thus, an appearance (φαντάσματος μιμήται), and a reflection three times removed from the real essence of the world: τὸν τοῦ τρίτου ἄρα γεννήματος ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως μιμητῆς καλεῖς. Plato reproaches art, then, that it is busy imitating reality ‘at a third remove’ from the divine originals.

Despite these accusations, mimesis can still be an acceptably accurate reproduction of reality, reflecting a true relationship between the human world and that of the divine essences (ἱδέαι). The state’s laws, for example, provide for the people the reflection (μιμήματα) of the truth known by experts. In a certain sense, mimesis is the very formula for the creation of the world. The movements of the stars follow the designs of the Supreme Being, reflecting his eternal nature and intelligence.

Mimesis, therefore, paradoxically, can turn to be acceptable even for Plato if one has got the antidote of a lucid mind (mimesis could act both as a poisonous drug, and as curing medicine, φάρμακον).

SUPERVISED MIMESIS VERSUS MIMETIC CORRUPTION

In particular, through his critique of mimesis Plato tried to control and balance public education and social life, by restricting the usual emphasis on pleasure (ἡδονή) or on artistic fiction (ἀπάτη). His acceptance of mimesis comes with a strong emphasis on the need for state supervision and censorship of mimesis in music, dance and art, education, etc. Even if such supervision was in place, however, Plato preferred the forms of accurate imitation of models to creative or innovative performance which might be open to exaggerations, τῶν ὁμοίων ἑνὸς τοῦ καλοῦ μιμήματι. In other words, he prefers ‘correctness’ to ‘pleasure’, οὕτως ἔνδεια, ἀλλ’ ἔνδεια ὀρφή.

In order to avoid moral ambiguity and the ethical damage caused by mimesis, Plato recommends firm regulations for the education of youth, especially for the young cultural wardens. These, as an elite group invested to watch over the ideological purity of the city and supervise its cultural life should be educated with the greatest care: mimesis was allowed in the form of poetry, acting, recitation, yet only if the youth played or imitated ‘suitable’ parts, like ‘men of courage, self-control, piety, freedom of spirit and similar qualities’ [ἐάν δέ μιμήσις μιμεῖναι μιμεῖται τὰ τούτων προσέκουσα εὕθως ἐκ παιδίων, ἄνδρειος, σοφόν, σοφίος, εὐθειαῖος, καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα πάντα]. They were categorically not allowed to play ‘the parts of women, young or old (for they are men)’, nor such actions like women ‘abusing their husbands or quarrelling with heaven and boasting of their supposed good fortune, or mourning and lamenting in misfortune,… or in sickness or love or childbirth’ for these are not worth of men.

The decent man, ὁ μέτριος ἄνθρωπος, should, therefore, represent only good characters, someone failing only in a few respects and to a limited degree, and should avoid impersonating a man worse than himself. Serious or elevated imitation (παιδία, παιδικά) is here a crucial concept opposed to childish fun (παιδικά χάριν). Otherwise μιμήσις is merely a game not a serious enterprise, παιδικά παῖς καὶ οὐ παιδία.
uses both indirect narratives and the direct (mimetic) style, finding place for impersonation, including numerous speeches in his accounts, emulating the most probable style of their authors (semitisms, LXX phrases, higher Greek, various quotations, etc.; cf. the dialogues and hymns in the Nativity narratives, Lk. 1-3; Peter’s proclamation at Pentecost, Acts 2:14-36; Stephen’s defending speech in Jerusalem, Acts 7:2-57; Paul’s speech in Athens, Acts 17:22-31, etc.). Generally, though, Luke’s imitation tends to be ‘elevated’ or ‘serious’ in style and content, reflecting the nature of his subject, the Christ and his Church.

However, Luke’s missionary reports confirm that Hellenistic towns often adopted a Platonic type of policy towards the disciples, as foreigners, trying to defend their traditional culture against innovations and external challenges. For example, in Acts 16:20, the rich owners of the slave girl with a spirit of divination are antagonised by Paul’s miracle and his preaching of the gospel and use a cultural argument against him: ‘these men are disturbing our city [ἐκτροάσσουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν]; they are Jews and are advocating customs that are not lawful for us as Romans to adopt or observe [ἐὰν ὁ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν παραδείξεσθαι οὐδὲν ποιεῖν].’

A similar argument is put forward in Ephesus (Acts 19:26-27). The imagery of cities with closed gates for strangers is very close to the picture drawn by Plato’s tirade against foreign visiting actors (ἐνσώκουν)

Do not imagine, then, that we will ever thus lightly allow you to set up your stage beside us in the market-place, and give permission to those imported actors of yours, with their dulcet tones and their voices louder than ours, to harangue women and children and the whole populace, and to say not the same things as we say about the same institutions, but, on the contrary, things that are, for the most part, just the opposite.

The casual visitor had to be checked at arrival ‘when he comes to the city, at the markets, harbours, and public buildings outside the city’, etc., so that none of these strangers should ‘introduce any innovation [μὴ νεωτερικῷ]’

A different treatment was in view, yet, for the foreign cultural representative (or ‘inspector’) who journeyed ‘to view some noble object which is superior in beauty to anything to be found in other States’. The city leaders should politely assist such a quest for cultural information. By accepting such visitors honour is done to ‘Zeus, patron of strangers, instead of expelling strangers by means of meats and ceremonies... or else, by savage proclamations’. In this way, two of Luke’s main themes in Acts, the status of the visiting evangelist and the cultural significance of meals, can be checked, independently, in the philosophy of life of the first-century Hellenistic town (cf. Acts 16:20, 17:16-34, 19:26-27, etc.; yet also in the rest of NT, from a Christian cultural perspective, this time, in 2 Jn. 1:9-11; 3 Jn. 1:10-11, Rom. 14-15).

Greek cultural inspectors (θεοφόρος), however, were dealt with caution; should they return with corrupted ideas after visiting foreign states in search of best customs and teachers, they could face death for ‘being a meddler in respect of education and the laws’.

It is interesting to note that, apart from the status of the evangelist in a foreign city, mentioned before in relation to Acts (Acts 16:20, 17:16-34, 19:26-27) Luke’s narrative reflects the unsettling effects of cultural mimesis, in various forms, with Jewish nuances, in his ‘on the road’ encounters. For example, Saul had the high priests’ support in arresting the Christians, who could be seen as cultural innovators who ‘belonged to the Way’. Later, he shares the fate of the Greek cultural inspectors who become themselves infected with new, foreign teaching during their visits and faced the condemnation of the state (although, the first Christians were not ‘foreign’ yet a very Jewish messianic sect).

Similarly, the Emmaus road dialogue between Jesus and Cleopas (Lk. 24:19-21) mentions the violent intervention of the Jerusalem leaders against Jesus, who was arrested and condemned to death on similar grounds, as an innovative preacher, a powerful prophet who challenged the established ways of Jerusalem (Girard’s scapegoat mechanism is well illustrated in the four gospels, in the violent, collective, social mimesis that led to Jesus’ crucifixion).

Further, the Ethiopian eunuch, as a challenging person, is implicitly presented as a stranger or foreign inspector looking for cultural and religious illumination, yet unable to raise himself up to the standards of Zion (due to his physical condition and his lack of understanding of the Scriptures). After unsettling the established paradigms of worship in Samaria, Caesarea and Azotus, Philip’s ministry integrates him into the new people of God, and the Ethiopian eunuch
himself would probably unsettle the worshipping paradigms of his native Ethiopia (Acts 8).

Paul’s missionary journeys are further evidence that Luke’s journeying accounts and the gospel’s effect in Luke-Acts can be well understood as cultural interaction between the city-state and the visiting evangelist. His journeys are journeys of challenge and change rather than journeys of perfect integration in the Hellenistic Mediterranean world.

Aristotle’s Mimesis as Creative Representation

The majority view is, with certain nuances, that Aristotle has developed his concept of mimesis in dialogue with Plato’s correspondent category, if not as a response to him. It is very tempting to frame Aristotle’s theory in Platonic terms, especially as mimesis is defined in Plato (Rep. 393c.5-6), but has no definition in Aristotle’s Poetics. Thus, as L. Golden contends, Plato’s views on mimesis represents the ‘principal point of departure’ for Aristotle’s aesthetic theories.401 Aristotle’s refinement of Plato’s mimesis seems to end up ‘meaning almost the exact opposite of what Plato had meant by it’.408 Alternatively, it might simply represent an independent argument since ‘there is no good internal evidence that Aristotle was driven in the Poetics by the need to answer Plato’.409 The scale, however, seems to incline towards Aristotle’s opposition to Plato: even a formal detail like Plato’s famous criticism of Homer, is completely reversed in Aristotle’s Poetics who praises the famous bard for his use of mimesis.

Aristotle’s theory of art is both a refutation of Plato’s negative view of mimesis and a skilled and revolutionary refinement of his great teacher’s insight into the positive force of mimesis.407

Homer deserves praise for many other qualities, but especially for realising, alone among epic poets, the place of the poet’s own voice. For the poet should say as little as possible in his own voice, as it is not this that makes him a mimetic artist. The others participate in their own voice throughout, and engage in mimesis only briefly and occasionally, whereas Homer, after a brief introduction, at once brings ‘onto stage’ a man, woman, or other figure (all of them rich in character).409

For Aristotle mimesis, yet, is more than just Homeric impersonation. Primarily, it has to do with literary creativity, with the art of representing reality through a complex story.

Aristotle and Literary Imagination

For Aristotle mimesis is a key term - his ‘master concept’ as Else put it,401 which relates action and plot, praxis and mythos, the creative writer and the world of real events. In a surprising move, instead of a definition, Aristotle provides his readers with a rather naturalistic justification of mimesis.

Imitation reflects, thus, an ‘instinctive’ cognitive disposition, all its forms originating in mankind’s natural desire for knowledge. This desire provides the pleasure (δοξη) of learning and inference (συνεγερέσθαι).403

Creativity in representation is present at several levels in the artist’s work. For example, in his choice of mimetic media (rhythm, language, music; τινὶ μίμησιν ἐν ρυθμῷ, καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἀρμονίᾳ),404 or of a mimetic mode (narrative or dramatic enactment),405 or of a mimetic object like men in action (πρᾶττοντας οὐδὲν αἰτήσαντο).406 Mimetic representations can have for objects reality or an imagined picture ‘things which were or are the case; the kind of things that people say and think; the kind of things that ought to be the case [ἡ γὰρ ὤν ἡ ἑστὶν, ἡ σοῦ φασὶν καὶ δοκεῖ, ἡ οίκα ἐνείη δεξί].407 One could add to this list of subjects poetical licence, as well, even ‘impossible things’, ἀδύνατα.408

Quite clearly, thus, Aristotle had in view a different kind of imitation, namely, a creative mimesis.409 His mimesis is so little reduplication of reality that he emphasizes the need for idealised characters in tragedy, who act as better characters than existing humans (βελτίως μιμοῦσθαι βούλεται τῶν ἄνω).410 In fact, in literary works mimesis re-creates reality.411 Therefore, as Hedrick notes, according to Aristotle ‘the “poet” is an inventor, ποιητῆς, of plots, or one might say a “maker” of stories’. Poetry constitutes ‘the re-presentation or μίμησις of an action’.412
Since poetic creativity and imaginative writing are central to Aristotle’s *mimesis*, the making of plots is, also, a complex artistic endeavour. The plot line, as such, plays an important part in the overall purifying effect of the dramatic art, through its *καθαρσις* or cleansing of the emotions and intellect, by feelings of fear and pity (δι’ ἐλέους καὶ φόβου).

Luke’s writing is clearly aiming at such an effect, as it often emphasizes the characters’ feelings. For example, the two disappointed disciples, Cleopa and his companion, feel, on their journey to Emmaus, that their hearts were ‘burning’ at Jesus’ words (Lk. 24:32, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καυσίμενη ἤν [ἐν ἡμῖν]); Saul is portrayed as ‘breathing destruction’ (Acts 9:1, ἐμπνέυσαν ἀπελήνικα); and Christians were afraid of him even after his conversion (Acts 9:26); the Ethiopian journeys further ‘full of joy’ (Acts 8:39, χαίρειν); etc. The list of Lukan examples can continue, beyond the ‘hodos’ stories, and so when Peter is recognized by Rhoda the whole church rejoices (Acts 12:13-16), when Eutichus is brought back to life the whole church is comforted (Acts 20:12), when the snake bite has no effect on Paul the Malteans are amazed (Acts 28:2-6), etc.

**ARISTOTLE’S UNDERSTANDING OF PLOT**

The plot (μύθος) of story is given special attention by Aristotle, who values highly the plots well-made (τὸν καλὸν ἔχοντα μύθον) and the well-constructed (συνεστῶσας εὐ μύθον). Of the six components of tragedy (plot - μύθος, character - ἡμισι, diction - λέξις, thought - διάνοια, spectacle - ὀπίς, and lyric poetry - μελοποιία), the plot is described as the first principle, the soul of tragedy (ἀρχὴ μὲν οὖν καὶ οἷον ψυχῆς ὁ μύθος τῆς τραγῳδίας). Aristotle calls it ‘the goal of tragedy’, ‘the most important of all things’ in a story (ὁ μύθος τέλος τῆς τραγῳδίας τὸ δὲ τέλος μεγίστου ἀπάντων), and, so, its link with mimesis is of particular value for one’s literary style.

**Mimesis and Plot Shaping**

Indeed, there is a very close relation between the literary plot (mythos) and the action (praxis) it represents. The plot imitates action, and in the same way action is a succession of real events, the plot is a succession of narrative scenes and a synthesis of real events: ‘the plot is the mimesis of the action... the construction [structure] of events [ἐστιν δὲ τῆς μεν πράξεως ὁ μύθος ἡ μίμησις, λέγω γάρ μύθον τούτων τὴν συνθέσιν τῶν πραγμάτων]’; μύθος is a concept of order which makes it possible to view literary works as ‘structured wholes’.

The dynamics of plot derives from the dynamics of its object: it coherently portrays ‘people in action’, ‘people on the move’ (ἡ γὰρ τραγῳδία μίμησις ἐστιν οὐκ ἀνθρώπινον ἀλλὰ πράξεως καὶ βίου), The causal connection between the various parts of a plot reconstructs on the literary level the coherence of the real life action. Outstandingly witty, this concept of Aristotle has encouraged various, further elaborations. For example, D. O. Via attempted to define ‘literary themes’ or paradigms as a ‘plot at a standstill’ (a definition well-suited for Luke’s paradigms, as well).

**Plot Components**

Aristotle mentions four main elements of the dramatic plot: ‘reversal’ (περιπέτεια), ‘recognition’ (ἀναγνώρισις), ‘suffering’ (πάθος) and ‘character’ (ἡμισι). Emphasizing the dynamic structure of a plot, Aristotle notes that ‘reversal’ and ‘recognition’ are the two most important elements of plot for the emotional effect of tragedy. They are major factors of change (μεταβολή, μετάβασις) in the story line, and in relation to them plots could be ‘simple’ when ‘the change of fortune occurs without “reversal” or “recognition”’, or ‘complex’ when ‘the change coincides with a “recognition” or “reversal” or both’.

‘Reversal’ (περιπέτεια) is ‘a change to the opposite direction of events’, that is in accord ‘with probability and necessity’. ‘Recognition’ (ἀναγνώρισις, ‘discovery’ for Fyfe), as its name suggests, is ‘a change from ignorance to knowledge, leading to friendship or enmity, and involving matters which bear on prosperity or adversity’. The best plots superimpose these two for a more memorable effect – and, as will be seen, some of Luke’s hodos stories meet this requirement, combining recognition and reversal and building effective narratives.

Recognition can take different forms in a story and Aristotle identifies four types of recognition. The simplest and un inventive is ‘recognition through tokens (διὰ τῶν σημείων), like birth marks, scars, etc. (cf. Odyssey’s recognition by Euryclea, Odyssey, 19.415-505). The second type is contrived recognition, manufactured by the story-teller (αἱ πεποιημέναι) by ‘false’ or forced reasoning, παραλογισμός, external to the story and belonging to the poet, that is by means of letters, voice, etc. The third type of recognition is through memory (διὰ
μὴ μὴ) referring to things whose sight brings awareness. Finally, the fourth type of recognition is by reasoning, or syllogism (ἐκ συλλογισμοῦ), a ‘second best’ in relation to the complex plot based on recognition and reversal, where, as mentioned, narrative coherence results ‘from the events themselves, where the emotional impact comes from a probable sequence’. 

The third element of plot is described by the concept of ‘suffering’ (πάθος; Fyfe’s rendering: ‘calamity'; Butcher: ‘scene of suffering'; Halliwell: ‘suffering'). According to Aristotle’s definition ‘calamity [suffering] is a destructive or painful occurrence, such as a death on the stage, acute suffering and wounding and so on [πάθος δὲ ἐστὶν πράξις φθορτική ἢ ὀδυνηρά, κτλ]'). The most effective types of suffering are those where these calamities happen among friends, when for instance brother kills brother, or son father, or mother son, or son mother - either kills or intends to kill, or does something of the kind, that is what we must look for’ (this vividly reminds one of Saul’s conversion and persecution, Stephen’s death, etc.).

The fourth element of plot is the ‘character’ (ἥθος). Essential to a dramatic character is that it ‘reveals [ethical] choice’, τὴν πρὸσοφροσύνην, and people should be able to identify with such ‘dispositions’. Thus, (a) dramatic characters should be ‘good’ (χρήστας; positive in intentions, although the outcome might be contrary to them), (b) be ‘appropriate’ (τὰ ἐρωτικὴν; building a persona that corresponds or harmonises to the common social prejudices, or perception); (c) be ‘like’ real life (τὸ ὁμοιοῦν, corresponding to live cases, similar to reality, genuine, believable, credible); and (d) be ‘consistent’ (τὸ ομαλὸν).

In the well-made tragedy the reversal of destiny should be caused by an inner, human ‘flaw’ of the main character, that leads him (her) downwards from prosperity into adversity (ἐξ ἐυτυχίας εἰς δυστυχίαν). The nature of this Aristotelian ‘flaw’ has been greatly debated, yet it should not be identified with depravity but rather with a great human error, intellectual or moral (δι’ ἀμαρτίας μεγάλην) that makes the character both a toy of destiny and morally responsible. Such a flaw is evidently present in Saul’s life, before conversion, and in the disappointment of Cleopas and his companion. Jesus’ suffering at the Passover, on the other hand, represents a descent into adversity on behalf of someone else’s flaw or error, or sin, involving the force of divine destiny, dei.
Luke cares openly for the narrative unity of his stories, in terms of time and space. For example, Luke 24 gives the impression of one single day (Lk. 24:1, 23, 29, 33 and 36). Saul’s conversion gives the impression of taking place in just a few days, (cf. Acts 9 and Galatians 1-2).

Finally, two other elements of tragedy contribute to its unity, its ‘diction’ (λέξις), and its argument or ‘thought’ (διάνοια). ‘Diction’ is defined by Aristotle as expression through choice of words [λέξεως ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν διὰ τῆς ὁνομασίας ἐρμηνείαν], whose components are element, syllable, connective, noun, verb, conjunction, inflection, statement.\textsuperscript{447} Mastering diction means ‘clarity and avoidance of banality’, elegance and conviction being endangered by the use of loan words, metaphors, vowel lengthenings.\textsuperscript{448} Similarly, ‘thought’ represents ‘the capacity to say what is pertinent and apt [τὰ ἐνότα καὶ τὰ ἀρμοττοντά],\textsuperscript{449} and it deals with the content and the form the argument (‘proof, refutation, the conveying of emotions’, the use of rhetoric style).\textsuperscript{450} In this respect, Luke’s style is well known for its wordplays, loan words, educated turns of phrase, and, for local colour, semitisms, direct and indirect speech, reports, convincing dialogues, all enhancing the unity and the literary dynamism of the story.

**Hellenistic Historians and Mimesis**

Although at home in literary works, in novels, compositional mimesis and literary style cannot be avoided by historians, either.\textsuperscript{451} History writing can be seen, in fact, as a mimetic representation, yet in a different way than poetry.

The difference between the historian and the poet is not that between using verse or prose; Herodotus’ work could be versified and would be just as much a kind of history in verse as in prose. No, the difference is this: that the one relates actual events [τὰ γεγονόμενα], while the other the kinds of things that might occur [οἵ τις αὐτοί γένοιτο]. Consequently, poetry is more philosophical [φιλοσοφώτερον] and more elevated than history [σπουδαίότερον; of graver import, Fyfe; see also in Halliwell, LCL, p. 59, n. (b)], since poetry relates more of the universal [τὰ καθόλου], while history relates particulars [τὰ καθ’ ἐκαστὸν].\textsuperscript{452}

History and poetry are contrasted in terms of object (the actual things - τὰ γεγονόμενα, and the particular - τὰ καθ’ ἐκαστόν, for history; the possible things - οἵ τις αὐτοί γένοιτο, and the general - τὰ καθόλου, for poetry; similarly, the mundane and less elevated matters, for history, versus mimesis of elevated matters, σπουδαίος, for poetry, and, in terms of general approach: philosophical versus unphilosophical.\textsuperscript{453}

For most Hellenistic historians, however, writing history involved a philosophical and didactic emphasis, the goal of moral improvement. History writing aimed at providing significant examples, παράδειγματα, for people to emulate or to avoid.\textsuperscript{454} Aristotle’s contrast between history and poetry can be seen as a mild, balanced one for ‘history is not absolutely disparaged: it is merely said to be less philosophic and worthwhile than poetry’.\textsuperscript{455} His assessment is certainly less radical, for example, than that of Polybius for whom history writing should involve an applied, useful imitation of truth (χρήσιμον), while poetic representations are mainly aimed at delighting (τερπόνον).\textsuperscript{456}

A study of the Hellenistic fashion of history writing strengthens the case for a stylistic overlap between the two genres (history and poetry), especially if one considers mimesis in its historical development.\textsuperscript{457} Thus, it has been suggested that Duris and others could have adopted a certain style for history writing under the influence of the Poetics yet in a way not intended by Aristotle, according to which history should ‘compete with poetry for the quality of [τὰ] καθόλου [universal things] by adopting its means of presentation’.\textsuperscript{458}

The writings of the late Hellenistic historians such as Theopompus, Phylarchus, Theophorus, Duris, etc., reflect a changed perception of history, able to use the literary means of tragedy, or turn its accounts into a colourful, entertaining story (displaying a taste for ‘des portraits individuels et une vision dramatique de l’histoire... l’effet esthétique et théâtral... la tendance au pathétique’), focused on persons not only on events, on their entire life as a vivid representation of a given epoch and of its morals.\textsuperscript{459} Such a dramatic-artistic way of representing history is found increasingly significant for the assessment of Luke’s own literary style, as his own manner of writing shares the same of the tendencies of these three Hellenistic historians.\textsuperscript{460}

**Theopompus’ Mimetic Style**

*Theopompus* has parted with the conservative tradition of Thucydides and Xenophon, and his manner of writing history has provided at the same time the model followed by many subsequent historians (especially by Duris and Phylarchus).\textsuperscript{461}
As Pédech notes, following the models of Herodotus in the use of sources and travel, of Hecateus in erudition and geographical information, and of Hellanicos in mythology, Theopompus’ writings often have a pronounced geographic and ethnographic character. In particular, he focused on the role of the individual, not of the city-state, as the main agent of history. Polybius reproached him, for example, for having narrated Greek history centred on Philip, instead of presenting Philip as part of the larger history of Greece: ‘it would have been much more dignified and fairer to include Philip’s achievements in the history of Greece than to include the history of Greece in that of Philip’. Despite this criticism, however, with Theopompus narration makes room for dramatic scenes and ‘acts’. As Walbank notes, he was the first to use πράξεως as ‘the acts of...’, ‘a historical account of somebody’s life’.

Phylarchus’ Mimetic Style

Phylarchus’ style was specifically sensationalist, and, as Polybius characterised it, saturated with ‘random and careless statements’. Polybius criticises his attempts at arousing ‘pity and sympathy’ by portraying events in a way peculiar ‘to tragedy, but not to history’. He has a penchant towards ‘bringing horrors vividly before our eyes’, stories like ‘clinging women with their hair dishevelled and their breasts bare’, ‘crowds of both sexes together with their children and aged parents weeping and lamenting as they are led away to slavery’, the torturing to death of the ex-tyrant Aristomachus of Argos, the recounting of catastrophes (περιπετείαι, ‘reversals’) for the sake only of dramatic effect, often without other clear motifs or aims.

Nevertheless, with this kind of Hellenistic historians, the gap between history and tragedy became increasingly smaller. As Quintilian writes, history is seen as having a right to use the means and the aims of poetic prose

Duris’ Mimetic Style

Duris needs to be mentioned, in particular, as the Hellenistic historian whose work has generated a complex discussion of the role of mimesis in the historian’s accounts. In a famous fragment from Macedonica, he criticised his predecessors, Theopompus and Ephorus, according to the custom, for their shortcomings in using mimetic techniques

His understanding of mimesis is, however, difficult to assess. Τῶν γενομένων πλέαστον ἀπελεύθησαν has been translated in various ways: ‘Sie haben nicht Geschichte zu schreiben verstanden’; ‘they cut themselves off from the past’; ‘Éphore et Théopompe sont de beaucoup inférieurs aux autres écrivains.’ N. G. Wilson translates ‘Ephorus and Theopompus quite failed to do justice to events. They had no talent for faithful reporting or making narrative agreeable, and were only interested in writing’.

The central idea of Duris’ criticism seems to be, however, not so much a parting with the tradition, as rather a failure to keep up with more recent developments. It is interesting to note that in Suda’s Lexicon, Ephorus’ style is said to have been simple, flat and without vigour: ‘Sie haben nicht Geschichte zu schreiben verstanden’; ‘they cut themselves off from the past’; ‘Éphore et Théopompe sont de beaucoup inférieurs aux autres écrivains.” N. G. Wilson translates ‘Ephorus and Theopompus quite failed to do justice to events. They had no talent for faithful reporting or making narrative agreeable, and were only interested in writing’.

This shows the complexity of the quotation above: what does Duris mean by his criticism of their γράφειν, or art of writing, or style? It has been suggested that he imputes to them their exacerbated attention to the γραφικὴ λέξις (the epideictic style, used in written accounts, which had different requirements and goals from, say, the more lively, open debate style, ἀγωνιστικὴ λέξις, the style of spoken oratory). According to Strasburger, in contrast with Plutarch’s traditional style of recording facts or legends, Duris prefers a more modern style and criticises Ephorus’ and Theopompus’ accounts for being neither truthful representations of life (μιμητικὴ), nor leading to artistic pleasure (ἡδονή).
Therefore, it is difficult to attain a ‘correct’ rendering of this tension between simple and entertaining style, between sensationalist descriptions and correct representations. One could suggest, however, the following dynamic translation

Ephorus and Theopompus have fallen short of modern standards: they have neither given proper place to mimesis, nor to a pleasant literary description, and cared only for a stylish sensationalist recording.\(^{478}\)

Of course, one of the main difficulties here is raised by the link between μίμησις, ἡδονής and ἐν τῷ φράσοι: is ἐν τῷ φράσοι linked logically to μίμησις, or to ἡδονής? Some authors supported the first variant,\(^{479}\) while for others, μίμησις and ἡδονής are two interdependent concepts and Duris used imitation in Aristotle’s sense as a reproduction (mimesis) in words (ἐν τῷ φράσοι) which brings the pleasure (ἡδονής) of understanding.\(^{480}\)

Yet, the crux of the problem still remains: what does Duris understand by historical mimesis? According to C. W. Fornara, μίμησις here is ‘an imitation of the emotion aroused by history’, much as in Phylarchus’ stories, emphasizing the human surprise at the workings of Fate (Fortune, Tyche).\(^{481}\) According to this sensationalist interpretation, Duris’ mimesis comes close to meaning vivid representation, and this is how the majority of scholars have understood it.\(^{482}\) V. Gray has suggested a different reading, however, arguing that Duris’ mimesis is most likely used with the meaning found in later writers such as Demetrius, Dionysius and Longinus. This kind of mimesis refers to an appropriate imitation of characters and situation, a representation ‘true to nature’.\(^{483}\)

Pédech, also, writes that for Duris ‘la μίμησις est une représentation concrète, quasi picturale de la réalité’,\(^{484}\) which is reminiscent of Plato and Plutarch (cf. Plutarch’s comparison between painting and history, one working with colours, the other with words).\(^{485}\) By way of parenthesis, the metaphor of painting has also been used to describe Luke’s style, his mixing of the artistic with the discordant recalling the style of an impressionism painter.\(^{486}\) One finds it, as well, in Aristotle, where poetic mimesis is similar to painting, and the poet is a mimetic artist, like a painter or any other image-maker (ἐστι μιμήτης ὁ ποιητής ὑπερέρχει ζωγράφος ἢ τις ἀλλός εἰκονοποιοῖς).\(^{487}\) The imagery of painting is also echoed in the requirement that the stories’ characters should be ὁμοιον and ὁμιλῶν (genuine and consistent).\(^{488}\)

In particular, Pédech draws attention to fragment F 89, where Duris used the term ἐκμιμηθόται. Commenting on Iliad, 21.234-248 (the overflow of Scamander in the pursuit of Achilles, as a mad flooding tide tumultuously sweeping the shore, and everything on it: cattle, people, trees, etc.), Duris argues that such imagery provides an accurate idea (ἐννοοῖν) of the real event.\(^{489}\) In conclusion, for Pédech ‘l’objet de la e!nnoia est de faire naître cette ἐννοοῖα, qui doit produire une peinture ressemblante et une impression forte’.\(^{490}\) Duris’ emphasis on historical representation appears to advocate an accurate yet dramatic impression of the real world.\(^{491}\)

Hellenistic Mimesis and Luke’s Journey Models

Apart from cultural, literary, and historical mimesis, Luke’s journey stories had another important resource, the Hellenistic novels with their adventures and ideology. Novelistic literature and its reflections in the LXX and in the Greco-Roman legends, provided Luke with major illustrations of literary mimesis at work.

The Journey Motif in Hellenistic Novels

As Pervo notes, whereas ‘historical monographs with convincing affinities to Acts are difficult to identify... novels that bear likeness to Acts are... relatively abundant’.\(^{492}\)

Literary parallelism with the Hellenistic novels became more attractive for the New Testament scholars when it was shown that a previously late dating for novel authorship, in general, from the fourth-sixth century AD onwards,\(^{493}\) needs to be amended to an earlier one, which starts from about 100 BC with the Ninus Romance, continues with Chariton’s Callirhoe (25 BC - AD 50), with Iamblichus’ Babyloniaka (approx. second century AD) and goes as late as Heliodorus’ Ethiopika and Philostratus’ The Life of Apollonius of Tyana (third - fourth century AD).\(^{494}\)

The earlier romances placed their plots in plausible historical contexts, linking them to important figures of the past or important events (Ninus, Callirhoe, the fragmentary Metiochus and Parthenope), whereas the later ones broke free of the influence of history writing and came closer to the literary and stylistic interests of the Second Sophistic (AD 70-300).\(^{495}\)
Culturally, the novel genre dominated the centre of the Mediterranean world and developed during a stable and prosperous period, when the Hellenistic East had recovered from the ravages of early Roman imperialism, and when ‘the parochialism of the polis was no longer dominant’.\textsuperscript{496} The literary environment was rather Hellenised than Hellenic,\textsuperscript{497} a multiracial one: for example, of the novelists whose works have been preserved, such as Heliodorus, Lucian and Iamblichus who were Syrians, and Achilles Tatius who was a native of Alexandria.\textsuperscript{498}

As novels were the product of a cosmopolitan society on the move, economically flourishing, militarily active and socially mobile,\textsuperscript{499} the voyage motif - already a major literary theme in Greek literature\textsuperscript{500} - became one of the most cherished plot lines in popular literature. Novels or romances have even been defined as ‘a fictional tale of adventure, usually written in prose, and most often involving love and travel’.\textsuperscript{501} Nicetos Eugemianus, a Byzantine novelist, describes merrily the novel genre in the following suggestive words

\begin{quote}
Flight, wandering, captures, rescues, roaring seas,  
Robbers and prisons, pirates, hunger's grip;  
Dungeons so deep that never sun could dip,  
His rays at noon-day to their dark recess,  
Chained hands and feet; and, greater heaviness,  
Pitiful partings. Last the story tells  
Marriage, though late, and ends with wedding bells.\textsuperscript{502}
\end{quote}

As an example, Chariton’s \textit{Callirhoe} comes close to certain features of Luke’s journeys in Acts and fits the story line mentioned above: numerous adventures and final ‘re-wedding bells’ (an incredible \textit{re-union} after the marriage proper took place at the beginning of the dramatic plot).\textsuperscript{503} These adventures happened during a series of eventful journeys in the Mediterranean area, from Syracuse to Babylon, through Miletus and Cyprus, and back (\textit{cf.} Acts) and started with Callirhoe’s survival after a severe injury inflicted by her jealous husband Chaereas.\textsuperscript{504} Saved by the pirates, she sails with them, remarries in Miletus, and journeys to Babylon to king Artaxerxes’ court where is captured by the sieging army, where her ex-husband served. Finally, they meet in an interesting \textit{recognition} scene, and the story ends happily with a re-marriage back at Syracuse.\textsuperscript{505}

In this literary context, not only Acts, but also Luke’s gospel has been seen as conforming ‘to the pattern of Hellenistic literature, in which the story of the travelling teacher or wonder-worker was a favourite theme’.\textsuperscript{506} Acts’ story line was seen as supported by the idea of a Mediterranean voyage, a ‘geographical expansion of the Gospel message from Jerusalem “to the end of the earth” (1.8)’.\textsuperscript{507}

Voyages, in conclusion, being ‘integral to the plot of both Acts and Greek romance’ can provide ‘a good starting point for a comparative analysis of Acts and the Greek novels’.\textsuperscript{508} Such parallels allow the reader to perceive not only geography as an opportunity for entertaining writing, but also history as literature, highlighting the importance of the plot and of journeying as major factors of narrative coherence.\textsuperscript{509}

In this way, the Hellenistic novel constitutes an important resource for Luke’s cultural and geographical perspective

The novels, products of this [Hellenized, Greco-Roman] \textit{oikoumenē}, often set their action precisely where Christianity first took root and flourished: Barnabas’ Antioch, Paul’s Tarsus, John’s Ephesus, Mark’s Alexandria, Polycarp’s Smyrna. But the point of comparison is not mere propinquity, for the novels provide an extensive, concrete, and coherent account of the traditional culture of the New Testament world.\textsuperscript{510}

This genre represents a convenient model for Luke’s stories: it does not force upon the text any strict structure; it reflects the hybrid variety of the Hellenistic environment (no single \textit{lex operis}),\textsuperscript{511} and still provides a well defined literary model (similar plots, literary dependence).\textsuperscript{512} As an objection, however, L. Alexander argued that the voyage plot in Acts differs from the plot of romance: thus, the NT hero is not a single individual but a collective entity (the Church) or a rhetorical entity (the Word); and the journeying movement in the NT is centrifugal, illustrating expansion, not the ‘outward-and-return structure of the novels’.\textsuperscript{513} Luke’s \textit{hodos} stories give certain grounds for disagreement, however, since Philip or Saul, or Cleopas are journeying as \textit{individually}, not collective characters. As well, Paul’s missionary journeys are notorious for their return-and-report pattern, since he always comes back to Antioch and Jerusalem for reports.
The Journey Motif in Jewish Literature

As evidence that Luke uses traditional Jewish sources, not only Hellenistic patterns, one needs to consider the OT journey and encounter models and those in the Apocrypha. A short review will confirm that at the level of the LXX material many stories conformed to the compositional features recommended by Aristotle (evidence of cultural influence - for the newer stories, and of general literary skills - for the earlier ones) providing Luke with both scriptural parallels and inspiring literary models.

Old Testament Models

The OT provides a number of important literary models for Luke's journey and encounter motif (cf. L. Brodie, H. Gunkel, E. Reinmuth). Among these are the divine hospitality and revelation stories like Genesis 18:1-15 (three divine visitors meet Abraham and share a meal together), Genesis 19:1-23 (two angels visited Lot prompting him to a journey out of Sodom; they can turn people blind, ἐπάταξαν ἁφαίρεσιν ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἐκ μεγάλου, v. 11); the leadership encounter in Joshua 5:13-6:6 (Joshua and the commander of the army of the Lord, a story which parallels the divine commissioning of Moses, Exod. 3:1-4:18); Balaam's unexpected 'on the road' encounter with the Lord's angel - which, again, includes the sight motif and the recognition element (Num. 22:21-36). A short review will confirm that at the level of the LXX material many stories conformed to the compositional features recommended by Aristotle (evidence of cultural influence - for the newer stories, and of general literary skills - for the earlier ones) providing Luke with both scriptural parallels and inspiring literary models.

Tobit's Journey and Encounter

The novel-like story of Tobit's healing is usually seen by NT scholarship as a major LXX parallel of Luke's account of Saul's recovery of sight (cf. Tob. 11:7-18). Yet, this story, aimed at vindicating a righteous Jew (6:1-9; 7:1; 11:1-6), is also an interesting example of a plot built around a divinely guided journey.

The Way and Hellenistic Mimicry

The problematisation present in the Jewish Hellenistic novels is actually the feature which differentiates them most from Greek novels and takes them closer to Greek drama

The sense of a threat is increased, the point of conflict is sharpened and the scope of the action is limited and turned inward upon one or two protagonists who bear the burden of their extended family, and by extension, of Jews in general.

This strengthening of the suffering element of the plot (πόδος) corresponds to the general realism and dramatism of the biblical tradition (cf. Auerbach), and has allowed Jewish novels to contribute in a specific way to the literary genre of Hellenistic novel. Apart from this enhanced perception of conflict they manifest a preference for journeying as an opportunity for new experiences and wisdom, as in Ben Sirach or in Philo as well as for journeying as a means of individual salvation, delivery, and reversal of fate.
the healing of Tobit and the wedding of Tobias (11:14-18). Raphael as a divine guide mediates God’s blessing and restoration and discloses his identity only at the end (12:11-22, a recognition scene), when ascending to heaven (ιδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν ἀποστειλαντά με... καὶ άνέβη, 12:20; cf. the sight motif in 12:21, καὶ οὐκέτι ἡμέραντο ἵδειν αὐτόν). The significance of this story does not reside in providing a parallel to Saul’s experience, only: it also constitutes evidence of a journey plot with dramatic elements (encounter, appearance / disappearance) and its special appeal for a Jewish Hellenistic audience.

Heliodorus’ Encounter

Like the previous story this legend (2 Macc. 3:1-40) has often been mentioned as a parallel, even source, to the account of Saul’s conversion and healing.524 Windisch gives a thorough discussion of their various points of similarity and contrast.525 His conclusion, reiterated by many NT scholars afterwards, is that the Heliodorus legend is an inspirational parallel for the Damascus story, rather than a source (again the idea of mimetic paradigms).526

The background of the story (Aristotle’s ‘complication’) is one of malicious accusations. Following Simon’s plot to discredit the high priest Onias, Heliodorus is sent by Seleucus IV Philopator to Jerusalem to confiscate the Temple treasure (2 Macc. 3:8, 13), under the pretext of an inspection journey in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia.527

The reversal point of this story is the moment when Heliodorus, ready to leave Jerusalem, has a vision, or rather an epiphany, in which a golden armoured horseman appears, his horse striking at Heliodorus (ὅφθη γάρ τις ἵππος ετς, 2 Macc. 3:25 [LXX]). Two young men ‘splendidly dressed’ appear to him (προσφέρνεσαν αὐτῷ) and scourge him thoroughly, causing him to fall to the ground (a suffering scene)528, plunged into deep darkness (2 Macc. 3:26 [LXX], cf. Saul’s blindness).

When the high priest offers a sacrifice on Heliodorus’ behalf the two angelic young men appear again (ἐφάνησαν, 2 Macc. 3:32) to restore Heliodorus. Finally, they ‘vanish out of sight’ (ἀφανείς ἐγένοντο, 2 Macc. 3:34 [LXX]; cf. ἀφανεύς ἐγένοτο, Lk. 24:31).529 And Heliodorus returns convinced that God himself will defend the Temple and its treasure (2 Macc. 3:38-40). This epiphanic vocabulary of appearance and disappearance (ἐφάνησαν, or ἀφανείς ἐγένοντο) provides one of the most important LXX parallels to the Emmaus disappearance of Jesus (cf. ἀφανεύς ἐγένοτο, Lk. 24:31) and to the disappearance of Philip who is ‘taken away’ by the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἠρπασεν τον Φιλιππον, Acts 8:39).

The Journey Motif and Its Greco-Roman Models

Luke’s cultural environment includes the Greco-Roman legends as well and they have an important paradigmatic potential for his mimetic writing. In terms of plot, two main non-biblical legends seem to be the most important pagan parallels to Luke’s post-Easter encounters, the legend of Romulus and the martyr of Apollonius.530 Furthermore, the fable of Hercules at the cross-roads, a story in which Heracles reaches the age of maturity and has to choose between two ‘ways’ (or manners) of life, personified by two goddesses, Ἀρετή and Κακία is one of the most influential leadership and ethical choice paradigm in antiquity.531

The Romanus Legend

As Ehrhardt notes, the Romulus legend ‘was an adaptable, migrant myth’,532 being mentioned by several authors, among which Plutarch, Dionysius from Halicarnassus, Ovid, Tit Livius, etc.533 Plutarch mentions other similar appearance and disappearance stories, as well, such as that of Aristæas the Proconnesian, and the disappearances of the bodies of Cleomedes the Astypalaean and of Alcmeone.534 His stance is, however, rationalistic, for he questions ironically the possibility of bodily survival or resurrection.535 In particular, Romulus’ legend reminds one of the Emmaus story, with its encounter scene.536

He saw Romulus departing from the city fully armed and that, as he drew near to him, he heard him say these words: ‘Julius, announce to the Romans from me, that the genius to whom I was allotted at my birth is conducting me to the gods, now that I have finished my mortal life, and that I am Quirinius’.537

In Plutarch’s account, the encounter with the divine Romulus is narrated at the precise moment when the historian has expressed certain dark doubts about the whole story of deification.538 Tension of a different type, however, is also present in Luke’s account, in the form of the conflict.
between Jesus and the Jewish leaders, a general bitter skepticism on the part of the disciples (Lk. 24:18-24). Luke’s story, however, is told in a much more positive manner.539

The two stories share at least two formal features: (a) a common emphasis on journeying - ‘like Romulus, Jesus is leaving the city where he had been a παροικος’ (Lk. 24:18);540 and (b) a recognition scene - ‘just as the identity of Romulus is established by his armour, so Jesus is recognized by his breaking of the bread (Lk. 24:30).’541 Alsup gives a longer, comprehensive list of correspondences.542

Apart from these points of formal correspondence one should note that Romulus’ encounter is set ‘on the road’ - the locus of divine guidance.543 Part of the narrative ‘complication’ (δεσις) of the story, and also of its dénouement (λύσις) is the political dimension of the appearance and of Ascanius’ (or Julius’) report to the Senate (Luke also uses political connotations in the final report to the Eleven, cf. Lk. 24:32-35, and, in Saul’s case, in Barnabas’ presentation of Saul to the Twelve, Acts 9:27). Consistently, Luke’s hodos reports are intended to justify a new vision and to validate a new direction in the life of the church (Lk. 24:24; 26). Such overtones are entirely consistent with Luke’s general interest in the political case of the Messiah Jesus.544

The theme of divine intervention with special messengers and special messages, is often part of Luke’s plot lines, as well. For example, in Peter’s delivery from prison (Acts 12:6-17), a miraculous escape takes place in the presence of an angel, then a double recognition, and finally a sudden departure.545 In the account of Herod’s death (Acts 12:20-24), Luke tells a story which echoes somehow Romulus’ divine appearance: dressed in resplendent royal robes,546 Herod accepts praise to himself as to a god (θεοὺς φωνή καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπων), and is suddenly struck with a quick death (cf. a reversed plot in Acts 28:4-6, where Paul, for not having died at the viper’s bite, is regarded as divine).547 Luke proves here a certain predilection for this motif of establishing whether somebody is or is not divine, which apparently reflects a Hellenistic cultural paradigm, a literary and theological topos turned into apologetical instrument.

APOLLONIUS AND HIS ‘MARTYRDOM’
Often mentioned by the later Fathers of the Church, Apollonius is presented in the Hellenistic literature of the time as a prophet of insight and supernatural powers.548 The extraordinary fact of his life, as the legend says, is that being condemned by Domitian he dared the emperor to find his body, and at that very moment he disappeared.549 There are multiple variant stories about Apollonius’ death (as happening in Ephesus, in Lindus, Crete, etc.)550 and generally they hold that he continued to appear to friends (like Damis and Demetrius), acquaintances, or to unbelievers (in the cave of Puteoli, in a public library in Tyana, etc.).551 Most often in these appearances, bearing a certain similarity to Jesus’ Easter encounters in Luke-Acts, Apollonius’ message is one of hope and encouragement about the reality of the human soul and its existence after death.552

Apparently, however, rather than being relevant as a source of inspiration for Luke, the legend of Apollonius represents a case of NT influence on Hellenistic vision literature.553 The story has a syncretistic look, reflecting the fact that Julia Mammaea, Philostratus’ patron until AD 202, worshipped Apollonius along with Jesus, Abraham and Orpheus.554 Christian apologists such as Lactantius and Arnobius referred to Apollonius, arguing that Jesus cannot be compared to him, at all.555 Going beyond the apologetical debate, the NT accounts of Jesus and the legend of Apollonius illustrate together the major importance of the appearance paradigm. In a way, also, Luke might be considered a precursory of later Christian apologists, his concerns, however, being about Jesus’ authority, the sacraments of the Church, apostolic authority, mission, etc.

HERACLES’ DIVINE DESTINY
Michaelis mentions the legend of Heracles at the forks of Virtue and Vice as one of the important parallels to the Way motif in the NT.556 Often referred to in relation to Matthew’s ‘two ways’ parable, this legend is analysed here as an ‘on the road’ encounter with a heavenly being, a story involving the Greco-Roman motif of a young man’s ethical challenge at the crossroads.557

In a moralistic vein, the legend emphasizes the moment when ‘the young, now becoming their own masters, show whether they will approach life by the path of virtue or the path of vice (εἴτε τῇν δί’ ἀρετῆς ὁδόν τρέψονται εἴτε τῇν δίᾳ κακίας).’558
Reminiscent of Luke’s theme of retreat into secluded places for the sake of prayer and teaching, or rest, Heracles goes into quiet places, as well (ἐξελθόντα εἰς ἡσυχίαν), to ponder his ἥδος decisions (ποτέραν τῶν ὀδών τράπηται, cf. ποιαν ὀδὸν ἐπὶ τῶν βίων τράπητ).559 The divine intervention takes the form of an encounter and a dialogue with the two goddesses of Vice and Virtue. The goddess of Vice (Κάκια) promises him ‘the pleasantest and the easiest road (τὴν ἡδίστην τε καὶ βάσταν ὀδόν)’,560 ‘a short and easy way to happiness’ while Virtue’s road to joy is pictured as a ‘hard and long road’ (ὡς χαλεπὴν καὶ μακρὰν ὀδὸν ἐπὶ τὰς εὐφροσύνας ἥ γνων σοὶ αὐτὴ διηγείται. ἐγὼ δὲ βάδισαν καὶ, βραχείαν ὀδὸν ἐπὶ τὴν συδαιμονίαν ἁδερ(ε) ς).561 The goddess of Virtue (Ἀρετή) stresses that, if he takes the road that leads to her (ἐπὶ τὴν πρὸς ἐμὴν ὀδὸν τράπεζο), she will communicate faithfully to him the divine things (ἀλλ’ ἡπερ οἱ θεοί διέθεσαν τὰ ἄντα διηγήσομαι μετ’ ἀληθείας).562

In one of the variant forms, Dio Chrysostomus introduces Hermes as having to choose between the road leading to true Royalty or to that leading to Tyranny. The path leading to royal virtues was safe, broad, and certain (ἀσφαλῆ καὶ πλατεῖαν, thus, people journeyed on it safely); the other was narrow, crooked and difficult (σκολιὰν καὶ βίαν), that is dangerous, many having lost their lives on the path (the meaning of this parable is opposite to Jesus’ story: safety is to be found on the good, broad road, while danger threatens one’s life, on the narrow road).563 In one of the two goddesses are called differently, too, the blessed Royalty, child of Zeus (μακαρία δαίμονον Ἀθηναία)564 and Tyranny (Τυραννίδο).565

Similar two-road imagery, associated with a discussion of the ethical way to happiness, is used in Diogenes’ letters to Hicetas and to Monimus (the two roads to happiness).566 These different versions of basically one and the same story: a decision at the crossroads, in the presence of a guide, and constitute important evidence of the mimetic literary mobility of this ‘choice at the crossroads’ paradigm. The essence of the story remains the same, yet the setting, the main character, and the nature of the guide (human or divine) are subject to change.

The Heraclean legend was very influential in Greco-Roman world, it represented a major model in the Hellenistic education of rulers.567 As Julian put it, Heracles was considered ‘the greatest example [παράδειγμα]’ of the Cynic lifestyle.568 Luke’s choice for the ‘way’ setting as the locus for a test of faith and missionary direction appears thus construed on an important Hellenistic paradigm of education and this observation raises once more the issue of the political profile of Theophilus.

The importance of the Heraclean traditions led some scholars even to the hypothesis that the primitive records of ‘proto-Matthew’ and ‘proto-Mark’ were dependent on them.569 More probable, however, would appear the hypothesis of A.J. Toynbee.570 After looking at a number of Hellenistic saviour figures, he concludes that the Gospels contain ‘a considerable number and variety of elements which have been conveyed to them by the stream of “folk memory”’.571

Mimesis, Journeying and Ideology

One of the main functions of mimesis, that of representation, had an important application in the geographical and historical literature of the Roman empire. In Luke’s world this type of literature was often associated with ideology. Geography and history were by themselves ways of rationalising the world, of building an interpretation of the horizontal and vertical space and of accounting for the diversity of people in the world.572 The two tended to be seen together, at least at the level of popular perception.573

Therefore, it is not an exaggeration to say that Jews learned geography ‘in conjunction with their study of the Bible, just as Greeks learned geography from their study of Homer’.574 Geographical findings, therefore, old and new, were often rationalised in the Judaic tradition, being interpreted according to a ‘biblical map’.575 As a result, the Hebrew world view offered, a static perspective while Greek ethnography shared a dynamic view: ‘the Jews could mechanically transfer an old name to some new people [see, Kition, Kettim, Kittim: Phoenician colony in Cyprus, Greeks, Romans]’ whereas the Greeks, more interested in the actual development, thought that ‘nations continued to be formed through expansion and division’.576 After Alexander the Great, however, these different perspectives displayed clear signs of reciprocal influence.577

Apart from reflecting on the historical consequences of their biblical stories, one particular way of Jewish authors to show their interest in geography and ideology was the development of the apocalyptic literature. Preoccupied, by definition, with
the issues of global history and the final judgement of the world, apocalypses were very often written from ideological perspective. For example, 1 Enoch's message and argument are presented, for the most part of it, during a special journey of the author to the allegorical extremities of the earth, to the 'luminaries' of heaven, to the regions of the dead, and to the world of angels, during which Israel's land and the history of the Hebrew heroes are being reinterpreted according to an enriched typological key. In terms of ideology, Enoch's geographical adventure becomes a pretext for delineating a developed theology of judgement and reward. As for the Romans, for practical reasons, their imperial ideology was well integrated with the subject of journeying and exploring the world

Roman writers did not attempt to make original contributions to scientific cartography, but rather sought to adapt Greek conceptions to the service of the Roman state. For the Romans, maps of the world were valued insofar as they were geopolitical and useful for propaganda and administration.

In this ideological context, it is plausible that Luke wrote his accounts from a specific integrated geographical-ideological scheme. His writing is aggressive in style (adopting journeys as its literary paradigm), culture (spreading the gospel in the Greek cities) and geographical conception (going as far as to 'the ends of the earth', or to Rome, the capital city of the Roman empire); as Alexander notes, through his journey accounts Luke 'storms' the ideological fortress of Greco-Roman world

Luke structures his narrative in such a way that his hero is presented as 'invading' Greek cultural territory: first the 'hidden' ports of the Aegean, then the 'Greek sea' itself. It is as daring in its way as the paintings of the Iseum, and potentially - at least for the Greek reader - much more disturbing.

In time, such incipient theological readings of geography have been continued by the literary developments of subsequent Christianity. Some of the most interesting testimonies come, for example, from the area of religious and pilgrimage maps. Thus, St. Jerome is attributed a number of maps of the Holy Land, where sites and landscape are accompanied by Christian comments. Similarly, the mosaic map from the church of St. John at Madaba (ca. AD 541-565) is considered a world 'celebration' of the Christian religion. Christian maps started to be regarded as graphical companions and illustrations to religious themes like 'salvation' and 'peregrination'.

Supplementing his skills as a historian, and his literary talent at composing a 'well-planned' story, Luke the novelist and the ideologist proved he had a 'vision and the means to express it', the vision that 'the world be Christianized'. More than adopting certain literary models, Luke's mimetic style displays the marks of a daring ideologising tendency. He imitates and challenges the imperial ideology of the Roman state with the width and the scope of his Christian journeys.
After looking at the definition of mimesis, in the second chapter, and at a number of literary sources and models that Luke had in the LXX and in the Hellenistic literature, as well, the reader is better equipped now for assessing Luke’s representation of sources. One of the most natural contexts for such a quest is the synoptic environment of the NT, itself. Lukan mimesis will be, thus, considered in relation to Mark’s and Matthew’s hodos material, and, next, this will be followed by a discussion of Luke’s formal choices in his own hodos stories.

The grounds for such a comparison is provided by the observation that the Way motif in the synoptic gospels is supported by a common series of hodos texts, reiterated by all the three gospels in a very similar sequence.

(a) the ministry of John the Baptist (Mt. 3:3; Mk. 1:23; Lk. 3:5-6)
(b) the Commissioning of the Twelve (Mt. 10:5-10; Mk. 6:6-13; Lk. 9:1-10)
(c) the parable of the Sower (Mt. 13:1-23; Mk. 4:1-20; Lk. 8:4-21)
(d) the healing of a blind person (Mt. 20:29-34; Mk. 10:46-52, Lk. 18:35-43)
(e) the triumphal entry (Mt. 21:1-8; Mk. 11:1-11; Lk. 19:28-47)
(f) the taxes rendered to Caesar (Mt. 22:15-22; Mk. 12:13-17; Lk. 20:21-26).\textsuperscript{587}

These references, together with other specific hodos stories of Luke, are evidence of a different types of journey notes, complementary to the Lukans Reisenotizen discussed earlier in chapter one. Together they represent an important, complex textual framework for Luke’s general motif of the Way, despite their heterogeneous character (prophecies, parables, miracles, wisdom teaching, historical accounts, etc.).
Luke's Representation of Mark and Matthew

Before any comparison is being brought into discussion, one needs to emphasise that the main synoptic hypothesis adopted in this study is the hypothesis of Markan priority. It seems remarkable that, while this is just one of the main synoptic hypotheses used in Lukan studies, quite a few authors from the ranks of those who defend alternative approaches would concede that 'such other material as Luke had remains secondary and supplementary to his Markan source' and that 'Mark was Luke's primary and respected source'. For the sake of a better understanding of Luke's mimetic interaction with the synoptic authors, we will explore, yet, as well, the possibility of Luke's use of Matthew (avoiding, at the same time, the complex issue of Luke's possible interaction with Q).

Mark's Use of the Way Motif

Apart from Luke's theology of the Way, Mark's corresponding motif is one of the most discussed motifs of the NT, always under close scrutiny and subject to many debates. From the very beginning, thus, one is met with the hermeneutical dilemma whether and when the Way should be seen as figure of speech or as a neutral geographical setting only. For some an absolute distinction is 'impossible' or even 'unnecessary,' while for others, he hodos should be more often translated as 'road' not as 'way', or 'the way', in order to 'avoid unintended theological connotations associated with the "way"'. This distinction has become a blurred one, in time, in many of the available Markan studies, since authors such as D. Rhoads and D. Michie have emphasized that settings have, always, a special contribution to the meaning of a narrative.

The settings of a story provide the context for the conflicts and for the actions of the characters. That context is often quite integral to the story, for settings can serve many functions essential to the plot.

There is another reason, however, for which Mark's hodos settings should be analysed as a meaningful series. Save for a few skeptics like P. J. Achtemeier, W. H. Kelber and R. M. Fowler, the majority of NT scholars seem to agree that one of the key elements that make the Markan narrative as a whole cohere is its geography. This has to do with Mark's influential model of a three-parts gospel: Jesus' ministry in Galilee and around it (Mk. 1:26), Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (Mk. 8:26-11:1), and, finally, Jesus’ Passion and Resurrection in Jerusalem (Mk. 11-16), yet, it involves more than that.

Mark's scheme of hodos texts

Setting a standard with his hodos scheme, Mark's series of hodos texts starts with the presentation of John the Baptist (Mk. 1:2-3; cf. Mal. 3:1, and Is. 40:3), a pericope with Christological implications and of programmatic importance. He creates a parallel between 'your way', in Mark 1:2, and 'the way of the Lord' in Mark 1:3, setting a Christological perspective to his hodos texts (Luke has a similar intervention in Lk. 3:4-6, modifying Mark's emphases).

Some of Mark's most eloquent examples of metaphorical use of the 'way' as a setting and as a symbol are found in the parable of the Sower (Mk. 4:4; 4:15), and in the Pharisees' and Herodians' interpellation of Jesus in relation to Caesar's tax (Mk. 12:14). Apart from that, setting references such as Mark 2:23; 4:4, 15; 6:8; 8:3, 27; 9:33, 34; 10:17, 32, 46, 52, are most often understood as part of Mark's intention to communicate a deeper meaning of the way, yet in a less spectacular manner.

Mark's special emphasis on Jesus' main poles of activity, Galilee and Judaea, transfers implicitly a special significance to the 'space between' and to its series of hodos events. The hodos notes come 'naturally' and provide an interpretation of this intermediary space so that the narrative sequence may cohere: (a) 1:14-8:26 Jesus is in Galilee; (b) 8:27-10:52 he is on the way to Jerusalem (8:31; 9:31; 10:32-33); (c) 11:1-15:41 Jesus is in Jerusalem.

Although few in number, the correspondences between Mark's hodos series and Jesus' Passion notes convey clearly the idea of a journey to the Cross (cf. Mk. 9:31-32, 10:31-32). In these Reisenotizen the disciples are memorably portrayed as following Jesus 'full of fear', οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο (Mk. 10:32) and 'afraid to ask', ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτῶν ἐπερωτήσαν (Mk. 9:32); this reiteration of 'fear' indicates Mark's mimetic sensationalism, similar to that noted by Auerbach in Peter's
denial, and to Aristotle’s idea of *katharsis* through intense emotions and through fear.

**The Symbolical Setting of Peter’s Confession**

One of the major tests of Mark’s symbolic use of the Way setting has been his account of Peter’s Confession. Since the story includes an ‘on the road’ setting, *ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· ἔπερωτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶ (cf. Mt. 16:13; Lk. 9:18), A. Stock concluded that ‘the Way motif is definitely a Markan element’, for ‘both Matthew and Luke consistently eliminate the references’. The Confession context is important for it transfers its narrative centrality to Mark’s *hodos* theme: in all structural schemes suggested for Mark ‘the breakdown usually comes in the subdivision of 1:1-8:26 and 8:27-16:8’, and so, Mark 8:27 represents the ‘turning point’ of the gospel.

Peter’s Confession represents a significant landmark for the gospel’s geography: For example, Mark’s references to the wilderness, the mountain and the sea occur almost exclusively before Mark 8:27, while his mention of the ‘way’ goes beyond this turning point. For U. Mauser, the significance of this landmark is that the proclamation in the desert, characteristic for the first part of the gospel, makes room now for ‘the way through the desert’, in the second part, a way that ends on the Cross, in a grave. Both stages of Jesus’ ministry are marked by an ‘uninterrupted confrontation with the devil’s might’, yet, at the end of the story, this takes the form of a deadly experience. By way of comparison, however, if John the Baptist ends his desert ministry in death, Jesus’ sacrifice is continued by resurrection and he takes the people of God out of the old age, into the new one.

The narrative centrality of Peter’s Confession creates, as well, the context for Mark’s reference to Philip’s Caesarea. This setting was interpreted as a crucial occasion for the Markan Jesus to put aside his Messianic secrecy in a non-Jewish place, at the beginning of his journey to Jerusalem, presenting himself as a king and a leader who remains loyal to his mission. One of the special roles of Mark’s geographical notes is, thus, to balance the theme of the Messianic secret. However, dedicated to his hypothesis that, basically, Mark’s composition is simple and not elaborate, R. Gundry objected to the integration of this *hodos* setting as part of Jesus’ journey to the Cross. According to him, Jesus cannot be ‘journeying towards his Passion’, here, since he travels north from Bethsaida rather than south to Jerusalem. Now, indeed, Mark’s narrative does alternate between North and South, between Galilean and Judaean territory: Jesus travels from Galilee (Mk. 1:16-7:23) to the north and east (Mk. 7:24-9:29, cf. 9:30-52) then to the Transjordan (Mk. 10:1-52) and finally to Jerusalem (Mk. 11:1-16:8). As regards Jesus’ symbolic – and redactional – journey, Mark communicates, however, a different overall structure, a linear one, and Philip’s Caesarea, together with Peter’s Confession can be regarded as the starting point of one great, revelational and last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, to his Passion.

**The Way in Mark and its Circular Structures**

One of the most important arguments in favour of Mark’s redactional intervention in favour of his Way motif is drawn from the evidence of his chiastic constructions with *he hodos*. This compositional tendency can be noted at the level of individual accounts as well as at the level of the whole book.

For example, the story of the Sower (Mk. 4:1-20; Mt. 13:1-23; Lk. 8:4-18) is told in an *inclusio* formula - cf. Mark 4:4, 15, preserved in all the three Synoptic gospels. Another Markan *inclusio* is present in the Bartimaeus’ healing episode (Mk. 10:46, 52; εἴκασπο πορεῖς τὴν ὁδὸν - ἐκκολούθησε αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ). Stylistic repetition of *hodos* is also present in the case of the disciples’ dispute about authority (Mk. 9:33, 34).

At the gospel’s level, present on both sides of Mark 8:27, the *hodos* series has a structuring effect and creates a conceptual framework for the story, leading to the idea of a comprehensive overall *hodos* chiasmus. As a more refined model, in contrast with its well known three-part division of the gospel, Mark’s gospel can be seen as a narrative in five parts characterised by five major localities: the *wilderness* (1:2-13), *Galilee* (1:14-8:26), the *way* (8:27-10:32), *Jerusalem* (11:1-15:41), and the *tomb* (15:42-16:8). Such a concentric structure would not only describe symbolically Jesus’ ministry in its essential parts, yet also was suitable for reading at one sitting, for example as a Christian Passover Haggadah.

Placed at the centre of this chiasmus the Way section has been seen as the *key* of the entire gospel, and Mark’s *hodos* terminology as having the potential to elucidate both the structure and the major themes of the gospel. The section is replete with information and narrative structures and, for example, includes three overlapping series of triads which
contribute to the general narrative coherence of the gospel: (a) Jesus’ Passion predictions (Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:32f), (b) the disciples’ failure to understand Jesus’ plans (Mk. 8:32-33; 9:32; 10:35-41), and (c) Jesus’ messianic teaching (Mk. 8:34-8; 9:35-7; 10:42-5). The whole section is built as a chiastic or inclusio structure with the εν τῇ ὁδῷ phrase occurring in Mark 8:27-10:52.618

THE WAY AS A CONTROLLING PARADIGM

For some NT scholars, for example, like J. Marcus, it would be ‘no exaggeration’ to assess that ‘the way of Jesus’ or ‘the way of the Lord’ represents more than one major theme in Mark’s Gospel and, instead, stands as the controlling paradigm for his interpretation of the life of his community’.619 As such, the Markan motif of the Way is essentially linked to the hermeneutics of the Kingdom and of the Wilderness, of the New Exodus, and plays an important role of narrative mediation for Mark’s topographical space.

The Way and Mark’s Interest in the New Exodus

For W. H. Kelber, the Way motif provides the theme of entrance into the kingdom of God (Mk. 9:47; 10:15, 23-25), and is essential in the hermeneutical tradition of Deuteronomy.620 W. Swartley notes that Jesus’ ministry is portrayed in Mark as ‘the ὁδὸς to the kingdom of God’.621 For him the synoptic gospels, in their bipolar structure of Galilee and Jerusalem ‘reflect the northern and southern settings of the origins and development of Israel’s faith traditions’, of the Exodus - as liberation, of the Torah - as holy instruction, and of the way-conquest - as a journey into God’s heritage and victory against sinful and rebellious nations.622

For J. Marcus, however, the Central Section of Mark’s Gospel, ‘is not, as Kelber and Swartley would have it, about the human way to the βασιλεία – to his kingdom [i.e., the Exodus] but rather about God’s way which is his βασιλεία, his own extension of power’.623 According to this messianic perspective ‘Jesus’ “way” is painted in the familiar biblical colours of the Deutero-Isaian “way of the Lord” (i.e. the New Exodus).624 Thus, Mark 4, 8-9 with its references to the way and to the themes of blindness and understanding, cf. βλέπειν, ὀραν, ἀκοεῖν, γιγνώσκειν, συνεῖν, ἔιδειν, νοεῖν (Mk. 4:12-13, 10:46-52),625 should be interpreted within this Isaianic emphasis on a final restoration (cf. Is. 6:9; בְּרָכָה and in Is. 35:8, and the theme of transformed wilderness).626

Structuralist Approaches to Mark’s Way Motif

Inspired by the symmetry of Mark’s composition and by this centrality of the journey to Jerusalem, structuralist studies have suggested that the Way functions in Mark as an important mediating symbol - both as a ‘myth’ and as a ‘parable’. As a paradigm of stability (expressed through the concept of myth) and of change (understood as parable)627 the ‘way’ would ensure the passage between the old and the new, the mediation between death and salvation, between chaos and order. For E. Malbon, Mark’s narrative unwinds progressively this tension between stability and change, between the earth’s chaos and the heavenly order, between the sacred and the profane, through the symbol and imagery of journeying.628 Mark’s geography can thus be organized with the help of a number of spatial opposes grouped into three categories of hierarchical relations - the geopolitical (geographical regions, cities, towns); the topographical (sea, wilderness, mountains); and the architectural (houses, synagogues, the temple).629

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Chaos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heaven</td>
<td>Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish homeland</td>
<td>Foreign lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galilee</td>
<td>Judaea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated areas</td>
<td>Inhabited areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Synagogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem environs</td>
<td>Jerusalem proper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Olives</td>
<td>Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Malbon, the spatial and conceptual mediation takes place progressively, so that the opposition between the Jewish homeland and foreign lands is mediated by Jesus’ ministry in the area of the Sea of Galilee; the opposition between Galilee and Judaea is mediated by the Road to Jerusalem; and, finally, the Jerusalem area, as an unstable environment leading to confrontation and death, is left
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without any mediatory elements. The Way, or the Road, as a ‘final mediation’, does not signal simply another place or setting in Mark’s topography, according to Malbon, but rather ‘a way between places, a dynamic process of movement’. Jesus’ movement from the wilderness (1:12-13) to the city underlies the entire Markan story, which is framed by parallel references to the Way. At the same time, during this mediation, the Way defines a new world, that is, the world of discipleship. Mark’s microcosm is dominated by the idea of journeying, leadership and discipleship: ‘John prepares the way, Jesus leads the way, the disciples are called to follow on the way’. The Markan Jesus is particularly bonded to this mediatory ‘space between’ which includes the symbols of the Way, of the mountain, and of the Sea of Galilee.

From a textual point of view, although this structuralist perspective confirms much of the previous research, it has a major shortcoming since it relies quite heavily on a major exegetical constraint: this symmetry of mediation depends on Mark’s shorter ending, focused on the empty tomb (Mk. 16:8). This raises some questions on its relevance for the other synoptic gospels, for Luke, for example, since the narrative structures of Luke transcend the limits of the gospel via literary correspondence, overarching parallels and echoed paradigms, and go beyond Luke 24, over into the book of Acts, across the literary and theological bridge of Jesus’ Ascension (although, to be sure, journeying has a mediatory role there, as well, as a narrative support for Jesus’ ministry and that of the disciples, in Luke-Acts).

Matthew’s Use of the Way Motif

Since the debate concerning Luke’s sources is an on-going one, in relation to the Synoptic problem, it seems appropriate to consider, in principle, the possibility of Luke’s interaction with Matthew, as well, while still allowing for Markan priority (cf. D. Chapman, A. M. Farrer, M. D. Goulder). Such an approach is worth contemplating having in view the increasingly richer literature on this subject. Of particular value, in this context, is the redactional commentary of J. McNicol, D. L. Dungan and D. B. Peabody on Luke, written from a consistent neo-Griesbachian perspective. According to them, Luke used a cyclic sequential parallelism to Matthew in his own exposition of Christianity’s beginnings, a technique which seems to follow the literary recommendations of Lucian of Samosata, according to whom historians should write a ‘progressive, well-proportioned narrative’, knowing ‘how to begin, how to arrange his material, the proper proportions for each part, what to leave out, what to develop, what it is better to handle cursorily, and how to put the facts into words and fit them together’. 

Jesus’ Journey to Jerusalem in Matthew

Thus, it has been suggested that Luke follows Mark’s sense of movement, while he combines it with Matthew’s emphasis on teaching, repeatedly breaking, for this purpose, Matthew’s discourses. This hypothesis would account for the mixed nature (teaching and journeying) of Luke’s journey section (Lk. 9-19), which otherwise remains a puzzle and a threat to Luke’s claims of compositional order. In this respect, such a double redaction hypothesis, such as that of E. Franklin, is to be preferred to J. Drury’s radical statement that in Luke 9:51-18:14 ‘the only certain answer’ is ‘that he [Luke] is not editing Mark’ and that this section is made of ‘Matthean material mixed with his own’ or of ‘Q’ origin, plus specifically Lukan material, arranged in Deuteronomic order. One of the possible objections against relating Luke’s journeying section to that of Matthew could be the fact that the latter is barely noticeable. However, although structuring Matthew is a difficult task, there is some evidence for a journey scheme there. Its starting point is slightly vague, since Jesus’ decision to go to Jerusalem is recorded as early as 16:21 (Peter’s Confession), yet the actual leaving of Galilee takes place at 19:1. Then, the journey proper covers a span of only two chapters and a half, between 19:1-21:16, similar to Mark 9-10. There is enough room, still, for some essential texts and events, such as the second announcement of Jesus’ Passion (Mt. 20:17-19), the healing of the blind man (Mt. 20:29-34), the Jerusalem entry (Mt. 21:1-8), etc. The end of the Matthean journey is similar to that of Mark, with the observation than Matthew stresses more the conflict between Jesus and the people of Jerusalem. In contrast, Luke would emphasize Jerusalem’s importance as a site for Jesus’ appearances after Resurrection, omitting the usual reference to Galilee. He avoids the confrontational ending of Matthew (Jesus vs. Jewish leaders), although conflict still lurks in the
background of the Emmaus journey and is present, as well, in Jesus’ lament over the city (Lk. 13:31-35).

**Matthew’s Own *Hodos* Scheme: A Chiasmus?**

Matthew is obviously fond of the *hodos* imagery since he introduces a unique series of *hodos* stories in his gospel:

- The journey of the Magi (Mt. 2:12)
- The reference to Galilee of the Gentiles (Mt. 4:15, cf. Is. 9:1-2)
- The paricope of the Two Ways and Two Gates (Mt. 7:13-14)
- The parable of the Two Sons (Mt. 21:28-32)

Apart from that, the *hodos* setting is used at times as a specific detail to enhance the local colour of the account (cf. Mt. 8:28-34, the healing of the two demon-possessed men; Mt. 21:18-22, the judgement of the fig-tree).

Although unevenly distributed, Matthew’s *hodos* texts are grouped into two large sections, Matthew 2-13 (Jesus’ ministry in Galilee) and Matthew 20-22 (the triumphal entry section). Outside these two groups the *hodos* setting is seldom mentioned (cf. Mt. 15:29-39) and, for example, even the parable of the Sower is told in a static setting, by the sea (Mt. 13:1, next to Jesus’ lodgings, cf. the *oikia* motif in Matthew).

By contrast, in Luke, this parable is told in the context of Jesus’ dynamic journeying (Lk. 9:1, 4-21). This chiastic arrangement is supported by Matthew’s pair of blindmen healing stories (Mt. 9:27-31 and 20:29-34). Also, the Matthean motif of ‘righteousness’ present in Matthew 3-6, goes quiet in the middle part of the gospel and re-emerges at the end in connection with the *hodos* theme, as the ‘way of righteousness’ (εὐ ὁδὸν δικαιοσύνης, Mt. 21:32). Finally, there comes the traditional account about the tax rendered to Caesar which raises ironically the issue of ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Mt. 22:16). The *hodos* stories support, thus, the hypothesis of a chiastic structure of Matthew, and highlight the synoptic variety of journey notes.

**Luke’s Representation of the Way Motif**

After this succinct review of Mark’s and Matthew’s *hodos* stories, Luke’s representational style should result from the way he interacts with his sources, by expanding them, adding to them, or editing out certain themes, by reshaping them according to his own emphases and theology. Along with such aspects of Lukian style, one expects to uncover, as well, certain elements of his mimetic philosophy.

**Luke’s Representation of Mark’s Journey Motif**

Luke’s representation of Mark’s journey motif is complex, involving the reshaping of the Central Section and the redefining of some of Mark’s themes such as the themes of prophecy, mission, prayer, wilderness, miracles, teaching and seeing, Jesus’ messiahship, etc.

Luke’s Expansion of Mark’s Journey Section

One of the best examples of Luke’s creative imitation of Mark is the inflation of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem, with its elaboration of Mark’s journeying notes. Thus, Mark’s journey section, two chapter long (cf. Mk. 8:27-10:32) has a ten chapter correspondent in Luke 9:18-19:27. At the same time, Luke’s journey vocabulary seems more comprehensive, employing terms like πορεύομαι, πορεία, ἐγείρω, ὀδευω, ὀδοπορέω, ὀδοπορία, ἐξορύσσω. He associates with this journey scheme a richer series of geographical notes which includes occasional withdrawals into secluded places (ἐν τῷ πόλει τινι, κατὰ μόνας, etc.), the repeated mention of towns and villages (Lk. 9:12, καὶ διεπείρατο κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κωμαῖς διδάσκων, etc.) which contextualises the story in the local landscape.


Such an emphasis can be noted in various texts. For example, Luke’s interest in Jesus’ messianity and in the historical matter of prophetic succession causes him to elaborate on the ministry of John the Baptist (Lk. 1:17; 1:76-79, 3:1-7, 7:27; cf. Mk. 1:2-3, Mt. 3:1-10). Thus, Mark’s traditional text (1:2-3) is expanded in three different sections (Lk. 1:76, 79; 3:4-6; 7:27), and Luke 3:4-6 uses Mark 1:2-3 but adds an universalistic ending: ὁμερεῖ πάσα σαρξ τοῦ σωστρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Is. 40:4-5).

In similar way, the evangelist has an intervention with Christological significance in Luke 3:4-6. Instead of using simply Mark’s τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ‘the paths of our God’, which corresponds to the LXX and MT texts - τὰς ἡμῶν (cf. Luke 22:37; 24:16, 46).
Concerning the Christological harmonisation of κύριος in Luke 3:4-6 with that of Luke 1:17 and 76-79 (esp. v. 76), it is not clear whether Zechariah himself thought of the lord Messiah in Luke 1:17, 76-79, in the same way as Elizabeth did in Luke 1:43 (ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου), or rather of God, the Lord. An argument in favour of messianic interpretation in these texts can be adduced from the use of κύριος in The Testament of Levi, 2:11; 4:4; The Testament of Simeon, 6:5. However, as Marshall points out, in such later works as these ‘this usage may be Christian’. 666

Further, Luke appears to be a critical and thoughtful user of the LXX references to the ‘way’. In Luke 3:4-6 he uses the plural, ‘the rough ways’, αἱ τραχεῖαι, whereas the LXX uses the singular, and in presenting the Lord’s spiritual reform, he prefers the term ὁδὸς λείας, ‘smooth ways’ instead of the LXX choice of πεδία ‘level places’ (cf. Lk. 3:5 καὶ αἱ τραχεῖαι εἰς ὁδὸς λείας - Is. 40:4 [LXX], καὶ ἡ τραχεία εἰς πεδία). Through such a usage he might allude to the missionary journeys of the Church in Acts, as well as to the enlargement of God’s kingdom to the ‘ends of the world’. It is noticeable, also, that Luke’s choice of words tends to reserve positive messianic connotations and a universalistic perspective for the Way.

Luke’s Missionary Emphases

Another instance of Luke’s multiplication of ὁδος stories is his use of two commissioning pericopes (Lk. 9:1-6, 10; 10:1-23; cf. Mk. 6:6-13). On the one hand, this is a Lukans emphasis on the disciples’ proclamation (Mk. 6:8; Lk. 9:3, 10:4; a case of narrative redundancy), and, on the other hand, these stories communicate the emergence of Gentile evangelism.

Indeed, in Luke 9:1-6, Jesus commissions the Twelve in correspondence to the number of the tribes of Israel (cf. Lk. 22:30) while the Seventy (seventy-two, in variant, Lk. 10:1; 10:1-12), 661 correspond to the traditional number of nations in the world (the Table of Nations). The same sequence of numbers is implied at Pentecost, twelve apostles (Acts 1:26; 2:14) and seventy nations (cf. Acts 2:5). 662 Similar concerns seem to be reflected in Luke 24:46-47 and Acts 1:8, where Jesus explains the nature of his disciples’ mission as one which involves going ‘to all the nations’ (εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη). 663 However, although this is a major theme in Acts, Luke is only alluding to it, here, in his gospel. 664

Stylistically, Luke’s presentation of the Commissioning of the Twelve is more dramatic in comparison with Mark’s corresponding pericope. Instead of indirect, simple narration of Jesus’ command as in Mk. 6:8, καὶ παρηγογεῖν αὐτοῖς ἑαυτόν μηδὲν αἰρομαι (cf. Plato’s ἀπλή διηγήσει, Rep. 392d), Luke presents it as direct speech (cf. Plato’s δίᾳ μισήσεσς), creating a new occasion to impersonate Christ: ‘take nothing, greet no one… stay there, leave, etc.’ (Lk. 9:3-6, 10:3-13).

Editing Out Mark’s ὁδος Clauses

Luke’s mimetic interests led him in certain cases to edit out Mark’s ὁδος references, even if he used Mark’s stories as such or chose to duplicate them. Two main constant interests of Luke can be noted here: one for a special sanctity of action ὑπηρεσίας, or rather of God, the Lord.

This is the case of Luke’s ὁδος setting. Luke’s mimetic interests led him in certain cases to edit out Mark’s ὁδος references, even if he used Mark’s stories as such or chose to duplicate them. Two main constant interests of Luke can be noted here: one for a special sanctity of action ὑπηρεσίας, or rather of God, the Lord.

The disciples’ dispute over authority is presented by Luke without Mark’s dynamism. Mark uses the ὁδος clauses to introduce the scene through Jesus’ direct speech, Mark 9:33-34, τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διαλογίζεσθαι - πρὸς ἄλλον ὁμοίως γὰρ διελέγησαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τὰς μείζων. Luke omits the ‘on the road’ setting, and, instead of Mark’s dynamic verbs (διαλογίζεται, διελέγονται), he uses nouns: διαλογισμὸς, in Luke 9:46, and φιλονεικία in Luke 22:24 - introducing the main scene with Mark’s vocabulary yet in the indirect narrative mode (Lk. 9:46, ἐσπήθη δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς ἐν εἶναι μείζων αὐτῶν, and 22:24 - ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τῷ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ ἑαυτὸς μείζων), which gives the scene a certain solemnity, similar to that of Greek dialogues between a master and his disciples (Plato also preferred the indirect style in narration). At the same time, there is evidence for a higher Lukian Christology: Jesus’ intervention comes ‘not via an initial questioning but in terms of his awareness of their thoughts’. 666

For Luke, a theios aner Jesus would not need to engage a
dialogue to find out people’s thoughts or to understand things happened in the past.

A similarly more refined and solemn atmosphere is met in Luke’s two reports on how one can inherit eternal life (Lk. 10:25-28, 18:18-23), where Luke omits Mark’s journey setting in Mark 10:17 (ἐκτοποιηθέντας αὐτόν εἰς ὄδον). Mark’s use of the numeral ἐς as an indefinite pronoun (Mk. 10:17, cf. ἐς τῶν γραμματέων, Mk. 12:28) is replaced by Luke with more specific and status-conscious nouns like νομικός (religious expert in the Law), and ἀρχων (ruler, leading official) and the characters ask questions in an official, more solemn way (ἀνέστη ἐκπείραζον, he raised up, asking, etc. Lk. 10:25, cf. ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτόν ἄρχον, the official asked him, Lk. 18:28).

Luke tends to use a high-er mimetic mode, and often he includes parables or accounts about persons of high status (cf. the Ethiopian’s story; the visit to Paulus, the proconsul of Crete, etc.). In Luke, Jesus is not so much a μῖσος τῶν αἰτιμῶν, as in Mark (cf. Lücking’s study), a representative of the poor, but rather one who often finds himself surrounded by people with a certain special social status. Comparatively, Mark’s report seems hurried and lacks the composed presentation of Luke: ‘one having run in order to kneel, asked him’, προσδραμὼν ἐς γοναπιτήριον αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν (Mk. 10:17). Also, Luke’s reconstruction reflects his interest in dialogues or debates (cf. Lk. 24:13-35; Acts 8:25-40, 9:1-31; the Areopagus debate, Acts 17:16-34, etc.).

Through such stories Luke interferes with Mark’s dynamic scheme of Jesus’ journeying ‘in full motion’ towards Jerusalem, by creating a series of contrasting static scenes set, though, as ‘on the road’ encounters. This feature has been noted, for example, by D. Senior

Luke does not present Jesus as a man in perpetual motion. He inserts into this long expanse of the Gospel (9:51-19:41) many of Jesus’ parables and discourses. The most important instructions on discipleship are also found here. Thus at the same time Jesus is ‘on the road’ the narrative seems curiously static.

D. Minguez highlights a similar contrast in Acts 8:25-40, where the desert (a static element) is being challenged by a dynamic evangelistic vision, expressed through a transformed journey.

In some of Mark’s hodos texts turned into static scenes, Luke emphasizes the revelation given through that special event. For example, in the Passion announcement in Luke 18:31 (cf. Mk. 10:32). Mark presents a narrator’s impersonal yet dynamic picture of Jesus leading the disciples in their way to Jerusalem (ἤσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα) which contrasts strongly with Jesus taking them aside (καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα, Mk. 10:32). Luke’s setting is a rationalised and coherent, a more personalized scene. Jesus takes the disciples aside from the beginning, and his revelational, evangelistic dialogue with the Twelve is longer than the one preserved in Mark (Lk. 18:31-33).

Another important example of editing out Mark’s hodos references is Luke’s story of Jesus’ healing of a blind person, where Luke mentions only one hodos setting out of Mark’s two references (Lk. 18:35-43; Mk. 8:22-26; 10:46-52). The healing takes place not when Jesus and his disciples ‘were leaving Jericho’, as in Mark, but ‘as Jesus approached Jericho’ (Lk. 18:35). Instead of simply following Mark’s emphasis on discipleship - καὶ ἤκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (Mk. 10:52), Luke’s agenda dictates here a doxological ending with combined Christological and discipleship-related implications, καὶ ἤκολούθει αὐτῷ δοξάζων τὸν θεόν (Lk. 18:43). The messianic identity of the healer is emphasized better, in this way, and this reveals again the summary-oriented mind of Luke, who needs to comment somehow on the outcome of the encounter. Through its changed ending, the story communicates a sense of narrative progression turning itself into an introduction of the next account of Zacchaeus’ conversion. Luke’s mimetic representation builds thus on the introductory and transition character of these hodos journey stories.

Luke’s mimetic principles of representation are evident, then, in his selection and reshaping of the miraculous feeding pericope, as well, that is the feeding of the 5,000 (Lk. 9:10-17). In this variant the final report does not mention the hodos setting, reflecting Mark 6:30-44, which omits it, as well (by contrast, Mk. 8:1-10, the feeding of the 4,000 includes a hodos setting; see Mt. 15:29-39).

Jesus’ portrait and the significance of the ending appear to have been major factors in Luke’s decision for this selection. Thus, Mark 6:30-44 has a graphic presentation of Jesus’ thanksgiving prayer (Mk. 6:41, ἀναβλέπων εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους), followed immediately
by a retreat to the mountain for prayer (Mk. 6:46; cf. Lk. 9:16, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν εὐλογήσαν αὐτός). By contrast, although Jesus’ thanksgiving is also mentioned in Mark 8:6, it appears in a less graphic way (εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλασεν καὶ ἔδιδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ).

At the same time, in Mark 8:1-10 Jesus feels compassion toward the crowds yet, he himself suggests that they be dismissed (Mk. 8:3, 9). As a whole, the narrative is framed by the danger of perishing ‘on the road’, an ἀπόλυσω - ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῦ...κατ ἱδίαν (Mk. 8:3, 9).

Apparently, such an association of the Way with Jesus’ dismissal did not promote a positive image of the Way, nor of Jesus. Therefore, Luke modifies the emphasis in Mark 6:30-44 and presents the sending home of the people as being the disciple’s initiative, not of Jesus. In Luke’s account Jesus is the compassionate Lord who corrects his disciples and suggests a meal and a time of rest for the people instead of a mere dismissal (Mk. 6:35-37). While Mark frames his story with the ‘dismissing the multitudes’ theme, using an ἀπόλυσω chiasmus (cf. Mk. 6:36, ἀπόλυσων αὐτοῦς, Mk. 6:45b, αὐτός ἀπολείπει τὸν ὄχλον), Luke edits this motif out and keeps a positive emphasis on the Way (people travelling with Jesus discover his messianic identity and the dismissal is mentioned only once, at the beginning, Lk. 9:12).

Although not a hodos story, Luke’s account of the sea storm provides another instance of similar redactional emphases (Lk. 8:22-26; cf. Mk. 4:35-41; and 6:45-53). Here Luke leaves aside Mark 6:45-53, where Jesus walks on the sea and is mistaken for a ghost (a possible ‘on the lake’ encounter), in favour of Mark 4:35-41. From this mimetic - redactional perspective, Mark 6:45-53, did not provide the ideal setting for teaching and revelation or for ethical choice - while Mark 4:35-41 did.

Stylistic Differences and Thematic Integration

In some of these hodos pericopes Luke intervenes stylistically in rephrasing the details and reshaping the story. For example, such an instance is the Commissioning of the Twelve (Mk. 6:6-13; Lk. 9:1-6, 10). Luke’s journey motif becomes more specific: Mark’s εἰς ὅδον is mentioned here as εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν, ‘on the journey’. This emphasis did not go unnoticed by NT commentators and, for example, Marshall writes that ‘Luke’s addition of the article with ὁδὸς may be due to Q, 10:4, or perhaps indicate that one particular journey is in mind’.

In another, more complex example, the theme of wilderness is transformed by Luke, this time in the reverse, for he is not associating it with a literary motif as theologically profound as Mark’s. Whereas in Mark the wilderness represents par excellence the site of temptation and suffering, Luke there is no such special meaning for ἐρήμος (cf. Lk. 9:10-17; Mk. 6:30-44). For Luke ἐρήμος represents rather the territory that includes the lower Jordan valley. Luke’s Jesus takes his disciples aside (παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς...κατ ἱδίαν), yet not to a significant ‘desert place’ but to a down to earth location, to Bethsaida (Lk. 9:10).

Where Luke’s story lacks in geographical dramatism, he makes up for it by establishing literary links with other more dramatic theological themes. Mark’s motif of retreat and his wilderness theme are being transformed, thus, in Luke’s gospel, in relation to other motifs such as the theme of prayer in seclusion or on the mountain, or of Jesus’ teaching in private (Lk. 5:16, cf. Mk. 1:35; Lk. 10:23; cf. Mk. 6:30; Lk. 5:16, cf. Mk. 1:35; Lk. 10:23, cf. Mk. 6:30).

The theme of prayer, in particular, is well represented in Luke. The disciples need to understand that they must pray always, τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε προσευχῆσαι (Lk. 1:1; cf. the connection with the larger δῆθεν theme of Luke-Acts: the necessity of Jesus’ Passion - Lk. 9:22; 17:27; 24:7, of testimony - Lk. 4:43; or the necessity of suffering for Christ, in Acts 9:16; 14:22, etc.). Jesus prays on a mountainside before choosing the Twelve (Lk. 6:12-16; cf. Mk. 3:13-19). Also, at the Transfiguration (Lk. 9:28-36; Mark omits, cf. Mk. 9:2-8).

Even Peter’s Confession (Lk. 9:18-28) can be regarded as part of this series of prayer texts set in an ‘off the way’ environment (cf. Lk. 9:18, ἐν τῷ ὑποτεντὸ προσευχῆσον κατὰ μόνας, Mk. 8:27-32 does not mention prayer). Jesus’ teaching on prayer is given in a similar context of retreat in a ‘certain place’ (Lk. 11:1, ἐν τόπῳ τινι προσευχῆσον). It may be noted that Luke joins the motif of journey with that of retreat and prayer, especially when he has in view a messianic revelation. Thus, Jesus prays after the return of the 70/72 disciples from their missionary journey (Lk. 10:21-23; see that Mk. 6:30-32 does not mention prayer). Luke 24:13-35 mentions the journeying and the disciples’ rest, in Emmaus, as
well as their prayer. Journeying and a time for meditation and prayer come together in Damascus (Acts 9:9, 18). Luke's prayer theme offers numerous points of contact with his hodos scheme, even earlier in the narrative, as in Zechariah's hodos quotations from Malachi 3:1, 4:2 and Isaiah 9:2; 59:8; 60:1-2 (ὁδοὺς ἀντί οἰς ὀδον εἰρήνης), mentioned in a context of prayer (praise song).

In the context of the disciples' misunderstanding motif in Luke 9, and of Jesus' revelation, Jesus' movements are noticeably slowed down in Luke's representation. Journeying with Jesus makes room for the Transfiguration and for the Great Confession, as occasions of revelation in secluded places, in static scenes. At the level of Luke's global structure, the narrative flows between three major static sections

The Jerusalem stories of Nativity (Lk. 1-3),
The Transfiguration and Confession scenes (Lk. 9)
The Jerusalem stories of Jesus' Passion and Resurrection (Lk. 19-24).

Luke's representational triad (revelation, prayer, retreat scene) occurs again in Luke 9 (the Transfiguration) and Luke 24 (the Ascension) in the special setting of the mountain, the two stories finding themselves in a special narrative correspondence. As the mountain reflects the idea of divine presence (cf. Acts 1:1-12), both texts are based on a Deuteronomistic imagery, and both mention heavenly beings, a manifestation of light, witnesses, etc. Messianic tension is present in both in the fact that, while Luke 9 gradually takes the reader into a deeper and mysterious concealment of Jesus' Passion, Luke 24 moves him gradually out of puzzlement to openness and understanding, and this is representative of Luke's 'theological geography'.

In conclusion, Luke's representation of Mark's motif of the Way includes various techniques. He keeps some hodos material and edits out some, he rationalises and personalises Mark's accounts, aiming at a positive perception of the Way as a messianic motif. He also integrates into his journey motif other specific themes of his, such as prayer or revelation in secluded places, evangelistic dialogues, solemn scenes and slowed down movements, or the use of high status characters.

LUKE'S REPRESENTATION OF MATTHEW'S HODOS TEXTS

This is a rather difficult and quite speculative entreprise, yet worth doing for the sake of exploring from an alternative synoptic perspective, Luke's mimetic style. An assessment of Luke's representation of Matthew's motif of the Way should take into consideration at least three main issues: their related editing of Mark's hodos texts (the synoptic threefold tradition), Luke's omission of some important hodos passages of Matthew's (a subject which raises the question whether Luke has, actually, known Matthew's gospel, at all), and the nature of their structural and narrative parallelisms.

Parallel Editing of the Synoptic Tradition

In a number of places, both Luke and Matthew adopt a similar line of redaction of Mark's passages. For example, in editing the 'Isaianic Gospel' of the Way, both display a similar tendency to expand Mark's hodos series and emphasize the ministry of John the Baptist. Both add extra OT references concerning the coming of the Messiah (Is. 40:3; Mt. 3:3; Mk. 1:2-3; Lk. 3:5-6); Matthew adds Isaiah 9:1-2 (Mt. 4:15), while Luke adds the prayer or praise song of Zechariah (Lk. 1:76, 79; cf. Is. 9:2; 40:3; 58:8; 60:1-2; Mal. 3:1). As well, both add an extra testimony concerning John the Baptist (Mt. 11:10; Lk. 7:27).

There are, also, other instances, when they edit differently Mark's hodos references. For example, Matthew 20:17-19 follows Mark 10:32-34 and places the Passion announcement in a hodos setting, whereas Luke, on the contrary, emphasizes Jesus' awareness of the coming Passion at the expense of Mark's journey indicators (Lk. 18:31-34).

Luke's Omission of Hodos Passages

The issue here is how Luke, if he knew Matthew, has come to edit out some large and famous hodos passages such as (a) the journey of the Magi to Bethlehem (Mt. 2:1-23), (b) the reference to the Galilee of Gentiles (Mt. 4:15), and (c) the Two Ways sayings of Jesus (Mt. 7:13-14). Admitting that the following analysis is forced too often to rely on the argument from absence, it is important, however, to see that such omissions can still be coherently explained in line with Luke's theological tendencies as known from his redaction of Mark.
The Two Ways parables can be regarded as Q material since they have a parallel in Luke’s pericope about the narrow door (Lk. 13:22-31; ἁγγείωσεν εἰς εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τῆς στενῆς θύρας, Lk. 13:24, etc.). Luke keeps the idea of challenge (στενή, enhanced by ἁγγείωσεν, etc.), yet does not preserve the mention of η οἰλίγγει (the gate and the way). If the text belongs to the Q source, one cannot be sure of its original form. Matthew might have modified it to include these elements, as well. The second important element in the saying is the opposition ὀλίγοι - πολλοί (few - many), preserved by both Matthew and Luke (Mt. 7:13-14; Lk. 13:23). However, instead of building on the idea of the two ways and on the contrast ὀλίγοι - πολλοί, like Matthew, Luke elaborates on the door concept (ἡ στενὴ θύρα; ἀποκλείει τὴν θύραν; κρούει τὴν θύραν, Lk. 13:24-25; cf. Mt. 25:10, ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα; also Lk. 11:7). Matthew’s contrast ὀλίγοι - πολλοί becomes in Luke a repeated contrast between the first and the last, οἱ πρῶτοι - οἱ ἐσχάτοι (Lk. 13:30). Whereas Matthew highlights the choice, Luke is more judgemental of the Jews and presents a total inversion of priority. For some reason, Luke is not attracted by the idea of choosing between two different ways. The way is not so much a matter of choice, in Luke, as it is itself an important locus for essential ethical and theological choices. As well, the plural ‘ways’ is kept as a reference to missionary ministry, as a sign of the Lord’s coming.

Next, the reference to the Galilee ‘by the way of the sea’ (Mt. 4:15), related to Gentiles, is surprisingly missing from Luke, especially if he knew Isaiah and tended to emphasize his message (and, also, if he used Matthew). However, it could have been omitted by Luke on the grounds that caused him to leave out Mk. 6:46-8:27 (the Great Omission), as well, i.e., his particular focus on Jewish mission in the Gospel.

Finally, it is difficult to understand why Matthew’s account of the Magi’s visit (Mt. 2:1-23) does not find its way into Luke’s gospel. The Lukan motifs of journeying, worshipping and joy at the birth of the Messiah are all present there. However, whereas Luke builds an idyllic picture of Jerusalem in Luke 1-3 (and this feature of Luke’s prologues is well known), Matthew’s atmosphere is on the whole, rather grim, dramatic, emphasizing the rejection of Messiah. For Luke, rejection is a theme to be mentioned rather at the end of the gospel. The issue of rejection and suffering occurs at the beginning of the gospel only in a very subtle, indirect way (cf. Simon’s prayer, Luca 2:34-35). Another possible reason for Luke’s omission of this pericope could be Luke’s Jewish particularism. One could suggest that the evangelistic, Gentile emphases in the story of the three Magi are reserved by Luke for the Ethiopian conversion in Acts (Acts 8:25-40).

Hodos Chiasmus in Matthew and in Luke
While Luke keeps together the parables of the adversary and of the Great Banquet, at the heart of his Central Journey (Lk. 12:58-59; 14:15-24), between the two questions concerning the inheriting of eternal life (Lk. 10:25-28; 18:18-23), Matthew places them at the beginning and, respectively, at the end of his gospel (Mt. 5:25, 22:1-14).

Luke centralizes ethical challenge and encloses it with a discipleship inclusio: it comes after a series of three Lukan specific hodos texts (how to follow Jesus, Lk. 9:57-58; the commissioning of the 70, Lk. 10:1-23, and the Good Samaritan, Lk. 10:30-37), and it is followed, immediately, by Jesus’ questions about discipleship (Lk. 14:25-33) and the parable regarding the ‘salt or soil’ quality of Israel (Lk. 14:34-35). This centralization of ethical challenge in Luke 12-14, highlights, in fact, the chiastic structure of Luke 9-19, which, as suggested by other studies, is centred on Jesus’ lament over Jerusalem (Lk. 13:33-35). Goulder, Talbert, Bailey, Blomberg, and Franklin agree that Luke’s journey narrative ‘falls into two parts with the conclusion of the first coming at the end of chapter thirteen.’ Matthew and Luke share, thus, the idea of an overall structural chiasmus, yet they construct it differently. While Matthew organizes his narrative into a large global ethical chiasmus, Luke’s centralizes the challenge and relies on a revelation chiasmus in Luke 9 - Luke 24.

The second part of this journey into Luke’s mimetic representation is focused on studying his literary style by assessing his own hodos accounts. For convenience, the hodos references are divided into three distinct groups: (a) the hodos occurrences in Luke’s Infancy narratives (including its thematic and literary links with Acts); (b) Luke’s Central Section (highlighting Luke’s own hodos stories and their literary structure); and, finally (c) the Emmaus hodos encounter, seen
as a journey story beyond the landmark of Jerusalem and of Jesus’ Passion.

**The Journey Motif and the Infancy Narratives**


The entire Nativity section in Luke is marked by the motifs of ‘journeying’ and ‘sojourning’. Thus, Mary travels from Galilee to Judah to visit Elizabeth (Lk. 1:39-56), Joseph and Mary embark on a journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem in Judaea (2:1-7), and the shepherds travel to Bethlehem from the hills of Judaea (Lk. 2:8-20). As well, Joseph and Mary travel to Jerusalem twice, once for Mary’s purification (2:22-39) and once for the Passover and, probably, for Jesus’ *bar-mitzvah* (2:41-51). In this last instance, the *hodos* mention in Luke 2:44 ( ἡλθόν ἡμέρας ὄδον) does not carry any deep metaphorical meaning, yet it contributes to the general impression of movement, characteristic of times of prophetic fulfillment. This period has an idyllic outlook emphasized later, as well, by Jesus’ picture as a young prodigy, a theme with Hellenistic connotations.

The special dynamics of the Nativity contributes to its prefatory role. Luke introduces here his paradigm of ‘divine visitation’, and comes back to it, later, in Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem and in the Emmaus encounter. Even from the Infancy narratives, this theme is coherently supported by the role of the Spirit as a divine character.

One can note, further, a significant linguistic correspondence between these Infancy texts and the other *hodos* accounts in Luke-Acts which emphasizes common Lukan authorship and the same representational vocabulary and vision. For example, the language of amazement and eye-witnesses, in Saul’s conversion, εὐστατόν δὲ πάντες οἱ ἑκούσωσιν (Acts 9:21) is found also in Luke 2:47; the divine intervention through angels, ἄγγελος δὲ κυρίοι - in Acts 8:26, and also in Luke 1:11, 2:9 (cf. Mt. 1-2); the reference to Israel, νῦν τε Ἰσραήλ - in Acts 5:21, 7:37, 9:15, 10:36, also in Luke 1:10. The noun ὄπτασις, vision, is not found in the NT elsewhere but in Luke 1:22, in the Emmaus road encounter (Lk. 24:23), and in 2 Cor. 12:1. Apart from the stereotyped expression in the ‘Lord’s prayer’, the adjective ὀφραντιος occurs only in Luke 2:13 and in Acts 26:19, in the description of Saul’s commissioning. In these texts, also, Luke prefers the form ἱεροσολύμω to that of ἱεροσολύμα (Lk. 2:25, 38, 41, 43, 45; cf. Lk. 24:13, 24:18; 24:33; 24:47; 24:52; Acts 1:8; 1:12; 1:19; 8:27; 9:2; 9:26, etc).

Another thematic correspondence between these texts is the occurrence of the *two witnesses* motif (Lk. 2:25-38, Anna and Simeon; Cleopas and his companion, Lk. 24:4; Moses and Elijah, Lk. 9:30-32; two angels, Acts 1:10; etc., cf. Morgenthaler’s ‘rule of two’).

Lastly, journeying in this section is integrated, as in the whole of Luke-Acts, with the themes of physical or intellectual impairment or with healing, as a result of faith or lack of it. For example, the story of Zechariah’s numbness (Lk. 1:20-22) has its counterparts in the intellectual blindness of Cleopas and his companion (Lk. 24:16) in Paul’s blindness and his recovery (Acts 9:8-9), in Elymas’ blindness (Acts 13:4-12), etc.

**Jesus’ Journey to Jerusalem and Its Hodos Stories**

In spite of several thematic approaches to Luke’s Central Section, in the last decades, none has interpreted it in terms of Lukan mimesis. Lukan researchers, so far, suggest that nothing much can be said about this passage where a loose theology is associated to a loose geography. By contrast, one can discover more of its message by looking at its form and its structure through the lens of mimetic representation.

**The Meaning of Luke’s Central Section**

The theological significance of Luke’s journey section is controlled by its *teaching* content and by its *Passion* perspective. In terms of material, Luke crams here much of his specific stories and shapes the story line into three similarly built parts (19:51-13:21; 13:22-17:10; 17:11-19:27; all sections integrate the motifs of journeying, teaching, specific parables, characteristic table fellowship, etc.). The link between teaching and journeying is a subtle one, and Luke sustains it by various literary techniques (for example, F. J. Matera suggests that majority of Jesus’ instruction is given at specific points of changes of time and place: Lk. 9:51, 56; 10:17,
The Way and Synoptic Mimesis

According to Kümmel’s redactional classification one can note seven different types of interpretations for Luke 9-19: (a) as an account of Jesus’ preparation and commissioning of his disciples; (b) as parallel to the teachings of Deuteronomy; (c) as a teaching series focused on the debate with Jesus’ opponents; (d) as a journey model of Jesus’ awareness of his Passion; or (e) as a compositional device unifying Jesus’ actual journey to his Passion with his messianic teachings; (f) as an effective Christian metaphor of the history of redemption seen as ‘the Way’; (g) an anticipation of Jesus’ ascension; (h) as a picture of the Jewish and Samaritan dilemma of choosing between listening to Jesus and rejecting him; or (i) as a retrospective composition of Luke, narrating Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem by analogy to Paul’s later and similarly tragic journey to the Judaean capital.

From a literary perspective, D. Moessner mentions four thematic strands in the assessment of this Lukan section. The first is the theological-Christological approach, according to which Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem is ‘a viable symbol of a distinctive phase in the unfolding dynamic of the Heilsgeschichte’, the authoritative journey of the king Messiah along with Jesus’ awareness of his suffering as a path to glory. The second is the ecclesiastical-functional approach, which considers that the coherence of Luke’s central section is due to a ‘useful parallel between Jesus’ journeying and the church’s present journeys’. Thirdly, the literary-aesthetical approach, uncovers a distinct literary structures like chiasmus, analogy to Deuteronomy, lectionary cycles, etc. In this case, the story’s literary coherence is achieved through artistic means for ‘Jesus still journeys to Jerusalem, but he does so through a carefully conceived artistic pattern’, a journey ‘frozen’ in a literary structure. The fourth is the traditional-logical approach, according to which the Jerusalem journey is an intrinsic sequence of the earlier gospel tradition, a ‘convenient scaffolding for a great mass of heterogeneous traditions’ which does not follow a perceptible chronological sequence.

In a more compact summary F. J. Matera suggests that two main aspects have been emphasized in the study of Luke’s Jerusalem journey, the Christological aspect and the ecclesiological one.

Closer to the present study’s perceptions, however, is M. Miyoshi’s classification, who notes two types of Lukan journey studies, based on whether the emphasis in interpreting the Jerusalem journey has been laid on (1) the journey indicators, Reisenotizen, or (2) on Luke’s specific theology of journeying, die Theologie der Stoffe im Reisebericht.

The present study takes into account the various, different types of journey stories in Luke 9-19 (‘journey within a journey’ stories, recognition accounts, journey parables, etc.), and suggests that such short paradigmatic accounts in Luke-Acts (hodos stories, trial and arrest narratives, prison delivery stories, etc.) are evidence of a constant style and provide a fresh point of view for the assessment of Luke’s theology of the Way. Luke’s journey is perceived, therefore, as a ‘literary motif that functions with specific narrative roles’.


The journey theme, already acknowledged as being essential to the message of Luke-Acts, is specifically illustrated, then, through this series of hodos accounts, which display remarkable literary dynamism and surprising novel-like features.

Stopped on the Way, a Discipleship Sub-Theme

The first Lukan specific hodos text in this section is Luke 9:57-58. Paralleled by Matthew 8:18-22, yet without a mention of the ‘way’ there, this passage shares the traditions of Mark’s report on the rich young man and his question about eternal life (Mk. 10:17-27). Luke 9:57 uses two specific journey-related terms, hodos and porevo, in the context of discipleship, akoloutheo: καὶ προευγενείαν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπέν τις πρὸς αὐτῶν, ἀκολουθήσαν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἀπέρχεται. A similar story appears in Luke 18:18-23, yet without an explicit hodos setting. This type of early Christian tradition singles out Jesus as a teacher often stopped on the road with a request for a word of Torah wisdom or for healing. Alternatively, Jesus would stop others ‘on the road’ or during a journey, with the purpose of teaching and discipling (cf. Lk. 9:50-62; esp. Lk. 9:59, Lk. 9:60). Apart from its OT or Hellenistic tradition, the pattern of instruction ‘on the way’ is profoundly characteristic of Jesus’ ministry, and this may have influenced the collective
memory concerning the later post-resurrection appearances or encounters.729

Multiple Commissionings of the Disciples
Luke was fond of recording different variants of Jesus testimonies, or to shape them, as literature, and thus one finds in his gospel not only the commissioning of the Twelve (Lk. 9:1-6, 10) but in addition, that of the Seventy disciples, as well (Lk. 10:1-23). It has been argued that in Luke 9:1-6 Jesus commissions the Twelve in correspondence to the number of the tribes of Israel (cf. Lk. 22:30). The Seventy (cf. the seventy-two variant for Lk. 10:1; 10:1-12),730 would then correspond to the traditional number of nations in the Table of Nations. Similar concerns are present in Luke 24:46-47 and Acts 1:8, where the disciples’ mission involves going ‘to all the nations’ (εἰς πάντα τὰ εὐθύς). The same sequence of numbers is implied at the Pentecost, twelve apostles (Acts 1:26; 2:14); and seventy nations (cf. Acts 2:5).731 Luke manifests here an interesting tendency towards gematria, with parallels only in Matthew.

Journey Parables: Meeting Half-Dead Travellers
Among Luke’s specific ἡδος texts, one of the most celebrated is Jesus’ parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10:30-37).732 This challenging story of Jesus is set by Luke733 on the road down to Jericho, leading away from Jerusalem (ἀνθρωπὸς τις κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ εἰς Ἰεριχώ καὶ Ἰορταίς περιέπεσεν, Lk. 10:30; ἱερεὺς τις κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, v. 31; Σαμαρίτης δὲ τὶς ὁδεύων ἠλέην, v. 33).

Its plot starts in a strikingly similar way to the common folk-tale of ‘The Grateful Dead Man’, usually cited as a parallel for Tobit’s journey. According to this story, a traveller comes upon the corpse of a man killed by robbers and buries him; later on in his journey, he meets a stranger - the dead man’s spirit who befriends him and helps him in his travels in return his earlier kindness. Often this help includes a happy-ending marriage of the traveller with a woman whom he delivered from a troublesome spirit.734 In the Good Samaritan parable the popular parallel goes only half way through the story, and this would have been enough rhetorically, to startle Luke’s audience (or Jesus’ original listeners). The particular format of Luke’s story shows that the Samaritan continues to take care of the attacked man and pays for any further expense, instead of being himself rewarded for his services.

As far as the plot is concerned, the story displays a series of dramatic ‘return points’. A first reversal of action, of a negative nature, is provided by the robbers’ attack. This violence takes place in a journeying setting, and fits well Aristotle’s requirements of a suffering scene: an Israelite brother attacks an Israelite brother, leaving him nearly dead. Luke’s description is dramatic, sensationalist: he ‘fell into the hands of robbers, who stripped him, beat him, and went away, leaving him half dead [λῃσταῖς περιέπεσεν... ἔδωκαν σε... πληγαῖς ἐπιθύμησε... αὐφέτες ἠμάθησε]’ (Lk. 10:3). The man’s fortunes are thus completely reversed from happiness to disaster.

After the traveller’s journeying is interrupted, the road turns into a setting of further trial and testing (v. 31, ἐν τῷ ὁδῷ, is paralleled in v. 32, by κατὰ τὸν τόπον). This is the second reversal, of positive nature, when the Samaritan comes on the same road as a providential saviour and helps the half-dead victim. The dramatic tension reaches a high level for this change of fate does not come through expected channels (cf. the priest and the Levite, Lk. 10:31-32). The recognition of the benefactor’s identity, a Samaritan, was in itself a reason for ethnic and religious tension. Luke’s final emphasis highlights the man’s restoration and the Samaritan’s complete care for his fellow traveler. Luke’s Jesus expects his audience to perceive this dramatic challenge and leads them to a clear conclusion (Lk. 10:36-37).

Journey Parables: the Prodigal Son’s Adventures
In Jesus’ parable of the Prodigal Son (Lk. 15:11-32), the reader encounters to a greater degree the elements of the Hellenistic novel. The departure to a distant foreign land has all the spicy details and the adventure characteristic to Greek novels: a long journey, the pride and courage of youth, the attraction of wealth and its short-lived existence, the perils of dissolute living, the drama of final restoration, etc. All hint to romance in a way that contradicts previous assessments of Luke, according to which this genre is entirely alien to Luke-Acts, and in general, to Jewish novellas (Lk. 15:13-14).735

The journey plot includes a turning point which takes place in a ‘discovery’ moment and is expressed through a language of decision (‘raising up’ and the ‘journeying back’, ἀναστάς.
poreúsmoi πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου, Lk. 15:18). The moment of decision comes in spite of the distance and of the apparently irretrievable loss of status (a scene of suffering, of pathos). The young man rehearses mentally his future apologetic dialogue with his father and the return includes the scene of an encounter ‘on the way’, a moment of recognition and greeting, followed by celebration. Characteristic of Luke, the dénouement includes a meal of fellowship, a feast of restoration. At the end, the happy father provides a summary (a report to his elder son), through which Jesus communicates to his audience the essence of the story.

Zacchaeus’ Encounter: Journeying, Sojourning, and Salvation

Another illustration of Luke’s interest in significant encounters during a journey is the account of Zacchaeus’ conversion, although the specific hodos setting is missing (Lk. 19:1-10). However, the account starts with an unmistakable emphasis on journeying, καὶ ἔσχαστο τὴν ἱεριχώ (Lk. 19:1), ὥστε ἐκεῖνοι ἠμέλλον διέρχεσθαι (v. 4), ἠλέην ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου (v. 5), ἠσηλθεν καταλῦσαι (19:7), ἠλέην γὰρ ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (v. 10).

Luke’s integration of themes links journeying with the ‘necessity’ or ‘must do’ motif – the δεῖ motif (Lk. 19:5b, σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου δεῖ με μείναι), a theme related not only to Jesus’ Passion (Lk. 9:22; 17:25; 24:7, 26) but also to other missionary aspects in Luke-Acts, and to the motif of table fellowship (cf. Lk. 2:49; 4:43; 13:16; 19:5; Acts 3:21).

Continuing the compositional emphases of the preceding story in the narrative (the blind man’s healing), the motif of ‘seeing’ is also present here, with restoration connotations. Thus, Zacchaeus tries hard to see Jesus, καὶ ἔζητε ἵδειν τὸν Ἰησοῦ (v. 3), ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτὸν (v. 4), although he is not blind but only ‘impaired’ due to his short height. With great artistic skill Luke uses the reciprocal construction, and Jesus sees Zacchaeus as well, ἀναβλέψας ὁ Ἰησοῦ (v. 5), and even more, the crowds saw their encounter and murmured against it, καὶ ἵδοντες πάντες διεγόγγυζον (v. 7). At the end of the story, Zacchaeus surprises everyone with his generous way of celebrating Christ, ‘Look, half of my wealth...’ ἵδοι τὸ ἡμίσια μου τῶν υπαρχόντων (v. 8), a happy ending which fully corresponds with the way Luke highlighted earlier the joy of Zacchaeus at the news that Jesus will enter his house (χαίρον, v. 6, cf. the Ethiopian’s story, Acts 8:39).

Luke uses a thematic ‘seeking’ inclusio here, καὶ ἔζητε ἵδειν (v. 3), and ἵδοντες καὶ σῶσαι (v. 10), with clear soteriological implications, and between these two remarks the story displays a dramatic reversal. Zacchaeus sought to see Jesus (v. 3), but finally the reader realises that Jesus is the one who sees people and seeks to save the lost (v. 10).

One has to note another characteristic of Luke’s style, that Messiah removes social barriers to make salvation available to all (Luke 19:9), and thus, Zacchaeus overcomes the disadvantage of his short stature and that of the large crowd standing between him and Jesus (v. 3), as well as that of his notoriety. The final restoration is sealed by a fellowship meal (Lk. 19:5-7). Furthermore, Jesus explains his actions to the revolted crowd in short a Lukan summary (report).

These emphases are enhanced by the particular position of this conversion story in Luke’s narrative: ‘the strategic placement of this story at the conclusion of the journey to Jerusalem suggests that it is in some way definitive for Jesus’ ministry on the pages of Luke’.

The Emmaus Story: A Journey Beyond Jerusalem

Jesus’ appearance to the two disciples on the Emmaus road is certainly one of Luke’s most significant additions to the synoptic series of journey notes and accounts (Lk. 24:13-35). Reflecting Luke’s general tendencies, the importance of the Emmaus journey derives from its transitional features, and from its redactional emphasis on journeying and theological challenge. As part of the hodos triad discussed in the present work, it clearly displays the features of Luke’s post-Easter encounter paradigm and illustrates his compositional principles.

MIXED MOTIFS AND LITERARY CONTINUITY

The Emmaus story has been regarded as a continuation of Luke’s more general journey motif. Its characteristics have led certain scholars to see it as a transitional story, connecting the previous journey of Jesus to Jerusalem (Lk. 9-19) with the post-Easter period. It certainly shares a similar ‘travel and discussion’ format (journey and didache), and the teaching contributes to the understanding of the passion mystery and of Jesus’ messianic identity. For Guillaume, this feature of
proclamation “on the road” (l’instruction kérygmatique “in via”) is the essential point of the whole account.

A highly polished narrative, the Emmaus account reflects Luke’s integration of different motifs and themes, and ensures a strong retrospective relation, through links with motifs such as the restoration motif, the table fellowship motif, the kingdom of God motif, the prayer motif, the sight motif, etc. Some of the motifs are looking forwards, announcing major themes in Acts: the proof from scripture motif, the report to the apostles, the encounter motif, etc. In particular, the table fellowship scene has strong eucharistic connotations, and as such it challenges the normal Passover paradigm, announcing the time of the Church.

For if the Emmaus meal is proleptic of the meal fellowship of the early Christian communities, then the location of the Emmaus meal is also proleptic of the primary geographical location where meal fellowship will be celebrated in the Church, i.e. outside Jerusalem.

At the same time, one can note that the two disciples do not belong to the select circle of the Eleven, and this is a foretaste of the shared and team-styled ministry of the Christians in Acts.

THE REDACTIONAL CHARACTER OF THE STORY

Both Schubert and Dillon concluded that Luke took the initial story of the ‘Emmaus appearance’ and fashioned it into an ‘Emmaus journey’. They suggest that the original story was ‘an older and simpler Emmaus tradition’, thought to have included verses 13, 15b, 16, 28-31, and to have ended with v. 31 ‘a very effective and truly dramatic climax of the recognition appearance’. This hypothesis seems well supported by the distinct Lukian character of the vv. 32-35 (cf. the use of ἐξεγείρομαι, Lk 24:35, cf. Acts 10:8; 15:12; 14; 21:19; Jn. 1:18; ὐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ὀρτοῦ, Lk. 24:35, Acts 2:42; uniquely Lukian; διηνοιοῦν, v. 32; cf. Lk. 2:23; 24:45; Acts 16:14; 17:3). The unexpected yet impressive inversion between the hodos reports in 24:33-35 (the announcement of the apostles first, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, then the report of Clepas, ἐξεγείρομαι, in v. 35), provides supplementary evidence that Luke carefully composes the end of this story, using the reports and their hodos formulation (vv. 32, 35) in a ‘subtle, yet highly deliberate’ way.

addition, it has been argued that the story had a ‘natural ending’ at v. 32, since on their return the two disciples could not have entered the gates of Jerusalem for they were closed at sunset (however, if Emmaus was situated at 160 stadia away from Jerusalem, they had enough time to travel and be back at dawn). Emmaus itself is not presented as the hometown of Cleopas or of his companion and the place they stopped could well have been but a station for a night before going to their homes.

JOURNEYING AND LEXIS

The journey motif pervades the whole of the Emmaus story and is particularly well reflected at the level of Luke’s lexis (diction and vocabulary, repetition, alliteration). Thus, the two disciples journey to Emmaus (ἡμας πορεύόμενοι, Lk. 24:13), and asks about their debate on the road (περιπατοῦντες, Lk. 24:17). Jesus’ appearance is serene, within the limits of normality (unexpectedly so, given the nature of the subject), reminding one of the appearance of Romulus to Ascanius, with the exception that Jesus is not recognised.

Once arrived in Emmaus, Jesus impersonates the innocent traveller, as if he wanted to continue his journey, προσεπισκόπησα τοὺς προφήτους πορευόμενοι (Lk. 24:28; cf. the use of προσεπισκόπησα, the alliteration). The memory of the events that had just happened warms their hearts so intensely, οὐκ ἦν καρδία ἡμῶν καταθλήθη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, that the two disciples mention the ‘on the road’ theme twice, first, in an indirect summary, τῷ ἑλάτω ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὡς διηνοιούν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφὰς (in Lk. 24:32); and secondly, in the final report to the Eleven, ἐξεγείρομαι τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ κτλ. (Lk. 24:35).

A comparison with the OT texts emphasizes as well the journey character of the story. In its first part, the Emmaus account has been described as a ‘journey encounter’, while the second part is dominated by the motif of a ‘heavenly rapture’ or miraculous disappearance, a motif that reminds of the Elisha-Elijah paradigm.

RECOGNITION AND HELLENISTIC PARALLELS

The meaning of the journey is particularly highlighted in the recognition scene at the breaking of the bread. Reflecting the unexpected yet impressive inversion between the hodos reports in 24:33-35 (the announcement of the apostles first, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, then the report of Clepas, ἐξεγείρομαι, in v. 35), provides supplementary evidence that Luke carefully composes the end of this story, using the reports and their hodos formulation (vv. 32, 35) in a ‘subtle, yet highly deliberate’ way. In
Luke’s Christological agenda, the scene is exquisitely narrated as a ‘divine’ recognition, since the disciples’ eyes are opened to know him, αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοιχθήσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν (Lk. 24:31).764 The combination between recognition and reversal of journey makes the meal scene a memorable one (for Aristotle the finest recognition is ‘that which occurs simultaneously with reversal’).765 Through recognition, the two disciples are restored to fellowship with the other apostles (Lk. 24:34-35; 36-50).

An almost perfect case of cultural relevance, the similarity of the Emmaus recognition scene to other such scenes in the Greek novels, can be illustrated by two specific examples. A first parallel is the recognition scene between Chaereas and Callirhoe (a story written between 25 BC - AD 50, contemporary to Luke). Their story is the story of two spouses separated by terrible adventures, who come together at the end of a long and perilous journey (during a siege, Chaereas captures the town of Aradus, and finds his wife amid the prisoners). The encounter scene describes how, getting near her, Chaereas felt his heart strangely stirred and was seized with excitement (ἐτοράχη τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ μετέδωκεν ἐγένοτο) although he did not know she was his former wife (cf. the disciples’ ‘burning hearts’, in their ‘premonition’ on the Emmaus road).766 Proper recognition takes place, later, when Chaereas starts speaking: ‘While he was still speaking, Callirhoe recognised his voice and uncovered her face έτι λέγοντος: ἡ Καλλίρρη γνώρισα τὴν φωνὴν ἀπεκάλυψατο’.767

Another captivating novel parallel is the recognition or, rather, mis-identification by voice and appearance, found in Iamblichus, Babylonika,768 a later story than Luke-Acts, yet relevant through its play on the theme of death and return to life. Here, an Aphrodite priestess believes she saw her dead son Tigris alive, risen from the dead, ‘recognising’ him by the way he speaks and looks (ἡ δὲ γὰρ σε γινώσκει, καί ὃν έπιτασ οκουσασα καί ὃς πη ιδουσα), while she was actually beholding another young man, Rhodanes.769 The real recognition scene is delayed, here, however, since Rhodanes and Sinonis, his young female companion, continued for a time to play the roles of Tigris and Aphrodite, taking advantage of the naïveté of the islanders.770 By contrast, Cleopas and his companion do not recognise Jesus (ἐπέγνωσαν) by his voice or by his appearance.771 The prolonged dialogue on the road enhances the narrative suspense. Also, just before the actual recognition at the meal (Lk. 24:30), Luke indulges a little longer in the theatrical features of his story: after Jesus is mistaken for a stranger, παροικεῖν, who wants to join the journey (Lk. 24:18), now, Jesus pretends he wants to journey further (a mimesis or imitation of journeying? cf. Lk. 24:28).772 The plot displays a remarkable internal symmetry: Jesus had joined the two disciples as a stranger, and now wants to journey further, still as a stranger. The comparison with Romulus’ appearance is valid for this part of the Emmaus account, as well, yet one has to remark that the mystery surrounding Jesus is certainly deeper: his identity remains still hidden at this point of the story.

At the end of this analysis of Luke’s journey stories in the Synoptic context, one can identify a few of his artistic rules for historic representation. For example, Luke has a tendency towards presenting the Way in a positive manner, with positive connotations. His editing of Mark’s hodos scheme integrates Mark’s geographical and theological themes with his own Lukan ones (cf. prayer and revelation in secluded places). Luke personalises and rationalises many of Mark’s hodos accounts, favouring an alternance of dynamic hodos events with static, solemn scenes, where high status characters stop and question Jesus on essential issues pertaining to salvation. The transition potential of Luke’s hodos stories is obvious, as in the case of blind Bartimaeus’ healing which serves as introduction to the restoration of Zacchaeus, and, as well, is evident in the Emmaus story, looking at the various motifs woven in the account.

Specifically, this survey of the synoptic hodos texts of the NT has highlighted that within the limits of his Central Section and even beyond it, Luke includes journey stories and paradigms of his own such as the parable of the Good Samaritan, of the Prodigal Son, the account of Zacchaeus’ restoration, and the Emmaus encounter. It cannot be overlooked that these stories reflect well Aristotle’s requirements for the well-written plot (significant encounters, recognition scenes, turning points and reversals of destiny, suffering scenes or suffering narrative backgrounds, restorational endings - meals, feasts, dialogues, care and assistance, restitution, significant summaries or reports).
Such evidence for a complex Lukan paradigm of journeying constitutes the foundation of this study’s further research into the literary anatomy and narrative function of Luke’s post-Easter ‘on the road’ encounters that constitutes the subject of the fourth chapter.

CHAPTER 4

The Post-Easter Paradigm

The evidence so far confirms that Luke’s ‘on the road’ encounters share more than a few formal correspondences. They are part of a larger Lukan collection of events set ‘on the road’ or during a journey, all displaying a similar type of plot line, in close correspondence with Aristotle’s rules for the well-told story and reflecting a specific form of Luke’s journey paradigm. Their literary and theological significance reflects the transitional characteristics of their narrative context, that is, of Luke 24 – Acts 1 and, respectively, Acts 8-9, and their own literary ‘anatomy’.

Literary Unity and Transition in Luke 24 - Acts 1


Subsequently, literary repetition in Luke-Acts has been analysed extensively from various angles as a mark of style or literary fashion, yet rather at a macro-narrative level, and frequently restricted to the patterns of Acts. Luke’s use of narrative repetition is evident in the notorious reiterations of Saul’s commissioning (Acts 9, 22, 26), of Cornelius’ conversion (Acts 10-12), and of the ‘apostolic decree’ (Acts 15:20-21; 15:28-
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29; 21:23-25). Luke’s Gospel has its own examples, such as the commissioning of the Twelve and of the Seventy / Seventy-two; the literary correspondences in the Nativity stories, etc. Using the language of communication theories this reiteration has been described as literary redundancy, or multiplication of narrative, or as themes with variations, the latter coming closer to this study’s views on Luke’s hodos encounters. These themes are ‘privileged loci for exploring Luke’s method and meaning’, and essential for the main plot lines of Luke-Acts. As expanding symbols in the narrative they create an effect of literary dynamism and unity.

The Narrative Context of Luke 24 – Acts 1

The two major sections of Luke-Acts, Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem (Lk. 9:51-19:44), and the missionary journeys of the early church (Acts 19:21-28:31), are connected through the pivot of Jesus’ Ascension which is a culmination of the resurrection appearances and a major illustration of Luke’s emphasis on Jerusalem. The Easter narratives have a pivotal role in Luke-Acts and the Ascension represents its narrative and theological ‘hinges’. In this context, journeying further with Good News as a message, has a transition role, as well, and in the process, it challenges the Jewish traditional emphasis on Jerusalem’s centrality.

Jerusalem’s centrality is transparent in Luke’s gospel and provides an essential link with the past, with the “arché” of the Church, reflecting the nationalistic pride of the first century Judaism(s). For Jews Jerusalem was the holy city, a major metropolis and fatherland.

I should speak now of the Holy City [τῆς Ἱεροσολύμας] the things I ought to. This city, as I said, is my homeland, the capital not of the Judean territory, only but of many others, for it has sent colonies, in time, to neighbouring countries, etc.

Such statements were not without biblical support. For example, Isaiah 1:26 states in similar words God’s promise to Jerusalem ‘And I will restore your judges as at the first, and your counselors as at the beginning. Afterward you shall be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city [LXX: πόλις δικαιοσύνης, μητρόπολις πιστή Σιων]’ (RSV). Similarly central was the Temple in Jerusalem and the oracular primacy of Scripture, whose restoration was regarded as symbolic of the Messiah’s age. The whole Mediterranean context was characterized by such a craving for national centres: the Samaritans assigned a similar centrality to Mt. Garizim, the Greek themselves had at Delphi, their own centre or ‘omphalos of the earth’; the Romans had Rome.

Thus, Luke’s reader would not be surprised to see in Luke 24 – Acts 1 so many references to Jerusalem and will understand the special significance of the city (Lk. 24:13, 24:18; 24:33; 24:47; 24:52; Acts 1:8; 1:12; 1:19). He might raise an eyebrow, though, at Luke’s use of two spellings for Jerusalem, that is Hierosolyma and Hierosolēm. It has been suggested that Hierosolēm stands for a geographical, profane meaning, and Hierosolyma for a sacral, hebraising one; or that Luke use Hierosolēm in Jewish contexts and Hierosolyma in non-Jewish contexts. A third explanation holds that Hierosolēm could indicate narrative material dealing with the apostles, while Hierosolyma highlights stories dealing with Paul and Hellenists. The grammatical hypothesis notes that Hierosolyma is declinable thus used with prepositions, while in all other cases Luke uses the undeclinable form, Hierosolēm. Lastly, Hierosolyma has been seen as an intra-textual etymological key for Hierosolēm, an emphasis on the city seen as a ‘holy Salem’.

In this last sense, Morgenthaler notes that ‘Hierosolyma was a hiera polis’, a holy city. Luke’s preference for the other form, Hierosolēm, city of peace, would indicate, according to him, a retrospective idealisation of the past, similar to the way in which the old city of Troy was idealised as past history by Homer and Vergil (‘holy Ilion’, ‘holy Troia’, cf. εἶπεν Τροίης ἠρέναν πολείθρων ἐπερεαν, in Odyssey, 1.2). The ideal of a new Troy led Aeneas into his journey for the founding of Rome ‘tendimus in Latium... illic fas regna resurgere Troiae’ (Aeneid, 1.205). By way of comparison, Luke’s use of Hierosolēm (Lk. 24:1, 33; Acts 8:27, 9:2, 21, 26, etc.) would emphasize the recent siege and the fall of Jerusalem (a subtle vaticinium ex eventu).

The challenge to Jerusalem’s centrality is evident, however, in the Ascension account, which takes place actually on the Mt. of Olives, outside the capital (Lk. 24:50; Acts 1:12).
The Mount of Olives, not Jerusalem, is the geographical ‘hinge’ of Luke-Acts. If (as argued above) Jesus’ departure to the Mount of Olives was theologically significant for Luke, then the fact that Luke-Acts is ‘centred’ on an event just outside Jerusalem’s walls may also be important.

Luke 9:51 has already prepared the reader to the idea that the actual destination of Jesus’ journeying is his ανα̇μνησις, the Ascension, not Jerusalem. The change of paradigm is enhanced through the movement into (ἐν) and out (ἀπό) from Jerusalem, in the Emmaus account, and through the famous Emmaus meal.

Narrative Unity and Transition in Luke 24

Indeed, the Emmaus encounter plays an important function, as well, at the heart of Luke’s last chapter. Luke 24, as a whole, displays interesting transitional features in terms of literary style and of narrative devices (one can see, here, at work an interesting temporal contraction doubled by a spatial divergence).

For such reasons, the Emmaus story has often been described as ‘a gem of the narrative art’. It functions as a meeting point of several literary and theological motifs of Luke, such as journey, fulfilment of prophecy, recognition and hospitality. At the same time, it serves as an introduction for the series of Jesus’ appearances (to the two disciples, to Simon - v. 34, to the Eleven - vv. 36-49, at the Ascension), and for Luke’s motif of proof-from-prophecy, and lays the foundation for the later qualifications for apostolic ministry.

In particular, in the context of the proof-from-prophecy motif in Luke 24, the Emmaus story plays an controlling role. Its internal chiasmus extends into a controlling circular structure for the whole of Luke 24, organised around the fundamental core of the Easter proclamation, ‘they say he lives!’, σά λέγουσιν αὐτῶν ζῆν (Lk. 24:23b).

TEMPORAL CONTRACTION AND NARRATIVE UNITY

According to Aristotle, as one can recollect, unity of action was more important for the tragic plot than unity of character and this implied a careful selection of events and an appropriate length of the show, or of the story.

In this context, one cannot help noting that in Luke 24 the reader meets a ‘carefully constructed time-framework’, a unitary temporal scheme that is ‘one of Luke’s devices for bringing out the theological significance of the events recounted’. Luke uses a series of time notes which emphasizes the gradual coming of the resurrection day, one single and superlative day of glorious manifestation of Jesus’ messiahship: the day of Preparation (Lk. 23:54), the first day after the sabbath, at dawn (Lk. 24:1); the day of resurrection (v. 24:7), on that same day - the Emmaus encounter (v. 23; cf. the evening, v. 29; the very hour, v. 33).

According to this scheme the whole of Luke 24 gives the impression of having happened on one single day, an observation which prompted different interpretations. For some authors the ‘one day’ interval is a hint that a new creation takes place at the resurrection. Thus, it signals a parallel between Luke 24 and Genesis 1, focusing on the eighth day - the first of the new creation and the day of the resurrection. The time notes at Luke 24:1, 23, 29, 33 and 36, speak certainly of Luke’s artistry in setting the temporal frame of his stories in a way that confers unity of composition to his accounts.

For others, closing the gospel story on a pure chronological note, in Luke 24, could have thrown the composition off balance, emphasizing a time-table instead of an event that transcends history.

This contraction of the temporal scheme into a shorter period is one of Luke’s effective means for achieving narrative unity. Luke’s style is not monochrome, however, for he would not avoid the idea of expanding the temporal scheme, either, when narrative or theological reasons make it necessary. In Acts 1:3, he highlights the forty days between Jesus’ resurrection and his Ascension, a period he did not mention in Luke 24. Apart from providing further historical detail, this period has, as well, Christological implications, for example it emphasizes a Moses-Jesus parallel.

Luke 24 remains, further, the space where Luke overlaps with apparent easiness different, yet concurring, temporal frameworks (Luke 24:13-35). There is a striking contrast between the narrated time (extradiegetic, characteristic of the main narrative plot line) and the two disciples’ perception of time in the Emmaus story (intradiegetic, characteristic of their own situation). Cleopas and his companion live their own time line, characterized by disappointment and counting the days back to the Friday of the Crucifixion: ‘it is now the third
day' τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν (Lk. 24:21). Once arrived in Emmaus, they feel acutely that the day came to an end, πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἐστὶν καὶ κεκλικεν ἡδη ἡ ἡμέρα (Lk. 24:29). Meanwhile, the reader and the narrator knew all the time that this is the first day of prophetic fulfilment, the day of resurrection! These two contrasting frameworks intersect at their high point when the disciples recognise Jesus. The narrative and temporal progression focuses, finally, on the very hour of their return to Jerusalem, αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ (Lk. 24:33, a Lukanism).

**SPATIAL DIVERGENCE AND NARRATIVE TRANSITION**

The transition role of the Emmaus journey can be seen, as well, as a result of Luke's use of two different spatial-frameworks centred on Jerusalem. Journeying or returning to Jerusalem is juxtaposed to the theme of leaving the capital, and both create an evident narrative tension in the story. The two disciples, indeed, are journeying, but there is a general feeling that they move in the wrong direction.

The significance of the distance between Jerusalem and Emmaus has been much debated (30, 63, 160 stadia). For some, Luke's details are 'sufficient to establish clearly that the meal was taken well outside the boundaries of the city'. For others, Emmaus is just another part of Jerusalem. In fact, we have here two different Lukian spatial perspectives.

Luke's placement of the first post-resurrection meal outside Jerusalem is a significant part of his table fellowship matrix and his geographical perspective. The meals of the new age that are founded on the death and resurrection of Christ will now be celebrated as much outside as within Jerusalem.

**Literary Unity and Transition in Acts 8:26-9:31**

The other two hodos stories illustrated by this paradigm, Saul's encounter with Jesus and Philip's evangelization of the Ethiopian eunuch, function in Acts 8-9, a section with similar characteristics to those of Luke 24. These two chapters display narrative unity, contrasting spatial and temporal frameworks, linguistic unity. The unitary character of this narrative pivot is enhanced by the landmark nature of Saul's encounter and of Cornelius' conversion (Acts 10-12).

**Literary Coherence and Unity in Acts 8:26-9:31**

One of the main reasons for the narrative unity of Acts 8:26-9:31 is the special mimetic relation between the accounts of Saul's encounter and of the Ethiopian's conversion. They share several features, prefigured before them by the Emmaus encounter. This kind of relation has not been directly described in the secondary literature as 'mimetic', yet Luke's repeated use of the same literary paradigms highlights the presence of some clear mimetic principles.

**NARRATIVE UNITY**

In Acts 8-9, Philip's and Saul's ministries are presented via a consistent parallelism. Thus, they both proclaim the Messiah Jesus (ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν; Philip in Samaria, Acts 8:5, cf. 8:35, ἐπιγγέλσατο αὐτῶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ; and Paul, after conversion, in Damascus, Acts 9:20, ἐκήρυσσεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ), and they both preach about Jesus' name (περὶ τοῦ ονόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Acts 8:12; 9:20, 27-29).

Further, Saul's story 'engulfs' Philip's evangelism between his mention in Acts 8:1-3 and in 9:1ff. In Acts 8:3 Saul is ravaging the church, ἐλμαίνετο τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, and, again, in 9:1 he breathes destruction against the disciples of the Lord, ἐμπέθε οὐκ ἔπεισεν καὶ φόνον εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦ κυρίου. This inclusio suggests that Philip's story represents a sort of parenthetical, introductory missionary account to Paul's major experience. It also relates Philip's portrait and mission to that of Paul (Philip is mentioned independently in Acts 6:5, then in this Pauline inclusio, Acts 8:5-8:40, and later in Acts 21:8, again in relation to Paul).


In terms of temporal frameworks, Luke compresses the temporal gaps for the sake of narrative dynamism. For example, Acts 9:26-28 gives the impression that Saul's journey to Jerusalem has taken place some time soon after Paul's commissioning (cf. Gal. 1:18). Luke telescopes this journey to Jerusalem and for the sake of narrative unity presents a more compact story.
The way time and space frameworks are built can vary even in relation to one and the same story. For example, in the first account of Saul's encounter, the story is presented according to a three-day-long time span, and three places are mentioned as important: Jerusalem, the road, and Damascus (Acts 9). Later in Acts 22, Luke mentions only the road and the Temple, as settings, and a single time reference, the encounter at noon. Finally, Acts 26 mentions only a single time reference, at noon, and one spatial location, 'on the road'. Characters can be portrayed differently, as well. For example, narrative concerns make Ananias to gradually disappear from the scene, in Acts 9, 22, 26.

LINGUISTIC AND THEMATIC UNITY


Particularly in Acts 8:26-9:31, Luke emphasizes the hodos setting in a uniquely emphatical manner. From a total of twenty-two specific references to the 'way' (hodos) in Acts, in its twenty-eight chapters, it is remarkable that there are six such mentions only in chapter eight and nine, considerably more than the average in the rest of Acts (for example, there is no mention of hodos in Cornelius' accounts, Acts 10-12).

This high concentration illustrates well Luke's mimetic emphasis on a specific lexis of transition.

As a whole, Acts 8-9 is characterised by Luke's creative variations on the Way theme. So, after the 'way' occurs in the angel's command to Philip (Acts 8:26), it provides the setting for the Ethiopian's baptism (Acts 8:27), as well as for the jubilant ending of the story (Acts 8:39). Then, it also occurs in implicitly, in the connotations of the Ethiopian's need for a guide (Acts 8:31, τὶς ὁδήγησε μν ἐμε), and in the metaphorical reference to Christians seen as 'those... being of the Way' (Acts 9:2, τινὰς... τὶς ὁδὸν ὑπόκειται). Finally, it is used with paradigmatic meaning in Ananias' dialogue with Paul (Acts 9:17, Ἰησοῦς ὁ θεός σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἦ θρού), and in Barnabas' report to the apostles, on Paul's behalf (Acts 9:27, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐδει τὸν κύριον καὶ ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν), and with apologetic meaning, with reference to those who witnessed Paul's experience, during his journey, οἱ συνοδεύοντες (Acts 9:7). This unusually rich mention of hodos represents a special literary connection between Philip's and Saul's narratives, on the one hand, and it also reminds of the hodos emphasis in the Emmaus story. In both cases it becomes an important characteristic of the literary and theological transition after Jesus' resurrection.

The literary play on the theme of journeying happily versus journeying dangerously (and being persecuted) is exquisite. The hodos motif of Acts 8:26-9:31 casts the happy journeying of the Ethiopian eunuch in a remarkable contrast with Saul's persecution of Christians, which appears thus as exceedingly violent. The contrast continues, ironically, with the fact that Saul's journey to Damascus is itself under threat. The Road to Damascus becomes the locus of his existential challenge, much as he would have liked to make it a threat for those who 'belonged to the Way'. This thematic play witnesses, again, in favour of Luke's remarkable literary skills.

Further, one should note the massive presence of poreuομαι constructs in Acts 8-9 (Acts 8:26, 27, 39; 9:3, 11, 15, 31, cf. Lk. 24:13, 28, ἐιστροφεύομενος καὶ εκπορεύομενος (Acts 8:3; 9:28). The combined semantic contribution of ὁδός and poreuομαι constructs, to which one could add the ἐρχομαι derivatives (ἐρχομαι, Acts 8:40; προσερχομαι, 8:29; διερχομαι, 8:40; 9:32; ἐπερχομαι, 9:6, 12, 17; συνερχομαι, 9:39), covers an extensive list of references in Acts 8-9, communicating an atmosphere of dynamism, a progressive mode forward which D. Mínguez would call 'the way of Philip', el camino de Felipe, as opposed to a certain apostolic rigidity concerning evangelism.

This type of dynamic journeying is highlighted further by the repeated prophetic commissioning 'rise up and go', constructed with ἀναστηθι and poreuομαι, such as ἀναστηθι καὶ poreuομαι, or with ἀναστηθι καὶ ἐρχομαι, addressed to Philip, to Ananias and to Saul, cf. Acts 8:26 ἀναστηθι καὶ poreuομαι, Acts 9:11 ἀναστασις poreuθητι, and Acts 9:6, ἀναστηθι καὶ ἐσελέθη. This command, indicating divine authority, urgency of situation and human obedience – with prophetic connotations (cf. its occurrence in Gen. 19:15, 22:3, 24:10, etc.; Jon. 1:2, 3:1, and in later LXX literature such as Tob. 8:10, 1 Eso. 9:1, etc.), has a high incidence in Luke-Acts in comparison with the rest of the NT, and in particular in Acts 8-10.

The 'rise up' command, however, is not used only of Saul or Ananias, in Acts 8-9, but also in Peter's case, as well, although from a different perspective. For example, Peter commands
Aeneas to stand up, Acts 9:34, ἀνάστησθι καὶ στηρῶσον σεαυτῷ; similarly, he raises Tabitha from the dead, Ταβίθα, ἀνάστησθι, in Acts 9:40, and asks Cornelius to stop kneeling before him, ἀνάστησθι καὶ ἔγω αὐτὸς ἀνθρωπός εἰμι, Acts 10:20. God himself commands Peter, in the table vision, to rise and eat, ἀνάστασθι, Πέτρε, θύσον καὶ φάγε, Acts 10:13, and determines him to go to Cornelius’ house in Acts 10:20, ἀλλὰ ἀνάστασις καταβάθη καὶ πορεύου σὺν αὐτῶι (cf. when Peter goes to rise up Tabitha, ἀνάστασις δὲ Πέτρου συνήλθεν αὐτῷς, Acts 9:39). Through such a formula Peter is portrayed as a man of action, ready to carry on the divine commands. The two verbs, πορεύομαι and ἀνίστημι, become thus marks of Luke’s mimetic representation, effective in creating a dynamic atmosphere of action and change, of God’s direct and implicit intervention through the word of his servants.

The linguistic homogeneity of these chapters and their journey emphases can be seen, further, in Luke’s use of πορεύομαι and ἐγγίζειν, another Lukan generic formula. It has been met twice in the Emmaus story, when Jesus joins his disciples ‘on the road’ ἐγγίσας συνεπορέετο αὐτῶι (Lk 24:15), and when he simulates his further journeying, ἤγιόσαν εἰς τὴν κόμην οὐ ἐπερευόμενο, καὶ αὐτός προσεποίησαν πορρῶτερον πορεύεθαι (Lk. 24:28). This ‘drawing near’ represents the actual setting of Saul’s encounter, as well, ἐν τῷ πορευθαί ἐγενέτο αὐτὸν ἐγγίζειν τῇ Δαμασκῷ (Acts 9:3), and a similar formula occurs in Philip’s evangelization of the Ethiopian, προσδέθε καὶ κολλήθη τῷ ἄρματι τούτῳ, προσδραμὼν δὲ Φιλιππός, κτλ. (Acts 8:29-30). Apparently, this is one of Luke’s preferred methods of preparing the atmosphere for a significant miracle (cf. the healing of the blind which takes place while Jesus was getting near Jericho: ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰεριχόν, Lk. 18:35).


The transition characteristics of Acts 8:26-9:31 need a more detailed assessment. Internal unity is important, yet one needs to highlight the distinction between Acts 8-9 from Acts 10-12 (Cornelius’ conversion), and the relation between Acts 8-9 and Luke 24 - Acts 1 (the Ascension).

**The Nature of Paul’s Vision**

Although Paul himself does not provide a detailed description of the nature of Christ’s appearance to him (cf. 1 Cor. 15:1-8), through his emphatic repetition of ὁμορραγέω he communicates that his encounter enjoys a similar status to that of other appearances of Jesus to his disciples (ὁμορραγεῖν Ἰησοῦν καὶ διδάσκειν... ὁμορραγεῖν Ἰησοῦν... ὁμορραγεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν, vss. 5-8). The crucial question, however, is whether Luke considers this appearance, as well, as an Easter christophany or as a less important vision (cf. Acts 26:19 ἡ συμφωνία ὑπότασις).

To an important degree, the nature of Saul’s vision is related to the meaning of the forty days passed between Jesus’ resurrection and his Ascension. For Conzelmann, for example, this represents a period which discriminates between the resurrection appearances and the later heavenly appearances which ‘are of a different kind, for they establish no relationship with the Lord in the special sense that the Resurrection appearances do’.

For Alsup, also, Paul’s vision is utterly different from the gospel appearances and these differences ‘are so categorical that two distinct traditional origins are undoubtedly to be sought’. Borgen even argued that Luke de-materialised the appearance to Paul so that his sub-apostolic status might be even more obvious.

Luke’s choice of terms might prove a useful guide in this assessment, however. The vision of the Macedonian, for example, is presented as a dream at night (ὄραμα διὰ τῆς νυκτός, Acts 16:9-10). At night, too, Peter encounters an angel of the Lord who delivers him (ἀγγέλος δὲ τῷ κυρίῳ διὰ τῆς νυκτός, Acts 5:19). Cornelius sees an angel of the Lord during the day, yet his experience is, again, presented in terms of ὁράμα, a vision: εἶδον ἐν ὁραματι τὸν ἄγγελον, κτλ. Acts 10:3, 22, 11:13; 12:7-9. Paul sees an angel in a vision at night, in Acts 27:22-24 (παρέστη γὰρ μετὰ τῶν ἡμέρας... ἄγγελον). In this context, Luke’s choice for τῇ συμφωνίᾳ ὑπότασις, a heavenly vision, in
Acts 26:18, the third presentation of Saul's encounter, stands in marked contrast to the aforementioned instances of ὀραμά; only παρέστη of Acts 27:22 enjoys a similar position, yet the latter takes place at night.\textsuperscript{856}

Luke leads his readers, thus, to think of this appearance as of a special christophany not a vision. The lexical difference (ὁραμά \textit{vs} ὀπτασία) combined with the contrast between the day setting of the Damascus' encounter and the night settings of the majority of the other visions (save Peter's threefold vision of a meal) emphasizes the higher degree of 'reality' in this theophany.\textsuperscript{857}

Its special nature, further, is highlighted by the contrast between heavenly light \textit{versus} day light, as a further element of theophanic manifestation (Exod. 24:15; Ps. 27:1; 29:7; 78:14; 97:1; Is. 9:2; 42:16; 60:1, 20; Ezek. 1:4; Micah 7:8, \textit{cf} Xenophon, \textit{Cyropaideia}, 4.2.15).\textsuperscript{858}

Luke is not very precise about the physical phenomena of the heavenly light, φῶς ἐκ τοῦ ὀυρανοῦ, and the voice, φωνῇ (Acts 9:3), \textit{and} Haenchen might be right that he 'shows a certain thoughtlessness',\textsuperscript{860} yet, still, the author emphasizes through certain details that this appearance was witnessed as 'real'. In particular, one notes the presence of Saul's journey companions, οἱ συνοδεύουσι (Acts 9:4), who function as major witnesses in the narrative.\textsuperscript{861} Luke insists then, lexically, that they saw that something happened, ὀραμα (ὁφθαλίς, ἠδην; Lk. 24:34; Acts 9:12, 17, 27; Acts 26:16), in contrast with the LXX emphasis on 'hearing', in the OT theophanies.\textsuperscript{862} According to Barrett, two other elements point out in the direction of a classical theophany, Saul's falling to the ground and the enigmatic dialogue with Jesus.\textsuperscript{863}

On the whole, even the defenders of a firm theological hiatus between the Resurrection appearances and the Damascus road encounter agree that Saul's encounter comes close to the gospel resurrection appearances, both as an exception and a confirmation of the Ascension limit.\textsuperscript{864}

The Easter appearances close with the risen Christ's ascension. Neither the vision of Stephen and Ananias nor the experience of Paul's companions on the Damascus road modify this pattern of no christophanies after the Ascension. The only (partial) exception is the appearance to Paul himself.\textsuperscript{865}

\textbf{SAUL'S CALL AND CORNELIUS' CONVERSION}

As the two accounts display obvious similarities, scholars have seen them as two related, major conversion stories.\textsuperscript{867} According to Withrup, both accounts pair up the central characters in a similar way. A major figure (Saul, Peter) is destined to foster the movement of the gospel to the Gentiles, and a minor figure 'disappears from the narrative' at the end of the story (Ananias, Cornelius). Structurally, the narrative argument is strengthened in both stories by the motif of a double heavenly vision.\textsuperscript{868} The course of the events is essentially altered by divine intervention, of the ascended Jesus in the first, of the Holy Spirit, in the second.\textsuperscript{869}

The vocabulary of these two stories has several points of contact, significant words like 'heavens' (Acts 9:3; 10:11), 'earth' (Acts 9:4; 10:11), 'voice' (Acts 9:4; 10:13), and 'rise up' (Acts 9:6; 10:13). For H.-S. Kim, the similarity includes even a Reisemotiv, the ὁδοιποροῦντων in Acts 10:9, and the 'getting near the city', τῇ πόλει ἐγγίζοντων, or the ἀναστάσες καταβάθη καὶ πορεύουσίν, in Acts 10:20.\textsuperscript{870}

Apart from this, the literary repetition of Cornelius' story has a strong local character, being confined to Acts 10-11, with a summary in Acts 15:7-9. By contrast, the repetition of Saul's story has a more general character. Luke repeats it in three different places in Acts (Acts 9, 22, 26).\textsuperscript{871}

Although it displays the characteristics of a missionary introduction, from the perspective of a \textit{hodos} appearance Saul's encounter rather looks backwards, putting an end to a previous persecution and signaling the end of the Easter appearances; by contrast, Cornelius' story is more future oriented, officially opening the Gentile period in the life of the Church.

\textbf{CORNELIUS'S CONVERSION AND THE ETHIOPIAN'S CHALLENGE}

The plot discontinuity between Acts 9 and Acts 10, is further highlighted by the contrast between the Cornelius' story and that of the Ethiopian.

The Community Difference
At this level the contrast between Cornelius’ conversion and that of the Ethiopian is shaped as a contrast between an individual and a community. Cornelius’ conversion stands as representative for all the Gentiles who would repent, while the Ethiopian’s is more private, less public and less publicized.

Cornelius is an insider: a Roman God-fearer known to the community (Acts 10:2). On the contrary, the Eunuch is an outsider: he journeys from afar and needs to travel back, and there are no other references to him in Acts.

Cornelius’ baptism becomes a matter of public notoriety, while the Ethiopian’s conversion, on the contrary, is known only to Philip and to the Eunuch himself, of course, to the reader. The Ethiopian’s story represents a breakthrough, as well, yet of a quieter sort. It functions rather as a development of Philip’s mission and as an introduction to Saul’s calling.

Cornelius’ conversion, on the other hand, can be perceived as a major step forward in the process of proclaiming the gospel to the Gentiles, ‘a definite advance on the story of the Ethiopian’. Saul’s missionary commissioning, as an apostle to the Gentiles, is placed, thus, between two Gentile conversion stories: a strange, unexpected conversion of a rich travelling Ethiopian, and a bold, foreseeable and traceable conversion of Cornelius, one of the pious Romans living in Palestine.

Contrasting Religious Portraits
The contrast between Acts 8-9 and Acts 10-12 comes clearly to the front in the comparison of the Ethiopian’s and Cornelius’ religious identity. The issue is, again, one of precedence and authority: who is the most radical figure of the two, who is the better representative of pagan or Gentile believers, who is to have converted and what is his place in Luke’s narrative?

According to Barrett, the Ethiopian is the more radical, since he could not have been a Jew by birth (Acts 8:27) neither could he, as an eunuch, have become a proselyte. However, for Boismard, interested to note the levels of Lukan and pre-Lukan redaction, there are certain echoes of the New Exodus theme in Acts 8 (cf. Is. 35) and so, the pre-Lukan, Petrine eunuch could have been a proselyte ‘un païen sympathisant du judaïsme’; while ‘Luke’ (or Act II), would have considered him with certainty ‘un Juif en exil auprès de la reine d’Éthiopie’.

Taking into consideration the complex social profile of the Ethiopian eunuch as regards race, class, and gender, or his lack of scripture understanding, his portrait appears to be rather that of an exotic African, a ‘God-fearing’ foreigner from ‘the ends of the earth’. Looking for religious integration he apparently faced rejection due to his foreign identity and to his physical impairment (cf. κωλύω). There is a difficulty, however, in interpreting ἐυνοῦχος as an allusion to physical disability. Some scholars, such as B.R. Gaventa or W. Willimon, alternate between acknowledging a physical impairment, and thus the eunuch is a pagan, a Gentile at the limits of acceptability, and a secondary, interpretable feature, a social position more than a disability - and then the Ethiopian is not such an extreme person, but primarily a general symbol of ‘all those from earth’s end who, unlike Jerusalem Jews, will receive the gospel’.

The best supported case, though, is that for a physical meaning of ‘eunuch’ in Acts 8:27. There is overwhelming evidence regarding the deviant, despised connotations of ἐυνοῦχος in the ancient Mediterranean world. It would be difficult to avoid these connotations, in Luke’s world, for a Greek reader, and Luke stresses the term repeatedly (8:32, 34, 36 and 39).

It follows that the Ethiopian is not only a ‘very strong representative of foreignness within a Jewish context’ or a God-fearer, but also he represents a character much ‘more remote from the people of God than Cornelius’, and his conversion marks ‘an even more radical stage in the rise of the Gentile mission that Peter’s visit to Caesarea’. The Ethiopian eunuch is a ‘better representative of the gospel’s reach “to the end of the earth” than Cornelius is’, but a less suitable one for a next step in the missionary ministry of the church; a more extreme case than Cornelius yet of lesser public notoriety: a prelude to Cornelius’ conversion, or Vorspiel, or Auftakt.

This whole discussion about the religious identity of the Ethiopian raises another issue, too, the comparison between Philip and Peter. Usually, scholars who reject the Ethiopian’s identification as a paradigmatic Gentile motivate this by ‘the disturbance this would cause to a prior conclusion: that the narrator intends to present Peter as the initiator of the Gentile mission in the story of Cornelius’ conversion’. Haenchen notes, for example, that
[Luke] cannot and did not say that the eunuch was a Gentile; otherwise Philip would have forestalled Peter, the legitimate founder of the Gentile mission! For that reason Luke leaves the eunuch’s status in a doubtful light.\textsuperscript{893}

For others, Luke is not interested in contrasting Peter with Philip, but intends to show that ‘the incorporating of the Gentiles into the Church without subjecting them to the law originated neither with Paul, nor with Peter, but with God’.\textsuperscript{894} The more radical variant of this stance is that Luke wants to emphasize how every ‘new step is taken by someone other than the apostles, and the apostles must then catch up with events that are happening independently of them’.\textsuperscript{895} However, Luke takes quite definite steps to clear the stage and to emphasize that the fundamental changes in the missionary agenda of the Church are brought by God through the apostles in Jerusalem (\textit{cf.} Philip’s evangelism is not any longer reported, after this event; in Acts 15, Peter stands up first, v. 7, then Barnabas and Paul, v. 12, and the Peter has the final word).

Narrative Independence
Apart from such attempts at rationalising the narrative sequence of the Ethiopian’s, Saul’s, and Cornelius’ stories, it has been argued that the Ethiopian’s conversion finds itself in a certain narrative isolation, by virtue of its independent nature. For example, Plümacher argued that, despite Luke’s efforts at integrating it narratively, the Ethiopian’s account remains to be seen just as a loose episode ‘äußerlich als Episode’.\textsuperscript{896} Barrett disagrees with the idea of such a narrative isolation, on the grounds that Luke returns later in Acts to mention Philip the Evangelist (Acts 21:8-9).\textsuperscript{897} However, the Ethiopian’s conversion does not seem ‘at home’ in Luke’s literary environment. For Haenchen, this story comes from an independent tradition (the Hellenistic tradition of the Seven) where it had a foundational inaugurating character for the Gentile mission, which it lost in Luke-Acts, because Luke did not want to jeopardize Peter’s apostolic authority.\textsuperscript{898} From a divinely guided first-ever conversion of a Gentile, the Ethiopian’s story becomes a prefiguring, unofficial beginning, a low-key step in a longer process, ‘an edifying story’.\textsuperscript{899} According to such a view, Luke takes the initial prominent and independent story of the Ethiopian’s tradition and paints it with the less contrasting colours of intermediarity, characteristic of a half-Jewish, half-Gentile portrait, of a ‘Zwischenbereich’ zwischen Judentum und Heidentum’.\textsuperscript{900}

The truth is that in Luke’s narrative logic Cornelius’ conversion cannot be regarded as ‘a causal factor in a sequence of events that moves toward the end of the earth’, nor as a ‘stepping-stone’ between the conversion of the Samaritans and the Gentiles’.\textsuperscript{901}

Temporal relations between the Cornelius episode and the preceding stories of Philip and Saul are very vague, and no causal sequence is indicated... Peter does not react to Cornelius in light of what has already happened to Philip and Saul. [...] The conversion of the Ethiopian was a private and isolated event that had no effect. The conversion of Cornelius has consequences in the following narrative, as the reference back to it in Acts 15 makes clear.\textsuperscript{902}

\textit{Hodos Encounters and Narrative Transitions}
Moessner’s journey scheme for Luke-Acts, with its transition pivots in Luke 9 and Acts 6-9, comes closest to this model. However, in view of the present findings, one could imagine a narrative scheme with other two transition pivots, both based on the \textit{hodos} motif present in Luke 24 and Acts 8:26-9:31.\textsuperscript{903}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
Anticipation & Extension & Fulfilment of history of salvation \\
Galilee & Jerusalem & Rome \\
\textit{hodos} transition & \textit{hodos} transition & \\
Galilee $\rightarrow$ Jerusalem & Jerusalem $\rightarrow$ Rome & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The Church story: from Jerusalem to the ends of the world
Morgenthaler’s geographical scheme of journeys and Jerusalem-set scenes in Luke-Acts is also close to the present observations on the structural implications of a journeying plus encounter paradigm. He notes, for example, four major
Jerusalem scenes and three main journeys in Luke-Acts, with the last (to Rome) breaking the symmetry.\(^{904}\)

I. Jerusalem scene
   Luke 1:5-4:13
   I. Journey to Jerusalem
   II. Jerusalem scene
   Luke 19:45-24:33
   III. Jerusalem scene
   Acts 1:4-7:60
   II. Journey (missionary)
   IV. Jerusalem scene
   Acts 21:18-26:32
   III. Journey to Rome


Luke 1-3 Revelation: The Nativity hodos stories
4:1-8:56 The journeys of the Galilean ministry
9:1-50 Revelation: Messiah’s journey to the Cross
9:51-19:44 Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem
19:45-23 Revelation: Resurrection in Jerusalem
Lk. 24 - Acts 1:12 Post-Resurrection Transition
Acts 1:13-7 Revelation: Pentecost, Pilgrims in Jerusalem
Acts 8:26-9:31 Pre-Gentile Evangelistic Transition
10-12 Revelation: The beginning of Gentile mission
13-28 The Acta Pauli (missionary journeys)

At the end of this analysis, one has to acknowledge that despite all these arguments, not everything in Luke-Acts is journey, or journeying story; however, the above mentioned compositional schemes highlight the important role of the hodos references in the narrative coherence of Luke-Acts. Luke’s encounter paradigm functions in well-defined contexts, with specific linguistic, thematic and structural features, and brings a specific contribution to the advance of the overall plot, to the completion of the Gospel’s journey from Jerusalem to Rome.\(^{905}\)

**The Anatomy of Luke’s On the Road Paradigm**

Since the literary context in which Luke’s hodos paradigm functions has been discussed, as well as the main cultural references that need to be checked in terms of cultural relevance and Lukan source, one could look now in greater detail at the paradigm itself. The following discussion aims to shed new light on the way the hodos encounters share a common structure, by referring to Aristotle’s plot rules and by emphasizing Luke’s literary intervention.

**The Emmaus Meal as Sacramental Ending**

This a major point of hodos parallelism since the other two encounters end with a sacramental scene, i.e. baptism. J. Dupont has argued in favour of a sacramental meaning of the Emmaus meal from the premise of this parallelism itself.\(^{906}\) The eucharistic significance of the Emmaus meal has been particularly well noted in the liturgical readings of the story, such as that of R. Orlet, who allows a later dating of Luke.\(^{907}\) His interpretation has won numerous adherents, with multiple, nuanced readings.\(^{908}\)

However, the eucharistic meaning of this meal has been acknowledged by others only as a ‘relation to the Eucharist’, with no clear reflection of ‘the mode of a primitive eucharistic celebration’.\(^{909}\) The objection seems valid, and D. Bock argued, for example, that ‘although there is breaking of bread and thanksgiving, [the Emmaus meal] is not a eucharist, especially given the absence of wine’.\(^{910}\) Since meals occur frequently in Luke-Acts (‘simple’ meals - Lk. 7:36; 11:37; 14:1; feasts - 5:29, miraculous provisions - 9:16, cultic meals - 22:14, weddings - 14:8-9, and the eschatological banquet - 12:37; 13:29), Bock accepts only the idea of a simple meal and of a resurrection fellowship.\(^{911}\) A similar view is espoused by Nolland according to whom ‘there is no sense in which Luke is claiming that Jesus celebrated a communion service with these disciples’.\(^{912}\)

While acknowledging Luke’s special use of κλάω (to break), authors such as Alsup and especially Green have stressed instead of eucharistic connotations that the ‘breaking of the bread’ (v. 35) highlights an important link of this meal with the Miraculous Feeding of the 5000 (Lk. 9:12-17). For Green,
in particular, this supersedes the possible link between the Emmaus meal and the Last Supper: 'Not coincidentally, the feeding of the thousands itself possesses revelatory significance within the Lukian narrative, leading from misconception to correct perception of Jesus' identity as Messiah (Lk. 9:7-20)'.

According to Danker and Derrett the Emmaus meal has the connotations of a divine banquet. Derrett's article calls for particular attention, since his interpretation associates two distinct motifs, the sight theme and the meal or the banquet motif. According to him, the Emmaus meal has a restoration, covenantal meaning. Luke's reference to ὠφθή, 'see', and 'eating and drinking' are seen as signs of the covenant, Exodus 24:10-11, as reminders of Israel's experience of Mt. Sinai. That he has an eucharistic interest here transpires from his language, for example, from his significant parallelism in Luke 22:19 and Luke 24:30.

The imperfect ἐκλάσεων is used only here by Luke (Lk. 22:19), yet it occurs in the rest of the NT in 1 Corinthians 11:24 with a clear eucharistic meaning, and, as well, in Matthew 15:36, 26:26 and Mark 8:6, 14:22.

Two other instances when Luke mentions the breaking of the bread have also been associated with the Eucharist, as well. One is Acts 20:11 (cf. Luke's note that 'on the first day of the week' they met 'to break bread', κλάσαι ἄρτον, Acts 20:7) and the other, more disputed, is a meal of encouragement, Acts 27:35. Taken during the shipwreck, just a few hours before seeing the land, this has also been interpreted, by authors like Wanke, as an allusion to the Eucharist.

Cleopas and his companion report emphatically that their recognition of Jesus happened at the breaking of the bread, ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου (Lk. 24:35). This Lukian phrase appears only here and in the more developed context of church worship in Acts 2:42. In this case, B. P. Robinson's comment, that 'Luke has no interest in the place of the Eucharist as such in the life of the Church, but considerable interest in the Last Supper', could indicate that Luke's emphases are being left aside or that, at the same time, one has to acknowledge too fine a distinction, that would highlight either a very early Lukian Gospel, and (or) a very untheologically minded Luke.

Given the early character of the scene, its sacramental connotations would appear as more probable, if Luke's intervention and interests are seen as better represented in the text, or more probable, too. In this respect, NT scholarship remarked two main areas of Lukian redaction: (a) the original account had stressed only the appearance element yet Luke turned it into a journey story (Dillon, Schubert); and (b) the original account followed the model of OT epiphanies, yet Luke decided to use, with apologetic intention, the Hellenistic language of a theios aner appearance (Ehrhardt).

It seems plausible, then, that the original story had referred only to a famous recognition meal, after the Resurrection, while Luke, later, has emphasized specifically, the proof from Scripture, the theios aner connotations, and the eucharistic parallels. His focus on recognition, on the opening of eyes at 'the breaking of the bread' and on the disappearance of Jesus, his special emphasis on ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου (Lk. 24:34-35), while the entire OT argument together with the encounter itself are mentioned simply as 'the things happen on the road', τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, represent important evidence of a Lukian eucharistic reading of the original account.

The Hodos Paradigm

Up until now, the paradigm transpiring from these three stories has been interpreted in two major ways. Scheffler has regarded them as 'fictitious' creations aimed at encouraging a persecuted community. Lindijer has suggested a hodos series instead, even if he has referred only to the Emmaus and the Gaza road accounts. Building further on their insights, the present thesis argues that this encounter paradigm is a literary form focused on the evangelistic 'creativity' of those non-apostolic ministers who have continued Jesus' mission, and as such, it is based on the centrality of two major scenes: the recognition and the restoration scene.

The Recognition Scene

‘Recognition’ or ‘discovery’, a progress in knowledge (in the form of ἐπιγνώσκειν, in Lk. 24) is clearly a key concept of the Emmaus story, coming at pivotal points, at the beginning...
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16), the climax (v. 31), and the conclusion (v. 35) of the pericope.\textsuperscript{923} This has led to the idea of a ‘sight and recognition’ chiasmus of Luke 24:16, 31a.\textsuperscript{924}

One can even identify two types of recognition in the Emmaus account: an ironical non-recognition (mis-identification) at the beginning,\textsuperscript{925} and a sacramental or meal-related recognition at the end of the story.\textsuperscript{926} This narrative complexity highlights two mechanisms of recognition: one by argument or dialogue, and one by divine mysterious intervention, during the sacramental meal.

As regards the Ethiopian’s story, this account does not include a proper ‘recognition’ scene, nor an epiphany.\textsuperscript{927} However, it has a recognition dialogue focusing on Jesus’ identity as Yahweh’ Servant (Isaiah 53:7-8). The Ethiopian experiences an evangelistic messianic ‘discovery’ or ‘furthering of knowledge’, a general, Scripture mediated recognition of Jesus’ messianic identity.\textsuperscript{928}

Next, the recognition scene is obvious in Saul’s encounter, and more subtle, too. The persecutor encounters an unexpected vision and finds himself under pressure to recognise the identity of the one who speaks to him (ἐκοίμησεν φῶνιν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ), Acts 9:4; cf. ὃν ἔπιασε ἀκούσας καὶ ὄψιν ἰδούσα,\textsuperscript{929} and γνωρίσας τὴν φωνὴν ἀπεκαλύφατο,\textsuperscript{930} Aristotle ranked recognition by voice among the contrived category and lower types,\textsuperscript{931} yet Luke’s scene has here a different foundation: this is a recognition by inference or logical argument, by dialogue, a ‘recognition by reasoning’, ἐκ συλλογισμοῦ.\textsuperscript{932} For us, this type of dialectic discovery of Jesus the Lord secures the narrative coherence of the story by connecting the encounter as such with the proof-from-prophecy argument. In general, Luke’s OT allusions take two complementary forms, explicit and implicit, and both of the are present in Luke’s hodos paradigm.\textsuperscript{933}

Pattern

The recognition dialogues are well structured, displaying a dialectic pattern: (a) question; (b) counter-question; (c) explanation (cf. Zmijewski, Morgenthaler). Since the Easter kerygma is paradigmatic in Luke-Acts, the evangelistic dialogue tends to display, also, a standard form.

Thus, Luke 24:17-19 displays a complex dialogue scheme: ‘a dialogue begins, questions are put and answered to, problems are expressed’.\textsuperscript{934} Jesus asks τίνες ὦ λόγοι ὦτοι ὦς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους (Lk. 24:17), and Cleopas answers with a counter-question Σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς ἵνα οὐκ ἐγνώκας τὰ γενόμενα εἰς αὐτὴν ἐν τοῖς ἡμέρας ταύταις (Lk. 24:18),\textsuperscript{935} and is addressed himself a leading counter-question, Ποία (Lk. 24:19). There follows a double explanation section: first the summary of the Passover events and of Jesus’ ministry provided by the disciples (Lk. 24:20-24) then Jesus’ explanation of the Scripture (Lk. 24:25-27).

In Philip’s evangelisation of the Ethiopian, the dialogue takes, as well, the question and counter-question form, as a Frage-Gegenfrage structure, or Rede-Gegenrede Schema (although not as developed as in the Emmaus account).\textsuperscript{936} The diletic nature of the dialogue is evident in various instances: the eunuch has the opportunity to ask two questions; Philip’s first inquiry can be described, as well, as a dialectical question open to two answers.\textsuperscript{937}

Aware of Jesus’ divinity, Saul addresses Jesus as κύριος (Acts 9:5) and his ‘recognition’ reaction is helped by both the implicit and explicit message of the speaker. Lohfink suggests that Paul realises Jesus’ Lordship for he is addressed in an OT fashion (cf. Acts 9:4-6, Gen. 46:2f, Exod. 3:4-10), with a characteristic divine call in three parts: λέγεις... τίς ἐσύ... ἐγώ εἰμι (cf. the dialogue format). Jesus’ statement has a biblical ring, a biblical format ‘Jesus muß biblisch reden... an Stelle von ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός... heißt es dort ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς’.\textsuperscript{938} However, the overall structure of the dialogue (1) address, or call; (2) answer with counter-question; (3) introduction with charge, does not come necessarily from the LXX, but is more general, for it also occurs in Joseph and Aseneth, 14, and The Testament of Job, 3, and thus Luke uses here a ‘narrative schema’.\textsuperscript{939}

Lexis and Dramatisation

The recognition context allows in Luke’s hodos paradigm for a special dramatisation of the dialogue. In Saul’s encounter this takes the form of theatrical mis-en-scène. Questioning takes place while Saul is fallen to the ground (πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, Acts 9:4) and Jesus’ presentation is marked by suspense (his identity is disclosed only at the second intervention, Acts 9:5).

A lengthier dialogue takes place between Jesus and Ananias (Acts 9:10-16), this time in a dream: the threatening heavenly appearance (cf. Acts 26:19, τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτᾶσι) is here contrasted with a more friendly dialogue ἐν ὀραματι (Acts...
The dialogue between Jesus and Ananias, as well, has a dialectic form (commission, v. 10; objection, v. 13; re-commission, v. 15). Not only is the double vision theme effective here, as often mentioned, but also the double dialogue plays a special role. Jesus is dramatically portrayed as a king, one who uses intermediaries, commissioners with a mission to heal and baptise future commissioners. Luke's 

hodos stories involve often such a high status emphasis, a high mimetic mode.

In both the Emmaus account and in that of Philip's evangelism the encounter with the stranger is narrated as a dramatic scene with a skilful introduction, Jesus introduces himself through a polite question, 

τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι σὺς ἀντιβάλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους περιπατώντες (Lk. 24:17). Philip intervenes and offers his help through an attractive wordplay (paronomasia), 

ὁ γε γίνωσκεις ἢ ἀναγίνωσκεις (Acts 8:30). In admitting his need for guidance the Ethiopian uses a polite and polished Greek, 

πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυνατίνῃ ἐὰν μὴ τις ὀδηγήσῃ με - (Acts 8:31), the only Lukan example of ἂν with the optative in the apodosis. Moreover, the Ethiopian asks a specific theological question with a 

δέουσα σου (Acts 8:34) 'a polite way of introducing a request' (cf. Acts 21:39; Lk. 8:38; Gal. 4:12). Consequently, Philip starts to expound the Scriptures and proclaims Jesus, 

ἀρέσκειν ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς τοῦτος εὐφυγγελίσατο αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν (Acts 8:35). The verb ἀρέσκειν has the connotations of elevated debate; it can be found as an introduction to intellectual arguments (Plato, Rep. 596a5: ‘Shall we then, start the inquiry at this point by our customary procedure?’, βούλει σὺν εὐθεῖα ἀρέσκειθα ἐπισκοπεῖτε, ἐκ τῆς εἰσθαυμᾶς μεθόδου).

The rhetorical qualities of these explanations are again highlighted in Luke 24:32, where Jesus sets the disciples' hearts 'on fire' (σοι ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καυμαίνει ἡ). The two disciples are 'convinced, delighted, and enabled to respond vigorously - for that is what καυμαίνει implies'.

Part of Luke's mastery of diction (lexis) comes from his rhythmmed alliterated constructions. One can find a higher frequency of rhythmical clausulae wherever Luke's compositional intervention is at work, and especially so in his speeches. For example, the Emmaus account includes its memorable μεῖνος μεθ’ ἡμῶν | ὅτι πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἐστίν | καὶ κέκλαικεν ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα (Lk. 24:28; cf. the alliteration in η, ι and ν). Similar use of rhythm and even rhyme is present in Acts 9:6, ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς τὴν πόλιν | καὶ καληθήσεται σοι ὅ τι σε δεί ποιεῖν, or in Acts 9:17, Σαοῦλ ἀδελφέ, ὁ κυρίος ἀπέσταλκέν με | Ἰησοῦς ὁ θεῖος σοι εἰς τὴν ὁδόν ἡ ἄρχου | ὅπως ἀνοβλήσης καὶ πληρῶς πνευμάτως ἀγίου.

Luke uses good rhythm and balanced constructions in his dialogue scenes or speech sections and, usually, these constructions occur at the beginning of the dialogue, as part of the captatio benevolentiae. Apart from inevitable Semitisms (ὁ νῦν ὁ Ἐμμαύς, Lk. 24:1; τὴν καλουμένην Ἐυθείαν, Acts 9:11; or Ἀναστηθῇ καὶ πορεύου, Acts 8:26, Ἀναστὰς πορεύθητι, Acts 9:11), Luke's Greek constructs here an elevated atmosphere, well suited to this type of divine encounter.

RECOGNITION AND THE ARGUMENT FROM SCRIPTURE

The mimetic analysis of Luke's recognition has to do, as well, with the argument, or 'thought' (dianoia) of his representations. The issue is whether Luke builds a coherent argument at the level of the OT quotations in each story, and if there is detectable, noticeable development of his OT citations in this threefold series.

As a rule, the introduction of the stranger (cf. dialectical dialogue) is followed by an argument from Scripture which corrects an initial misinterpretation of the prophetic texts. If in the Emmaus' story the two disciples had the wrong messianic expectation, and if the Ethiopian does not understand the prophet Isaiah and this prompts the argument from Scripture and Prophets (cf. the use of γραφῆς, γραφαί in Lk. 24:27, 32 and Acts 8:32, 35; and of προφητεύων in Lk. 24:25, 37; Acts 8:28, 30, 34), Saul's lack of understanding receives a different treatment, yet its characteristic lack of OT references has there a Christological significance.

The OT Argument in the Emmaus Encounter

The recourse to Scripture in the Emmaus account is part of Luke's major motif of prophecy fulfilment. There is a special correspondence between the OT emphases at the beginning

In the Emmaus story Jesus’ direct or explicit argument from prophecy is conducted via an emphatic mention of all of the OT scriptures (Lk. 24:25, ἐπί πᾶσιν σὺς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφήται, and Lk. 24:27, ἀρραβώνυμος ἀπὸ Μωϋσεως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν... ἐν πᾶσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς). This repetition of the ‘all’ syntagm is not accidental, and has ‘a polemical ring’, with two major implications in reaffirming the authority of the OT.

First, Luke points to the exhaustive nature of Jesus’ messianic claim, and in this light ‘it was Jewish ignorance that had caused the death of Christ’. Then he addresses an encouragement to the Christians who, according to Ehrhardt in spite of being dissatisfied with the use of synagogal testimonia for the Messiah Jesus, refused to spiritualize, and eventually evacuate, the use of the Old Testament in the Church.

The Christological dialogue in the Emmaus story brings into focus as well the issue of what kind of Messiah Jesus was: ‘a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people’ (Lk. 24:19), expected to bring redemption to Israel (Lūtroομαι, Lk. 24:21), an Exodus-like liberation. Yet, while the Exodus motif was well rooted in the hopes of Palestinian and Hellenistic Jews in the first century AD one still needs to ask whether Luke did not have in view here some other, more recent, yet also influential Septuagintal texts.

According to the present study, the implicit references to the Scripture, i.e. LXX, in the Emmaus encounter are linked to the Maccabean traditions, to their call for national independence and obedience to the Law. Luke 24 is related to Maccabean literature in two main ways, both implicit: firstly, through its mention of ‘Emmaus’ as a site, involving its historical significance, and secondly through certain linguistic and theological correspondences.

In the hypothesis of a Luke less acquainted with Palestine and more with the LXX, one could argue that his ‘Emmaus’ is the one placed in the valley of Ajalon, a witness of victorious Maccabean battles (Ἀμμοῦς, in 1 Macc. 3:40, 57; 4:1-15; 9:50).

This ‘Emmaus’ represented a strategic place in defending Jerusalem. It was a fortress of similar importance on the west of Jerusalem as Jericho was on the east. In the war of AD 70, the Roman legions finally converged on Jerusalem from Jericho and Emmaus.

‘Emmaus’ thus, had a certain political resonance, related to victorious battles and returns to Jerusalem, to great military speeches. For example, the army of Judas the Maccabee camped at ‘Emmaus’ and he encouraged his troops there (1 Macc. 3:57-58). It is in this place that the Israelites remembered God’s salvation at the Red Sea, κινδύνη ὡς ἐξουσίας οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν βαλασίᾳ ἐρυθρά (1 Macc. 4:9), and cried that God may ‘favour us and remember his covenant with our fathers and crush this army before us today. Then all the Gentiles will know that there is one who redeems and saves Israel’, καὶ γνώσονται πάντα τὰ ἐννν ὅτι ἐστίν ὁ λυτροῦμενος καὶ σωζόντων τῶν Ἰσραήλ (1 Macc. 4:10-11, RSV). After victory they praised God for ‘Israel had a great deliverance that day’, ἐγενήθη σωτηρία μεγάλη τῷ Ἰσραήλ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἔκεινη (1 Macc. 4:24-26, RSV).

There is a surprising linguistic correspondence between Luke 24:21 and 1 Macc. 4:10-11, pointing to the importance of the liberation theme ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζουμεν ἂν αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτρῶσαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ (24:21), a Lukan phrase not paralleled in the rest of the NT. The two disciples’ concept of redemption appears to be a political one, implying ‘freedom from Roman tyranny through a “messianic” deliverer’ (cf. Acts 7:35, where Moses is called ‘ruler and deliverer’, ἄρχων καὶ Λυτρωτής). The two disciples journeying to Emmaus were expecting an alter Moses after the model of Judas, the Maccabees.

The Emmaus setting with its implicit connotations helps Luke to highlight the contrast between Jesus and the Maccabean messianic paradigms, supporting Jesus’ argument from Scripture concerning his identity and messianic ministry (cf. Acts 21:28, as well).

OT Citation in the Ethiopian’s ‘On the Road’ Encounter

Luke’s argument in this ἡδος account is famous for its explicit mention of the prophet Isaiah (cf. Is. 53:7-8; Acts 8:32-33) and for identifying Jesus with the Servant. It has been suggested that Luke associates the paschal theme of the
sacrificed lamb with the baptism motif, strengthening the idea of restoration.\textsuperscript{963}

Regarding the actual text, Boismard argues that the initial version of the story contained 27b, 28a, 29-31, 35-36a, 39a.e and that it mentioned the name of Isaiah only in Acts 8:30, where Philip hears the Ethiopian reading from the prophet’s book. The repetition in Acts 8:28 and the actual passage in Acts 8:32-33, thus, would represent the intervention of the Lukan author proper (cf. Acts II).\textsuperscript{964} This is an interesting hypothesis for according to it the same Luke who was fond of using OT prophecy has added the hodos emphases in vv. 39b, 36a, emphasizing thus the Isaianic motif of a New Exodus.\textsuperscript{965}

Since this is a matter of implicit LXX allusions, one has to admit that the presence of other mentions of Isaiah, in Luke-Acts, favour the conclusion that Luke knew more of the context of this quotation. For example, he alludes to Isaiah 52:13 (the Servant’s exaltation) in Acts 3:13 and he quotes Isaiah 53:12 in Luke 22:37 - as being fulfilled in the person of Jesus.\textsuperscript{966}

It could be suggested in this context, although this is an argument ‘from silence’, that Luke quotes Isaiah in a context-sensitive manner, deliberately playing down the idea of the Servant’s death for ‘the sins of his people’ for his quotation of Isaiah 53:7-8 ends short of Isaiah 53:8b, από τῶν ἰσομίων τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον.\textsuperscript{967} As Dillon remarks, Isaiah 53:7b-8c is ‘cut off tantalizingly short of the Isaian Servant’s death’ (Is. 53:8d), and ‘such cropping is not accidental’ (cf. the following, underlined text).\textsuperscript{968}

\begin{quote}
Isaiah 53:8 pάντες ὅς πρόβατα ἐπιλανιθήμεν, ἀνθρωπος τῇ ὀδός αὐτοῦ ἐπιλανεί: καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν. 53:7 Καὶ αὐτός διὰ τὸ κεκακώθη οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα: ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη καὶ ὡς ὄμος ἐκατάλαβον τοῦ κύριου αὐτοῦ ἄφθονον. οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. 53:8 ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθε: τὰν γενέαν αὐτοῦ τις διυπηρετεῖ: οτι ἀφέτευ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἢ ἦλθη αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἰσομίων τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον.\textsuperscript{969}
\end{quote}

As A. George notes ‘it is truly remarkable that Luc was able to find and quote from Is. 53, exactly that almost unique passage which speaks about the death of the Servant without mentioning its relation to the sins of the people’ (cf. Is. 53:4, 6, 9-12 LXX).\textsuperscript{970} Similarly, Dillon comments that ‘Luke’s “theology of the cross” does not include atonement for sins’,\textsuperscript{971}

The usual interpretation of this omission is that Luke’s theology of Jesus’ death is rather a theologia gloriae, which interprets the death of Jesus as the prerequisite for Jesus’ entrance into glory (see Lk. 24:26-27) and less of a theologia crucis, which sees Jesus’ death as atonement or expiatory sacrifice for our sins (see Acts 20:28').\textsuperscript{972}

However, Luke’s omission of the prophet’s ‘death for sins’ (cf. Is. 53:5, 8b) can be related to his known universalistic perspective on the Gospel. Had Luke continued the quotation with the Isaianic τὸ λαός μου (Is. 53:8b) or had he started it earlier with ἀνθρώπος τῇ ὀδός αὐτοῦ ἐπιλανθή: καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν (Is. 53:6), the emphasis would have unfortunately fallen on the prophet’s message for his own Jewish people. As things are, the focus is on Jesus’ messianic identity, and on the Ethiopian’s access to its universal benefits.\textsuperscript{973}

By avoiding to mention the specific address to Israel, λαός μου, and her wanderings (τῇ ὀδῷ... ἐπιλανθή) Luke’s argument maintains a cautious ambiguity (the unity of ‘thought’, cf. Aristotle’s διανοία). He keeps the Way as a positive symbol,\textsuperscript{974} and prepares its later use in the singular in the commissioning of Saul (cf. Acts 9:2, etc.). The offence of having already described an Ethiopian eunuch who is received into the people of God seemed sufficiently challenging for the moment; there was no need to accuse the whole Israel of wandering (ἐπιλανθή).

The Implicit Argument From Scripture in Saul’s Encounter

Characteristic of Saul’s hodos encounter is the fact that Luke uses no obvious quotation of Scriptures. This comes as a surprise, since he later mentions the prophets, even if laconically, in Peter’s evangelism of Cornelius (Acts 10:43, πάντες οἱ προφητεύουσιν ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν λαβείν διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ). In the hodos series, therefore, Saul’s encounter ‘on the road’ represents an anti-climax of Luke’s explicit references to OT. There are, apparently, two possible explanations for such an omission (a) Luke did not want to interfere with the original lack of OT references; or (b) Luke had here a different theological emphasis (he tells the story three times emphasizing Saul’s commission and the need for a Gentile mission). The story, however, makes use, arguably, of OT implicit references. On the one hand, such an OT allusion is already part of Luke’s style; on the other hand, the Pauline
A first reflection of OT style can be found in the "double calling," the Hebrew סאול סאול (Acts 9:4). Saul's counter-question acknowledges the special divine character of his interlocutor (Tit 3, κύριε; Acts 9:5). The recent emphasis in Lukan studies on Davidic Christology, allows, furthermore, to reconsider here an older theory regarding the possibility of a second LXX allusion. As early as 1932, H. Windisch has noted the possibility of an implicit narrative connection between Saul, the persecutor of the Messiah, and Saul, the late king of Israel, the persecutor of David, the future king.

Following Windisch's argument, one can suggest that from the perspective of Luke's hodos paradigm Acts 9 and 1 Sam. 24 are related through a number of relevant correspondences. Both stories emphasize the hodos setting (ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, 1 Sam. 24:4 [LXX]; and καὶ ἀνέστη Σαούλ καὶ κατέβη εἰς τὴν ὁδον, 1 Sam. 24:8 [LXX]). Both stories involve a persecution dialogue, David's call stops king Saul from pursuing him (cf. Jesus' call stops Saul's journeying). Both stories involve the pursuing of a righteous hero, the throne-inheritor (διὸκεισ - καταδικαίωσις). David's question to Saul raises the issue of persecution and murder; καὶ υἱὸν ὦτος τινὸς σὺ ἐκπορεύῃ, βασιλεὺ Ἰσραήλ - ὀπίσω τινὸς καταδικαίωσις σὺ; (1 Sam. 24:15 [LXX]). A similar question is addressed later, ἵνα τί τούτῳ καταδικαίωσις κύριος μου ὀπίσω τοῦ δούλου αὐτοῦ (1 Sam. 26:18 [LXX]).

To this persecution dialogue one could add the issue of the proverb mentioned in Acts 9:5-6 (cf. Acts 26:14, 'It hurts you to kick against the goads', NRS). The closest Jewish parallel seems to be Pes. Sol. 16:4: 'he jabbed me as a horse is goaded to keep it awake, my saviour and protector at all times saved me', and generally, this Lukan saying is seen as a puzzling Greek-sounding proverb, completely lacking in Hebrew and Aramaic parallels. The general assumption is that Luke (or Paul) added this saying because they wanted to suit the speech to a royal audience and highlight the divine constraint of the commissioning.

It would be interesting to note that there is a long tradition for quoting proverbs in a debate or persecution dialogue. The first parallel is David's quotations in front of Saul 'as the ancient proverb says, “Out of the wicked comes forth wickedness”' (NRSV) (1 Sam. 24:14), or 'he has come out to seek my life, like one who hunts a partridge in the mountains', (1 Sam. 26:20). One could mention other OT parallels, such as Jotham's address to the people of Shechem (Judg. 9:1-21), etc. The problem, however, is that the parable is not part of Acts 9, it has been translated and introduced here, by Erasmus, from Acts 26:14 (Basel, 1516).

This recognition dialogue with its allusions to the royal persecution narratives in the LXX would help a Jewish reader to perceive the Davidic character of Jesus. It makes room, also, for Luke's emphasis that the ascended Jesus uses his 'divine voice' and substitutes himself for the authority and message of the OT Scriptures. Jesus is a Yahweh-like royal figure who commissions Ananias and Saul, who utters prophecies about the fate of his servant in the same way in which the OT Scriptures prophesied about him, concerning his suffering and exaltation.

The adversative ἀλλά (Acts 9:6) announces a definitive break in the course of Saul's life, and the command to rise up (ἀναστῇ) and to wait to be told what he is expected to do, λαλήρηται σοι ὁ τι σε δεί ποιεῖν, has its counterpart in the declaration of Acts 9:15-16 σκέψεις ἐλεγκτής ἐστίν... ἵνα γὰρ ὑποδείξῃ σάρκι ὁ θεὸς παύσῃν. Thus, δεὶ ποιεῖν and δεὶ παθεῖν prefigure prophetically Saul's new destiny and express, as well, Jesus' divine authority.

The contrast between the implicit and explicit use of LXX is important as an intra-paradigmatic variation, in the context of Luke's hodos encounters. Luke uses the paradigm to emphasize the idea of a divinely guided Christianity, in continuing development and progress. Thus, one can note here a series of fine similarities and distinctions. The resurrected Jesus uses the OT argument in the Emmaus story in a way similar to his earlier earthly ministry. Philip follows Jesus' example and presents the gospel with a similar emphasis on the OT (Lk. 24:27, Acts 8:34; Lk. 24:27, 32, Acts 8:35; Lk. 24:27, Acts 8:35), and Saul, after his conversion, proved as well from Scriptures that Jesus is the son of God (Acts 9:20; 22; 27; 28). However, Jesus' relation to the OT is changed after his Ascension. If before the Ascension, the risen Jesus refers back to the authority of the Scriptures, in Emmaus, in Saul's story the voice of the ascended Jesus speaks with the full authority of the word of God.
This internalisation or personalization of the meaning of proofs-from-prophecy shows that Luke allows for a certain gradual change in his theological emphases. A high Christology gradually takes control over the story, as it did over history, as well, and the hodos encounters are witnesses to this transformation.

RECOGNITION, PATHOS AND MIMETIC CHARACTERS
Apart from recognition as a plot element of major importance, it can be argued that Luke's mimetic representation of his hodos encounters also includes the motif of suffering. Quite a number of NT scholars have noted the presence of recognition in Luke's hodos encounters, yet the background of these stories is dominated by the presence of a suffering motif, in Aristotelian sense, taking the form of Jesus' supreme sacrifice at the Passover, of the Eunuch's physical disability, and of Saul's persecution and malice. Over against this background Luke's characters have to take ethical and faith-related decisions.

Story Characters and Their Ethical Choices
The issue of ethical choice is one of Luke's characteristic emphases in his short journey stories. It can be noted, for example, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, where he takes the decision to interrupt his journey and help a fellow human in need. The young man in the parable of the Prodigal Son takes a fundamental decision to return home and ask for his father's forgiveness. Similarly, Zacchaeus decides to do everything in his power to see Jesus, and then he gives away half of his wealth as a sign of his restoration. This emphasis is reminiscent, also, of the 'way' as a special setting for ethical challenges in Hellenistic literature (cf. the parable of Heracles at the crossroads, and the Cynic Epistles, in chapters two and three).

Similarly, when the two disciples journeying on the Emmaus road meet a divine Jesus in disguise, they soon find themselves before a decision to reconsider the Scriptures in a new way. Later, their insistence that Jesus would stay with them is clearly the result of a positive decision concerning his interpretation of the prophets.

This positive thrust has a comedy-related tendency, in contrast to Greek tragedy, and is closer to the style of the Hellenistic novels. Luke's characters do not sink to the depth of misfortune and disbelief, as a result of their fatal 'flaw' (ἀμαρτία). They are restored through their interaction with the risen Jesus. The 'blinding' of the two disciples on the Emmaus road does not imply a fatal course on their actions, like Hera's madness descending on Heracles, or like Oedip's murder. Luke's stories could better be described as reversed 'could-have-been' tragedies.985

The Ethiopian is also given a choice: to accept or not the help of a stranger who could explain the Scriptures to him; and later, to ask or not for baptism. In both situations, he meets the challenge and he experiences a transformation of status and a change in destiny.

The most dramatic situation, however, is that of Saul. He is almost forced to surrender, the Lord leaves so little room for choice. Is the main theme of his story the punishment of a persecutor (cf. the story of Heliodorus, 2 Macc. 3:1-40) or the call of a future missionary? According to our hodos paradigm, this brings together three different episodes (1. the encounter, Acts 9:1-9; 2. the reversal of life and ministry at Damascus, Acts 9:10-25; and 3. the reiteration of the reversal at Jerusalem, Acts 9:26-31), the theme of reversal and restoration has precedence over that of punishment. Saul's 'on the road' experience leads him to an ethical, theological choice as well: he rises and is baptised, ἀναστάς ἐβαπτίσθη (Acts 9:18), and then preaches Jesus' name in Damascus and in Jerusalem, ready for the forthcoming mission.

If Luke emphasizes the happy ending of his hodos encounters, one can ask further whether his characters are 'appropriate' and 'credible' (see chapter two, on Aristotle). Here, Luke's ethnographic and historical details contribute considerably to the portrait of his main characters. The contextualisation of the two disciples (name: Cleopas, journey to Emmaus, time of day: evening, date: the third day from Jesus' crucifixion), or of the eunuch (Ethiopian, from queen Candace's court, treasurer, journeying on the road down to Gaza, using a chariot, reading aloud), or of Saul's story (letters from priests, continuation of persecution, mention of Jerusalem and of Damascus, the street called Straight, the house of Judah, Saul by name, Ananias, Barnabas, etc.) all present them as perfectly contextualised, credible personages, living in a Hellenistic Palestine.
According to our mimetic model, however, there is another character in the story: the Lord himself. His presence does not surprise the reader in the same way it surprises the actual heroes of Luke's accounts. He is a sort of extradiegetic character: he comes into the story and leaves, at will, in these post-Easter encounters, and even the narrator is not able to justify the movements of this character. Hence, a certain feeling of mystery accompanies these accounts and creates a reaction of awe. Philip acts according to the same paradigm, his role being an extradiegetic one: he approaches the Ethiopian unexpectedly (yet, the reader knows already the details of this visit), akin to an appearance, he disappears suddenly (in contrast to the Ethiopian, the reader learns about Philip's final destination). This correspondence between Jesus' and Philip's actions, as extradiegetic characters, strengthens the view that Luke pays attention here to a special narrative paradigm.

The Emmaus Encounter and Jesus' Suffering
In the Emmaus account the suffering motif can be mentioned mainly in relation to Jesus' Passion. For Luke this passion is divinely ordained, part of God's plan of salvation (ἐδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν; Lk. 24:25-27), as a preliminary stage before the glorification of the Messiah. It is remarkable, in this context, that God's will or plan (ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ θεοῦ) is used by Luke 'similarly to the way Hellenistic historians speak of a divine principle of order or fate' (such as τύχη, εἰμαρμένη, γνωμή, ἀνάγγει),

However, next to these themes in the background of this story, one notes also the disciples' suffering, as well, as they are troubled at the thought of Jesus' definitive death. This suffering is dramatically highlighted by theatrical details, for Luke presents the disciples stopping and looking sad, 'long faced', ἐστάθησαν σκυθροποι (Lk. 24:17).

For Luke, however, Christ's suffering was not only a historical reality and a good dramatical detail to mention, but also an opportunity to discuss the increasingly more debated issue of the death of the wise. In an age when Socrates asserts that 'those who pursue philosophy aright study nothing but dying and being dead' when Plato accepts voluntary death in certain conditions, and when Seneca's famous 70th Epistle is a panegyric to the freedom of death, and the deaths of Socrates and of Cato of Utica (95-46 BC) were particularly influential as models, Luke's hodos encounters made good literature and interesting philosophy with their discussion of Jesus' suffering. For, even if Jesus' death becomes a model for persecuted Christians (cf. Stephen, Acts 7; Paul's journey to Jerusalem, Acts 20:7ff.), the force of the model resides in the continuation of life in a heavenly place, through resurrection, not in a reason for voluntary death (cf. the impact of this teaching in Athens, Acts 17:31-32).

As a literary technique, this contrast between Jesus' death and the discovery of his resurrection draws its force from a series of logical pairs of intense dramatism, such as journey and teaching versus meal and revelation, argument about the significance of death versus the experience of resurrected life, non-recognition versus recognition, and the joy of understanding Jesus' identity energises the disciples with that superhuman strength to journey back to Jerusalem, on the same night.

Philip's Encounter: Suffering Prophet and Rejoicing Eunuch
In the second example, Luke portrays the Ethiopian as one uncertain to whom the prophet was referring in Isaiah 53:7-8, where the servant of the Lord is said to be taken to the slaughter like a lamb (ὡς προβατὸν ἐπισφαγήν ἡγθή), and made to suffer the humiliation of injustice (ἐν τῇ τάση παθήσεως [αὐτοῦ] ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἡρθη). The παθός motif seems to be expressed here in two different, yet convergent ways. First, Luke quotes Isaiah in a context-sensitive manner, playing down the Servant's death for the 'sins of his people'. As Bruce observed, in the Ethiopian's story one could deduce 'a theology of suffering, possibly of redemptive suffering, but hardly of vicarious suffering'.

Secondly, the Ethiopian can identify himself with the suffering and the shame of the Prophet, not only from a universal perspective but from the perspective of his impairment, as well (this is one of the ways mimesis functions). If ἐνυόφως in Acts 8:27 refers to physical impairment, then the Isaiah pericope read by the Ethiopian (Is. 53:7-8, in Acts 8:32-33) provides a further illustration of suffering, παθώς, which overlaps with the suffering characteristic of the prophet.

Spencer argues consistently that Luke replaced the emphasis on the servant's death and on its atoning efficacy by 'highlighting instead the element of τασπαθωσαίας (vv. 7-8a)',
with its negative connotations of ‘oppression’, ‘degradation’, ‘humiliation’ and ‘debasement’. A reading that accepts castration among the connotations of the Ethiopian’s story corresponds well with the honour and shame code of the first-century Mediterranean culture, and with the suffering message of Isaiah 53. Physiological masculinity was related to male social identity and reputation. The Eunuch finally gains a positive perspective on life by being given a new status, i.e., a place in the new people of God. These positive endings are characteristic of Luke.

Saul, the Persecutor, and the Suffering of Christians

Perhaps the most dramatic, theatrical expression of the suffering motif in Luke’s hodos encounters, an essential part of Luke’s mimetic of persecution, is to be found in the account of Saul’s encounter with the risen Christ. The correspondence with Aristotle’s views is striking, since he says that ‘tragedy must seek... cases where the sufferings occur within relationships, such as brother and brother... when the one kills (or is about to kill) the other’. The suffering motif is present, first, implicitly, in the background, since the reader is already informed about Stephen’s death assisted by Saul (Acts 7:58, 8:1). Acts 8:3 is echoed and enhanced by Acts 9:1. In this way events from without the encounter proper participate in the general motif of suffering. This is reminiscent of the way ‘complication’ works, comprising ‘events outside the play, and often some of those within it’.

The encounter continues with an explicit reference to suffering in Luke’s straightforward statement regarding Saul’s threat to Christians, o δε Σαυλος ετι εμπνεων απειλης και φωνου. The suffering inflicted by Paul on his fellow Jews (Israelite brothers) reaches a climax in Jesus’ accusation of Paul, where he identifies himself with the persecuted ones, τι με διωκεις, and Ἰησους, ον συ διωκεις (Acts 9:4-5). Conversion and change seem not enough to absolve Saul of his guilt: the disciples continued to be afraid of him, παντες εφοβουντο αυτον μη πιστευνετε οτι εστιν μαθητης (Acts 9:27).

The motif of suffering is, then, present in Paul’s personal life. The first reference would be his blindness, and later in the text, Jesus announces Saul of further future suffering as a missionary, Acts 9:16, ὁσα δει αυτων... παθειν (cf. Acts 9:6, δει ποιειν). Further, Saul is in danger of being killed by the Jews in Damascus for his preaching (Acts 9:23, ἀνελειν) and, when he escapes to Jerusalem, he again is in danger of being killed by the Jews in Jerusalem (ἀνελειν, Acts 9:28). In Acts 9:1-31 the rich lexical variety of the journey motif is matched by the lexical variety of the threat and suffering motif: ἐμπνεων απειλης and φωνου (v. 1), δεδειμενους αγαγη (v. 2, 21), διωκεις (v. 5), ουδεν εξελεπεν (v. 8), μη βλεπον, και ουκ εφαγεν ουδεν επιειν (v. 9), ὡσα κακα... ἐποιησεν (v. 13), παθειν (v. 16), πορθησες (v. 21), ἀνελειν (v. 23, 29), ἀνελασειν (v. 24), εφοβουντο αυτων (v. 26).

The Reversal and Restoration Act

One should note the simultaneous presence of reversals (περιπέτειας) and recognition (ἀναγνωρισις) as characteristic of the superior type of plot, the complex one, in Aristotle’s terms, which provides a solid foundation for the overturn of fortune (μεταβασις) between prosperity and adversity. In fact, this narrative transformation has a reverse nature in Luke’s paradigm: the positive endings of the post-Easter encounters indicate a lighter genre than tragedy, closer to novels and to comedy. More dramatic is Saul’s story, where the persecutor becomes the persecuted, and good fortune turns into a series of lynching attempts.

There are two important narrative relations to be noted here, the relation between recognition and reversals in Luke’s paradigm, and the role of ‘reversal’, as such, both as a change in direction and in the characters’ destiny. The first involves a geographical point of return, the idea of journeying. For example, in the Emmaus story the disciples return to Jerusalem and Emmaus represents such a point of return (Wendepunkt der Geschichte). Similarly, the Damascus road encounter is a point of return for Saul’s journeying in Acts 9. Concerning the second narrative relation, reversal affects a character’s destiny, and the Ethiopian’s conversion and Saul’s commission display such a ‘hinge’ transformation at baptism. One could note, however, a third dimension of reversal in Luke, as well, the theme of the divine δει, ἀναγκη (see Aristotle ‘necessity’, κατα το ἀναγκαίον).
Schubert was among the first scholars to draw attention to the existence of multiple climaxes in Luke’s journey encounters. According to him Luke uses several ‘high points’ in the Emmaus story: a climax in the recognition scene (Lk. 24:31), and an earlier one, in Jesus’ proof-from-prophecy explanation. Just makes a similar observation, concluding that ‘the teaching together with the breaking of the bread form the climax of Luke’s Gospel’. Yet, how can such a double climax be explained, in terms of narrative?

As mentioned before, the three Lukan post-Easter journey encounters end with a similar emphasis on a restoration into fellowship, illustrated by a sacramental act. Such a plot development can be described as *linear progression with a sacramental climax* (LP-SC). Yet, at the same time, a different plot line is at work, based on the encounter and its representative feature, the evangelistic dialogue. The encounter element is placed at the centre of the narrative and has often been seen as generating a chiastic organisation of the plot (EC, *encounter chiasmus*).

Sometimes, NT commentators have argued that the restoration event itself (the sacramental act) is at the centre of a chiastic structure and controls the story (SC, *sacramental chiasmus*). Usually scholars take sides on this issue, opting either for a sacramental or for an encounter chiasmus. Better than favouring one of the two climax models, it could be suggested, instead, that Luke’s composition keeps in balance these two important plot elements, the recognition and the restoration scenes, in a double climax structure, which fits the literary recommendations of Aristotle’s *Poetics*.

**Evangelism and Sacrament in the Ethiopian Story**

As seen, two major events compete here for narrative centrality: the teaching ‘on the way’ and the sacramental act of baptism.

The presence of evangelistic teaching at the centre would rather support a linear progression of the story with a sacramental ending (LP-SC). J. H. Neyrey has suggested a composite scheme (a chiasmus of combined EC-SC type, *i.e.* evangelisation-sacrament type).

For Neyrey the meaning of the story resides in its centre ‘where Jesus takes the pastoral initiative to teach and feed’. The story indicates a complex continuity of Jesus’ ministry after resurrection, through his apostles (cf. Nolland, Lindijer). Luke anticipates the later ecclesial transformations by letting the reader know that (a) it is not to the apostles that Jesus ministers here; (b) it is not in Jerusalem that he made himself known at the first meal; and, finally, that (c) this is the first time when Jesus argues directly and apologetically from the OT Scriptures in support of his messianic ministry.

The presence of evangelistic teaching at the centre would rather support a linear progression of the story with a sacramental ending (LP-SC). J. H. Neyrey has suggested a composite scheme (a chiasmus of combined EC-SC type, *i.e.* evangelisation-sacrament type).

The presence of evangelistic teaching at the centre would rather support a linear progression of the story with a sacramental ending (LP-SC). J. H. Neyrey has suggested a composite scheme (a chiasmus of combined EC-SC type, *i.e.* evangelisation-sacrament type).

For Neyrey the meaning of the story resides in its centre ‘where Jesus takes the pastoral initiative to teach and feed’. The story indicates a complex continuity of Jesus’ ministry after resurrection, through his apostles (cf. Nolland, Lindijer). Luke anticipates the later ecclesial transformations by letting the reader know that (a) it is not to the apostles that Jesus ministers here; (b) it is not in Jerusalem that he made himself known at the first meal; and, finally, that (c) this is the first time when Jesus argues directly and apologetically from the OT Scriptures in support of his messianic ministry.

**Evangelism and Baptism in the Ethiopian’s Story**

As seen, two major events compete here for narrative centrality: the teaching ‘on the way’ and the sacramental act of baptism. The centrality of teaching is emphasized by the antithesis between mystery and comprehension, ignorance and...
revelation (vv. 25, 40). This chiasmus is supported by the Spirit inclusio (vv. 29, 39), by the evangelism motif (cf. v. 25 - εὐαγγελίζοντο; v. 35 - εὐαγγελίσατο; v. 40 - εὐαγγελίζετο), and by the journey motif (vv. 25, 40), etc. Spencer makes a fine (probably too subtle) distinction, placing the citation of Isaiah 53:7-8 (J) at the centre of the chiasmus.

vv. 25 A. ὑπεστρέφον εἰς Ἰεροσολύμα, B. πολλάς τε κόμας τῶν Σαμαριτῶν C. εὐαγγελίζοντο
vv. 26 D. ἔλαλησαν πρὸς Φίλιππον E. πορεύου... ἐπὶ τὴν ὄνν σιλβίαν
vv. 27 F. Καὶ ἰδοὺ...εὐνοῦχος
vv. 29 G. εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ Φίλιππῳ, H. ἀναβάντα καθίσαι συν αὐτῷ.
v. 31 I. ἦ δὲ περιοχή τῆς γραφῆς
vv. 32 J. Is. 53:7-8: citation v. 35 K. δὲ ἔλαβαν τὴν οὖν τοῦ Φίλιππου L. Εἰς πορεύετο γὰρ τὴν ὄνν σιλβίαν
vv. 38-35 M. Ἔκ τὰς πόλεις πάσας Ν. τοῦ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς Κατάραις

Mínguez has stressed the centrality of evangelism, rather than the presence of a hodos inclusio. Accordingly, O'Toole criticised him for focusing on εὐαγγελίζεσθαι and not on the central place of πορεύεσθαι and οὗτος. This shortcoming is even more puzzling given that Mínguez himself highlighted the significance of the way (hodos) motif, which, allowing for a static versus dynamic hodos contrast, represents the profound generative matrix for the narrative coherence of Acts 8:26-40, ‘el camino de la fecundidad’, ‘the path of (spiritual) fruitfulness’, the path of productiveness.

As an alternative to Mínguez’s emphasis on evangelism, O’Toole and J. Dupont argued for the centrality of baptism. For O’Toole the structure of the story takes the shape of a geographic inclusio (the journey) with the baptism as its core. He, thus, suggests a sacrament-centred structure (chiasmus of type SC, yet he does draw any chiastic scheme explicitly; cf. Guillaume’s structural scheme).

vv. 25-35 journey from Jerusalem, evangelistic dialogue
vv. 36-38 river baptism by the road (sacrament)
v. 39-40 journey to Ethiopia (final hodos emphasis)

Yet, if Luke’s purpose is to show that ‘Philip acts like Jesus’, then, by comparison with the first half of the Emmaus story (cf. Lk. 24:13-35 // Acts 8:26-40) one should suggest a similar circular structure.

vv. 34 dialogue: the Ethiopian seeks guidance, v. 35 Philip’s evangelistic explanation
vv. 36 dialogue: the Ethiopian asks for baptism
vv. 38 climax: baptism and changed journey

Extending this observation, one notes a linear narrative progression that starts with a double commissioning (Acts 8:26-29; v. 26: ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου, v. 29: Πρόσελθε καὶ κολλήθητι), and continues with evangelisation at its centre (Acts 8:30-35). This ensures the moment of recognition and reaches a sacramental climax in the act of baptism (Acts 8:36-38), where the reversal of status and expectations takes place. The dénouement presents the two men emphatically parting their ways (Acts 8:39-40).

Encounter, Baptism, and a New Call for Saul

In terms of structure, the textual limits of the story can be defined in three ways: (1) Acts 9:1-19a, the journey story ends with Saul’s baptism; (2) Acts 9:1-22, it ends with Saul’s preaching in Damascus; (3) Acts 9:1-31, it includes the full story, ending with the return to Jerusalem. Within the limits of the first variant, Acts 9:1-19a, the story has a reversal point in the encounter with the risen Christ, and a final restoration climax in the baptismal sacrament.

vv. 1, 2 journey set up: Paul’s leaves Jerusalem with an agenda against the Hodos people,
v. 3a journey setting: as a leader, accompanied by soldiers,
vv. 4-6 the revelational dialogue the miraculous blinding,
vv. 7-8 journey setting: incapacitated, led by his companions
vv. 18, 19a journey end: at Damascus; he regains sight, and is baptised; Ananias’ hodos summary.

According to the second variant, Acts 9:1-22 is the pericope that can be regarded as an independent literary unit, and it allows for a concentric structure, as well. An argument in favour of this textual division is the pivotal character of the temporal note in Acts 9:23, ὥς δὲ ἐπλήρωσεν ἡμέρας ἰκανοῖς (‘after some time had passed’, NRSV). If this stands for the three years mentioned by Paul in Galatians 1:17-20, before which he did not visit Jerusalem and did not see any of the apostles, such a division would correspond to the natural course of events.

Thirdly, it can be argued, as well, that the Lukian account of Saul’s conversion includes the whole of Acts 9:1-31 as a unitary text, starting in Jerusalem and ending with Saul’s return to the same locality yet in an entirely different situation (the persecutor becomes the persecuted one, the arch-enemy of the Church becoming a minister of the Word).

Rather than considering that Acts 9:19b-22 belongs to the next section, and together with vv. 23-31 forms another independent unit (Acts 9:19a-31), one could argue that Acts 9:1-31 is a self-consistent unitary passage, displaying credible marks of Luke’s compositional intervention. The reversal cycle in Saul’s life is complete. According to this variant of the story, the central events are Saul’s baptism and the recovering of sight, as a restoration climax. Then, the two corresponding halves can be interpreted as Acta Pauli - before baptism, and Acta Pauli - after his baptism.

9:1-9 (A) Paul, the persecutor of the Way
9:10-25 (B) Paul, the persecuted Christian (Damascus)
9:26-31 (C) Paul, the persecuted preacher of the Way

The first two sections (A) and (B) allow for a chiastic (reversal) parallelism. The last two sections (B) and (C) are perfect parallels, save the hodos report in (C), and include the hesitation of the disciples (Ananias, v. 13-14; the disciples in Jerusalem, v. 26); the reassurance motif (the Lord, v. 15-16 and Barnabas, v. 27); Paul’s preaching (in Damascus, v. 20-22; in Jerusalem, v. 28b-29a); the plots devised by the Jews in order to kill Paul (in Damascus, v. 23-24; in Jerusalem, v. 29b); Paul’s escape (from Damascus to Jerusalem, v. 25; from Jerusalem to Tarsus, v. 30). All the three subunits (A, B, C) are based on a recognition event (Jesus and Paul, Paul and the disciples) and on a reversal of destiny (from Jewish persecutor to Jewish Christian, from Christian evangelist to a persecuted minister). The overall scheme displays a reversal pattern.

The Final Hodos Reports

Apart from its role in supporting a chiastic structure, the ‘way’ setting is remarkable through its part in Luke’s final summaries. The question is what kind of reason or message, literary or theological, is Luke attaching to these end-reports.

The Two-Pronged Report of Emmaus

In one of the first mentions of this narrative feature, Dillon has drawn attention to the particular form of this hodos summary, presented by Luke in a two clauses format.

A succinct, two-pronged conclusion to the whole pericope. Indeed, τα ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ and ὃς ἐγνώσθη ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου recapitulate the entire passage in its two components, the travellers’ dialogue and the meal scene.1033

Another perspective on this summary is that of a ‘report to the apostles’, a trend which starts with the Emmaus account and continues in a long series of similar reports in Acts (Lk. 24:33-35; Acts 4:23-31; 11:1-18; 12:11-17; 14:26-28; 15:1-35; 21:15-20a).1036 Luke’s redaction is present in particular in the mention of the Eleven (vs. 33) and in the report, ἐξηγοῦντο.1037 Fitzmyer regards the double use of ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (vv. 32, 35) as a supplementary emphasis on the ‘geographical setting’ in which Christ instructs his disciples about the meaning of Scripture (the theme of ‘in via teaching’).1038 As Jesus gives his ‘final and supreme instruction’ about his destiny in such a setting this represents a ‘subtle, yet highly deliberate’ Lukan use of the hodos motif, one ‘not to be missed’.1039 In its first occurrence, the hodos report takes a reflexive form, intensely affective and personal (Luke 24:32)

Οὖχι ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν κατοικία ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν
ὁ δὲ ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ,
ὅτι διήνοιξεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς.

Its phrasing has rhetorical connotations: κατοικία ἦν (‘was burning’, periphrastic construction with κατοικία, κατά, old Attic - ‘to burn’, here metaphorically) was used as a descriptive of rhetorical conviction.1040 Διήνοιξεν (cf. 24:31a Διήνοιξαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, 24:45 Διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νόον, also Lk. 2:23, Acts 16:14; 17:3) is a Lukanism, part of Luke’s sight and understanding motif. As can be seen, the first summary is focused on the rhetorical event, the evangelistic dialogue ‘on the road’ (ἔλαλεν, ἐξηγοῦντο) with Jesus’ supernatural power of conviction. By contrast, the second one takes the form of a report (ἐξηγοῦντο) to the Eleven in Jerusalem (Lk. 24:34-35)

ἐξηγοῦντο
τα ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ
καὶ ὃς ἐγνώσθη αὐτῶι; ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου

Here Luke highlights the element of recognition (ἐγνώσθη corresponds chiastically with Lk. 24:16 μὴ ἐπιγνώσατι) and the report’s emphasis changes: the encounter and the explanations of the road are referred to, simply, as τα ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, while the things remembered specifically are the ‘breaking of bread’, the eucharistic meal.

The Final Hodos Reference in the Ethiopian’s Encounter

If Philip is called at the beginning of the story to go on a desert road,1041 Luke reiterates the hodos setting by framing the final part of the account in a special ‘way’ inclusio. The road setting specifically borders the event of baptism. However, one has to note that the previous explanation of the gospel is also framed between two significant journey interruptions. At the first stop the Ethiopian invites Philip to explain the Gospel (Acts 8:29-30). At the second stop he has the opportunity to accept the Gospel and to be baptised, a possibility he realises ‘while journeying along the road’ (ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, 8:36).1042 At the end of the Ethiopian’s baptism, Luke places the second end-mention of hodos (the third in the account), after Philip’s disappearance, when the eunuch continues his way full of joy, ἐπορεύετο γὰρ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαῖρον (Acts 8:39). The Lord has transformed this journeying home of the Ethiopian: he is no longer just a Jewish proselyte or a god-fearer, he has become a fully accepted member of the Way (cf. Acts 9:2).

For Mínguez the final hodos emphasis in the Ethiopian’s story contrasts with the previous apostolic lack of evangelistic horizon. By comparison with the conservative ways of the apostles, the way of Philip is a progressive way.1043 His suggestion is interesting, having in view that of all the three hodos encounters, only Philip’s evangelisation does not include a hodos report to the Twelve. However, the special place of the apostles in Luke’s volumes would not encourage such an interpretation which implies a lack of agreement between the evangelistic agenda of Philip and that of the apostles (cf. in Samaria, Philip’s evangelism is fully approved by the Twelve).

Through his omission of a report to the Twelve in this story, Luke creates, however, an evangelistic suspense, for this act of gospel proclamation is bolder than the previous interaction with the Samaritans. With accomplished literary skill, and great theological precaution, Luke introduces step by step the
issue of Gentile evangelism: first he introduces the Ethiopian’s story, then Paul and his commissioning, and thirdly Peter, the one who, with undented apostolic authority, ‘inaugurates’ officially the new ministry towards the Gentiles.


Saul’s New Credentials and His Hodos References

Luke’s insistence upon a two clause hodos summary re-surfaces in the account of Saul’s encounter. In its first occurrence, the hodos flash-back is part of Ananias’ introduction to Saul (Acts 9:17), which emphasizes the authority of the Lord Jesus as the one who ‘shows himself’ (ὁ ὄφθεις) and the one ‘who sends’ (ἀπέσταλκεν)

Luke emphasizes here (a) the essential theophany character of this encounter (ὁ ὄφθεις ὅσι, using passivum divinum), (b) the actual journey setting (ἐν τῇ ἁδῷ) and (c) indirectly, the theme of obedience versus resistance to the Lord, via an ironic contrast between Ananias’ obedience and Saul’s initial violent campaign. The whole report centres on the significance of Jesus’ identity and authority (ὁ κύριος... ὁ ὄφθεις, apodosis with aorist participle). Further, Luke’s reaction confronts the reader with an implicit contrast between Paul’s way, ὑπὲρ συμπαθείας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, and Christians who belonged to the Way, τῆς ἁδοῦ ὄντας (9:2).

As in the Emmaus account, the hodos summary occurs a second time, in the form of a developed evangelistic report to the Eleven (Acts 9:27).

διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς
πώς ἐν τῇ ἁδῷ εἶδεν τὸν κύριον
καὶ ὅτι ἔλαλησεν αὐτῷ,
καὶ πώς ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐπαρρησίασατο
ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

In terms of format, Barnabas carefully mentions (διηγήσατο, narrates) two major credentials in Paul’s favour (a) the experience on the way (the vision and the dialogue, ἔδειν and ἔλαλησεν) and (b) the complete change in Saul’s life, who has turned into an evangelist (cf: the Emmaus’ two-pronged report). Alternatively, one can see here a three clause statement: (a) Paul saw the Lord while he was ‘on the road’ (πῶς ἐν τῇ ἁδῷ εἶδεν τὸν κύριον), (b) the Lord spoke to him (καὶ ὅτι ἔλαλησεν αὐτῷ), and (c) subsequently Paul started a genuine and successful preaching ministry in Damascus, proclaiming ‘the name of Jesus’ (ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐπαρρησίασατο ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ).1044

Concerning the author of the report, the text suggests that Barnabas is the main subject: he is concerned with Paul (ἐπιλαμβάνομεν αὐτόν), he takes him to the apostles (ὁγαγεῖν) and reports (διηγήσατο) - however, the report could also be attributed to Saul (διηγήσατο, aor. ind. 3rd. pers. sing. of διηγώμαι, can stand for both). In this variant, Luke emphasized here Paul’s subordination to the Twelve (see Acts 15; and the priority of Peter in the evangelisation of Gentiles, Acts 10-12). There is again a contrast between Acts 9:1-2 and Acts 9:27, possibly ironic, that highlights the substitution of Paul’s relation to the priests with his subordination to the apostles. If Barnabas made the report, the contrast is rather about the Jewish and the new Christian credentials of Paul (persecution letters from the priests, yet new preaching credentials to and from the apostles) highlighting the complete change, or reversal in Paul’s life.

The hodos summaries, as a Lukan motif, represent a skilful way of providing an ending to the post-Easter encounters and a dynamic introduction to Gentile evangelism. They constitute important evidence of Luke’s compositional art and of his ability to interwave motifs, to use narrative ‘complication’ (δέοις) and dénouement (λύσις).

They do not emphasize only Luke’s fondness for what has happened ‘on the road’ (encounter and dialogue). They also illustrate his interest in the credentials and the dynamics of the missionary ministry, and in the issue of evangelistic restoration through sacraments.

If on the one hand these stories reflect a continuation of Luke’s Way motif in the Gospel (cf: Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem), on the other, the hodos reports highlight the
authority of the apostles and the need for apostolic validation of all the major events in the life of the Church. In particular, Jesus’ appearances and the Gentile evangelistic initiative needed to be understood and validated for the Church by the Twelve apostles. This was an important emphasis for the emerging Gentile church, an important foundation for its relation with the Jewish Christian community.

These reports are also an illustration of the transformation undergone by the Easter hodos kerygma. From a setting of an encounter with the risen Jesus, leading to a joyous announcement of the resurrection (the Emmaus encounter), the hodos setting becomes a symbol of God’s initiatives towards the Gentiles (the Ethiopian’s conversion), and finally a locus of far reaching missionary perspectives (proclamation to new peoples, to kings, promises of success, warnings of persecution; in Saul’s conversion). Luke’s representation of encounters allows us to note the transformation of the meaning of the Way motif: from an Isaianic reference to the Way of the Lord (the New Exodus), it becomes a resurrection symbol, then an evangelistic symbol, associated with a representation of Christianity itself. From a purely collective symbol it has become the locus of a personal, existential adventure with God.

These reports have not exhausted the multiple meanings of the Way motif in Luke-Acts. Paul’s mission provides new perspectives which will require further study. For the time being, it has been showed that Luke’s theology of the Way represents more that Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem, and that mimetic (i.e. compositional) approaches are a valuable scholarly means for understanding Luke’s style and theology.

Conclusion

Starting from the observation that Luke’s post-Easter encounters display a series of formal correspondences, this assessment has gone a step further, building on the ideas of C. H. Dodd and C.H. Lindjer by using the literary insights of Aristotle’s Poetics. Basically, this analysis has been built on two premises: (1) these accounts should be regarded as hodos encounters, and not just as post-Easter appearances (thus, they are integrated into Luke’s major literary and theological motif of the Way); and (2) their literary correspondences should be analysed according to the terms of Hellenistic mimesis, that is, with the representation concepts explained by the Hellenist and Greek historians and literary theorists (cf. Aristotle, Duris, Theopompus, Ephorus). The results can be listed under two headings: The relevance of mimesis for Luke’s Journey motif and The narrative coherence of Luke’s journey stories.

The Relevance of Mimesis for Luke’s Journey Motif

Formally, these ‘on the road’ encounters display with sufficient clarity, within the limits of topical variety and literary creativity, one and the same pattern that conforms well to Aristotle’s recommendations for the ‘well-made’ or ‘well-represented’ plot. Luke’s literary environment (historiography, novel-writing, tragedy, the epic genre) provides many examples, some of considerable interest, of such well-planned plots involving climactic recognitions and reversals of fate. By comparison, one notes Luke’s awareness of Hellenistic literary taste, and also, his literary creativity and his theological and philosophical principles.

This assessment of Luke’s literary representation of sources and of reality has constantly referred to Aristotle’s categories of plot composition, for their clarity and literary insight (even if his Poetics is oriented primarily towards an analysis of tragedy, and its views are not cited directly in Hellenistic literature). The appropriateness of this discourse is based on
the fact that Aristotle’s work represented a synthesis of a larger, on-going discussion, and that his views on compositional mimesis are echoed indirectly in a number of other authors; also, his treatise provides a useful point of comparison with many other, and later Hellenistic authors, who treated the subject in a different manner.

In particular, Luke’s literary paradigm for his post-Easter encounters provides a special place for the *hodos* symbolism (the ‘way’ as a setting and as major reference in the final lines of the story), includes a journey encounter that plays a special narrative and theological role of transition, and builds the story plot according to the mimetic requirements presented in Aristotle’s *Poetics* and in other literary treaties. The main findings of the present study can be summarized in the following 10 observations

1. The post-Easter encounter paradigm displays a central ‘recognition’ or ‘discovery’ scene (*ἀναγνώσις*), an unexpected encounter ‘on the road’ provided by divine initiative.

2. The recognition moment has a complex dialectic structure involving a question and counter-question dialogue. Luke’s dialogues display a strong Christological emphasis reflecting both his sources and his specific theology, which involves explicit and implicit LXX references. The arguably implicit references to Isaiah 35, 53; 1 Maccabees 4; or 1 Samuel 24, 26 reflect the messianic conceptions of Luke’s time (Davidic, Mosaic, Maccabean): the risen Jesus is the prophesied Messiah, the ascended Jesus has the absolute authority of Yahweh, of Yahweh’s word in the Scriptures. Luke’s recognitions correspond well to Aristotle’s recognition by reasoning (*ἐκ συλλογισμοῦ*).

3. The background of the three encounters can be understood in terms of Aristotle’s pre-climactic conflicts, known as ‘complication’ (*διάλογος*), centred in Luke’s case on Jesus’ Passion. It involves a suffering motif (*πάθος*) centred on Jesus’ individual death, but also reflects its collective significance, and includes, as well, the personal suffering of the main story characters, alleviated by their encounter with Jesus. According to Luke’s social and national emphases, Jesus’ Passion is perceived as a violent, unjust, disappointing and dividing event for the entire Jewish people. Such an official rejection of Jesus and of his teaching is reminiscent of Plato’s views of cultural censorship and military supervision of all religious and artistic innovation, of philosophical and artistic mimesis. The Gospel is represented, thus, in terms of a challenge for the Hellenistic city and its citizens, as an opportunity for cultural and religious renaissance.

4. The reversal event (*περιπέτεια*) present in all three Lukan stories mentioned above is assimilated to a ‘homecoming’ or restoration ending, featuring an act with sacramental connotations (a meal with eucharistic connotations: Lk. 24:30-31; a baptism: Acts 8:36-38; Acts 9:18). The presence of reversals combined with recognitions highlights the existence of a complex plot, a compositional feature highly approved by Aristotle.

5. The paradigm plot ends with a variation on the recognition theme, a departure of the messenger (or disappearance) and a replacement of his physical presence with a lasting spiritual insight. The latter is connected with the general literary and prophetic motif of ‘sight and understanding’, resulting in a joyous new vision and ministry. This personalisation of restoration has been interpreted as a testimony to Luke’s art of dénouement (*λύσις*).

6. In terms of diction (*λέξις*) the vocabulary used by Luke is rich and well suited to the subject matter. In particular, the vocabulary related to the theme of suffering is rich in concepts and imagery, constituting a major compositional element next to the journey vocabulary. The composition is balanced, for the inevitable ‘barbarisms’ associated with Luke’s OT citations and allusions (LXX imitation) are paralleled by an obvious attempt by Luke to write a polite, cultured, well rhythmed story (cf. particularly in the introductory sections of the Christological dialogues).

7. The characters of the accounts, for which the Aristotelian term is τὰ ἰδιότητα (a semantic extension for [moral] ‘characteristics’, ‘habits’ cf. *Poetics*, chapters six and fifteen, *e.g.*, 1450a.37, 14450a.5-10, etc., preferred by Aristotle to the more specialised term, τὸ πρόσωπον) are portrayed as being on ‘their way’, journeying, experiencing an unexpected restoration from a previously wrong or irrelevant course of life. This type of plot corresponds to the Hellenistic stories where the road or the journey were frequently used as an opportunity for divine encounters and for moral decisions.
Similarly, Luke’s *hodos* encounters involve the intervention of a divine character such as the risen Jesus or his Spirit, or his angel or messenger, essential participants in the transformation (μεταβολή).

8. The ‘on the road’ setting is emphatically mentioned at the end of the story in the form of a *hodos* report (the Emmaus account and Saul’s encounter) or of a narrative re-iteration of setting (the Ethiopian’s evangelisation), cf. Luke 24:32, 35; Acts 8:39; 9:17; 27. These reports or reiterations provide a specific introduction or transition to the next accounts: the Emmaus ‘road’ report introduces the encounter of the Eleven with the risen Jesus; the Ethiopian’s happy journey down the Gaza road introduces the issue of ‘those belonging to the Way’ in Acts 9:1 and of Saul’s journey(s) (persecution and call); the Damascus *hodos* reports introduce (a) the new preaching journeys of Paul and the issue of his relation with the apostles, and (b) Peter’s apostolic, ground-breaking evangelistic journeys (the Cornelius episode, etc.).

9. The narrative and theological unity of these journey encounters is emphasized by Luke’s method of designing different and overlapping spatial and temporal frameworks. Distances and periods of time are contracted or expanded in order to suit the narrative dynamics and to support the main narrative emphases. This liberty in presentation does not always coincide with the characteristics of the initial event. It reflects rather Luke’s mimetic understanding of literary representation. Luke 24 gives the impression of all happening in one day, although it covers more than that in its actual temporal length. The Emmaus road encounter is explicitly presented as taking place within the span of one evening, although it involves a supper at night and the return to Jerusalem, later, an event that could rather take place the next day, since the city gates would be closed at sunset. Different accounts related to Saul’s commissioning, such as his encounter with the risen Jesus, his healing in Damascus, his early preaching in Damascus and his fleeing in a basket, as well as his later testimony in Jerusalem and his subsequent departure to Tarsus, are brought together in one single story which emphasizes the reversal of his destiny. The reader is given the impression of a unitary series of events taking place during a relatively short period of time. Time and space are seen from a special hermeneutical perspective as well as in the case of the Ethiopian’s conversion. Luke takes, apparently, an initially independent evangelistic story, and places it in a literary context of mission and persecution that chases the first Christians away from Jerusalem. Functioning as a transition narrative between Stephen’s death and Saul’s call, the story prepares the reader, together with Saul’s conversion, for the later ‘official’ beginning of Gentiles’ evangelisation through the conversion of Cornelius. The literary effect emphasizes the dynamic nature of these journeys and of Christianity as the Way.

10. The argument of Luke’s *hodos* encounters (διανοια) is Christological and evangelistic in nature, affirming the significance of Jesus’ death (of universal value and not a model for others such as Cato’s, Socrates’, or Seneca’s deaths), of his resurrection and ascension, and of his divine lordship. The ideology of the disciples’ journey has to do rather with Jesus’ evangelistic programme to the farthest corners of the earth, than with the actual model of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem. In the process, Jerusalem’s centrality is challenged as well as that of Rome, implicitly. The scene is set thus for a new *hodos* paradigm: people’s lives are challenged and changed through personal encounters with Jesus’ gospel ‘on the road’.

This study submits that Luke’s art of emplotment can best be characterised as a mixture of drama, novel, Hellenistic historiography and comedy. This can be seen in the positive endings of his stories, in the element of adventure and the legendary details, in his care for the historical and geographical texture of his narrative. Such an observation confirms and further contextualises the findings of C. H. Dodd, R. Pervo, D. O. Via and R. W. Funk, who have highlighted, as well, the complex, tragic and comic nature of many of Luke’s parables.

In particular, such a combination of literary features was characteristic of the Hellenistic historians (cf. Duris, Theopompus, Ephorus, Phylarchus, etc.), who used personalised and dramatised representations of reality, a mimesis designed to communicate historical facts and to delight or impress the audience. Luke, therefore, can be compared with these authors not only as a Hellenistic historian himself, but also from the point of view of style and
of literary mimesis, as a Hellenistic writer who is fond of vivid descriptions and the personalisation of events.

The merits of the present study reside, thus, in combining this reconsideration of Luke as a Hellenistic historian with a nuanced view of him as Hellenistic mimetic author, at a moment when in the area of NT studies the majority of commentators have emphasized Luke’s mimesis rather as an imitation of the Septuagint’s style and content. These mimetic features indicate that Luke’s approach to his sources was literally and philosophically motivated, as well, not only ideologically oriented or theologically focused.

The Narrative Coherence of Luke’s Journey Stories

This book’s contention is that Luke’s theology of the Way should be based on more than just the redactional Reisenotizen of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem, or the teaching and journeying format of Jesus’ ministry, important as they are. One can identify, for example, a ‘journey within a journey’ phenomenon in Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem (J. Navone), journey stories such as the parable of the Good Samaritan, the account of Zacchaeus’ conversion, the parable of the Prodigal Son. These stories, together with the post-Easter hodos encounters, reflect a different literary paradigm and a particular, specific interest of Luke in the journeying motif. Their main action is an important encounter set ‘on the road’, leading to restoration, to a personalised, positive reversal of destiny. The main characters in these stories are Jesus, the subject of the ‘recognition’, and an evangelized person, a convert (the roles may be redistributed, i.e. an evangelist and the evangelized person). The encounter is initiated by a divine person (the angel or the Spirit of the Lord, or the risen Jesus himself).

This new paradigm is not focused on a collective personage, such as the Church or the disciples, who benefits from these encounters, but rather on a journeying individual who experiences salvation (restoration) in the context of personal adventure. Such a story line comes close to the typical novel plot and could appeal in special way to the first century reader, displaying a great apologetic and evangelistic potential.

Through such stories Luke continues to provide and defend a positive meaning for the Way, in agreement with his use of hodos in the singular in Luke-Acts, and in consonance with his representational emphases in the Gospel, with his redaction of Mark (when mentioned together, Jesus and the Way are presented in a positive manner). Luke’s special events set ‘on the way’ do not lead to setbacks, failures, sudden terminations of journeying or of life, but represent as many opportunities for evangelistic progress and restoration.

On account of their characteristics, these stories are able to function effectively in the narrative transition and contribute to the literary coherence of Luke-Acts. The gospel of Luke and the book of Acts, on the one hand (cf. Luke 24 - Acts 1), and the two halves of Acts, on the other hand (cf. Acts 8-9), are thus connected through similar challenging encounters ‘on the road’, in addition to other great Lukian motifs (Ascension, Pentecost, Persecution, Mission).

Luke 24 ensures the gospel’s finale through a thematic and paradigmatic transition to the themes and motifs of Acts. Acts 8-9 reiterates this paradigm and introduces the Gentile mission (Acts 10-12) and the later missionary journeys of Paul (Acts 13-28). Both sections have a similar transition profile, based on hodos encounters and significant hodos reports. While the hodos setting connects the resurrection stories with the main journey of the gospel, Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem, the hodos reports relate these post-Easter challenges to the validating authority of the Lord and of the church, one of the main themes of Acts.

In essence, the post-Easter hodos paradigm communicates a model of divine encounter that can be perceived both as good literature and as challenging theology. Confronting the reader with Jesus’ resurrection and with his supreme lordship, the hodos post-Easter encounter has, in Luke’s representation, an evangelistic character and is more open to popular emulation than Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem. Its individual ethos, reversal and restoration thrusts do not communicate a collective Exodus-like paradigm, but rather a contemporary adventure and an emphasis on individual salvation, available to Jews and Gentiles alike. It allows the reader to perceive Luke, the evangelist, as an educated writer, a talented storyteller, a sensible communicator, a profound, bold, creative and inspiring theologian of the early Church, an author profoundly marked by the idea of meeting the resurrected Jesus in a life changing encounter, during one’s journey through life.
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call: divine, 234, 250; OT double call, 245, 246; Philip’s call, 267; Saul’s, 219, 246, 276, See conversion causal: 104, 107, 224 central: Central Section, 41, 43, 194; Emmaus story, 203; evangelism, 261; recognition, 274; vision, 9 centrality: 41, 69; Jerusalem’s, 70, 201; narrative, 145, 146; the Ethiopian’s, 260; the Temple’s, 200; theological, 13 centre: chiastic, 258; dramatic, 15; Jerusalem, 206; meaning, 259; narrative, 258; of Acts 9, 208; of Saul’s conversion, 32; outside Jerusalem, 201 centrifugal: 123, 207, See centrality change: challenging journeys, 99; discipleship paradigms, 64; from ignorance to knowledge, cf. recognition, 105; in destiny and journey, 257; in destiny and status, of Ethiopian, 250; in Jesus relation to the OT, 248; in meaning of the way, 69; in perceiving history, 111; instruction at points of change, 177; metaphor, 105; metabole, 105; of fate, in The Good Samaritan parable, 183; of fortune, reversal, 105; of journey paradigms, 70; of life, Saul, 262; of person, via mimesis, 93; of Saul’s life, 270 character: literary - better than living humans, 101; credible, in Luke, 250; decisions, in Luke, 248; destiny, 257; destructive interference, 93; dramatic, 106; extradiagnostic, 250, 251; flaw, 106; genuine, 117; high status, 194; idealised, in tragedy, 101; imitation of characters, 117; in tragedy, 85, 103; plot element, 104, 106; proselyte, 222; restored, in Luke, 249; rich, 100; Saul, main character, 32; settings, 143; subject to change, 134; suitable, 96; the Lord, 250; the Spirit, 31, 175; toy of destiny, 107; unity of character, 203 chiasmus: composite, 259; encounter, 258; evangelistic, 258; hados structures, in Mk., 147, 148, 149; journey based, in Lk. 24, 203; recognition by sight, 47; sacramental, 258, 261 choice: 56, 170, 250; ethical, 54, 55, 106, 134, 165, 171, 249, See decision; linguistic, 79, 109; of Ethiopian, 249; of mimetic media, 101; of paradigm, 135; theological, 250 climax: 82; Emmaus’ meal, 188, 257; Ethiopian’s baptism, 262; multiple, 257; Saul’s baptism, 262; Saul’s persecution, 256 coherence: compositional, 82; literary, 84; narrative, 105, 122, 149, 226, 233, 261; of real events, 104 comedy: 20; comic nature, 277; Peter’s betrayal, 90; restoration, 249, 256, 277; reversed tragedy, 249; vs. tragedy, 101 complex: dialogue, 233; plot, 105, 107; recognition, 232 complication: desis, 107, 124, 130, 255, 271 composition: Aristotle, 23; creativity, 83; elements, 40; Emmaus’ story, 14; Hellenistic rules, 19; Lukian, 29, 78, 154; Lukan art, 271; Lukian structure, 57; Luke’s Central Section, 57, 178; Markan, 150; mimesis, 75, 109; Saul’s story, 263; structure, 85; techniques, 85; unity, 66 compression: of time periods, mimesis, 74; temporal, 209 conflict: dramatic, 125 continuity: cultural, between Luke-Acts and Hellenistic environment, 196; of Jesus’ ministry, 259; of journeying and Emmaus, 186; of Luke’s journey motif, 27; of plot, discontinuity between Acts 9–Acts 10, 218; of redemption; Robinson, W.C., 64, 65 contraction: temporal, 202, 204 conversion: Cornelius’, 7, 197; Ethiopian’s, 3, 17, 31, 46, 48, 172, 207, 224; Hellenistic stories, 17; Lydia’s, 6; parallels, Emmaus, Ethiopian, Saul, 248, 271; parallels, Ethiopian vs. Cornelius, 219, 222, 224; parallels, Ethiopian vs. Saul, 123, 276; parallels, Saul vs. Cornelius, 217; Samaritans’ and Gentiles’, 224; Saul’s, 5, 31, 127, 208, 256; Zaccaeaus’, 164, 184 crisis: the core of a plot complication, desis, 124 crossroads: decision, 55, 133, 134; Heracles, 55

D
delight: dialogue on the Emmaus road, 236; history and literature, 111; Luke’s history style, 277; of art, mocked by Plato, 93; of dramatic art. See pleasure
denouement: lysis, 107, 130, 184, 262, 271 destination: Jerusalem, 40; Temple, 41 destiny: dei motus, suffering pathos, 248; instruction in via, 266; reversals, 194, 257, 265, 276, 278; Saul’s, Cleopas’, 107; tragic, major fall, 106 dialogue: 5, 270; chrestological, 238, 275; complex, 233; debates, 163; dialectic, 234; Emmaus, 98; evangelistic, 1, 258, 260; Heracles, 133; Lukian, 83; master-disciples, 162; on the road, 267; questions, 274; reasoning, 233; recognition, 232, 247; revelational, 164; scenes, 237; suspense, recognition, 193 dianoia: 85, 103, 109, 237
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diction: Aristotle's mimesis; choice of words, 109; lexis, 103; linguistic unity, 109; clarity, choice of vocabulary, 78; Lukian style: atheism, 79; Emmaus vocabulary, 48, 189; Ethiopian's rhetoric, 235; Philip's style, 235; rhythm, 236; vocabulary, 78; Markan style, 85

disappearance: 16, 18, 275, See appearance, encounter, vision; Elisha-Elijah, 191; Emmaus, 231; Ethiopian's, 268; Hellenodorus legend, Emmaus, 128; Hellenistic legends, 128; Philip's, 32, 47, 128
disciple: apostasy and the Way, 68; commissioning of the 12-70, 181; discipleship paradigms, 64, 68; disputes, 148, 161; Emmaus; disappointment, 241; disciples vs. apostles, 69; fear motif, 256; following vs. perseverance, 68; hodos challenges, 172; Jesus; as a model, 66; cares, 168; following, 164; leads, 163; journeying paradigm, 71, 152, 180; katharsis, 103; mission, 160; persecutions, 63; place in narrative, 205; recognition, 192; restoration, 192, 249; reversal, 265; suffering motif, pathos, 251; teaching in via, 266; understanding motif, 149
discovery. See recognition, anagnorisis
drama: dramatic climax in Emmaus, 188; drama and history, 111, 113; drama and Jewish novels, 125; drama and sensationalism, 115; dramatic; details, in Emmaus, 251; dialogue, of Saul, 234; journeying, 124; plot components, 104; return points, 182; scene, for Ethiopian, 235; situation, of Saul, 250; stories in OT, 125; Incarnation, 91; Luke and Hellenistic drama, 21; Luke's interest, 15; mimesis, novels, history, 73; OT dramatism, 89; Peter's betrayal, 90; Plato's mimesis, 83; the Prodigal Son's drama, 183; recognition scene, 15; the Good Samaritan's, 182; tragedy, in Saul's story, 255, 256

e emotion: emotion and intellect, 102; emotion and tragedy, 105; emotional impact, 105; emotions and history, 116
emploment: Luke's techniques, 277
emulation: 82; of popular stories. See imitation, mimesis
enactment: 15; mimesis, 74, 101, See impersonation
encounter: in Acts 8-9, 207; Jewish Hellenistic models, 125; Lukian encounters, 27; Lukian specific; Emmaus, 190; Philip and the Ethiopian, 253; of the Prodigal Son, 183; Saul and Jesus, 255; Zacchaeus, 184; Lukian specific encounters; thieves, priests, Samaritans, 181; OT models, 124
ending: confrontational (in Matthew), 155; doxological, 164; happy, 185, 210, 250; positive, 8, 255, 256, 277; restorative, 194, 275; sacramental, 1, 259; universalistic, 159
entertaining: history, 110, 111; stories, 28; style, 115, 122
epiphany: christophany; Saul, 214; Saul, horama, 215; Hellenodorus, 127; post-Easter, 32
ethos: 103, 104
eucharist: 267, etc.; alluded to, 227, 231, 275; eucharistic connotations and miraculous feeding, 228; eucharistic reading, 231; the Last Supper, 230
expansion: centrifugal, 123; geographical, 43, 122; geographical, radiating, 70; of pattern, 14
external: symbols of the way, 35
eyesight. See sight motif, blindness
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E

eight: angekang, tyche, gnome, eimarmene, 251; of innovators, 98; reversals, 125, 183, 273; sensationalism and history, 116
fear: 23, 102; God-fearer; Cornelius, 7, 219; Ethiopian, 7, 222, 268
feast: Eleusis, 51
feel: compassion, 165; hearts burning, 103; loss, 15; mystery, 250
final: bells, 121; destination, 39; recognition, 31; report, 9, 130, 190; restoration, 183, 185
flaw: of character, 106; of Saul, 107
focus: double focus; challenges, opportunities, 269; evangelistic dialogue, 267; Jesus' messianity, 244; Journey motif; Reisenotizen, 56; legend; on Jesus, 32; of encounters, 231; of history; on persons, 111; on hodos accounts, 173; on Jesus' debates, 178; on Palestine, 58; on return, 206; on Septuagint imitation, 76; recognition, 231
foreign: actors, 97; cultural inspectors, 97; Ethiopian, 220, 222; foreigner; baptism, 8, respect, 85; lands, 151, 183; performers, 85
framework: conceptual, for Peter's Confession, 148; narrative, 14, 67; spatial; two different, in Acts 8-9, 208; two different, in Lk. 24, 206; temporal; different types in Acts 8-9, 209; different types in Lk.24, 205; different types, in Lk. 24, 203

F

gate: angekang, tyche, gnome, eimarmene, 251; of innovators, 98; reversals, 125, 183, 273; sensationalism and history, 116

G

gene: appearance, 11, 17; appearance, OT related, 18; development, types, 18; Hellenistic novel, 119, 122, 125; Luke's literary environment, 273; mixt tragedy-comedy, Saul's story, 256; overlap, history and poetry, 111; romance, in Luke 15, 183; special, new, Peter's betrayal, 90

H


I

ideology: geography, 138; geopolitical, 139; in 1 Enoch, 139; literature, 277; of Roman Empire, 140; of the disciples, 277

imagery: Eleusian, 51; Hellenistic, 50; life as a journey, 54; New Exodus, 46; of painting, 117; Scamander and Achilles, 117; two-roads, 134; wilderness, 150

idealised: characters, 101; cities, history, 201; reports, 28

ideology: geography, 138; geopolitical, 139; in 1 Enoch, 139; literature, 277; of Roman Empire, 140; of the disciples, 277

imagery: Eleusian, 51; Hellenistic, 50; life as a journey, 54; New Exodus, 46; of painting, 117; Scamander and Achilles, 117; two-roads, 134; wilderness, 150
imitation: accurate vs. creative, 95; challenge of ideology, 140; creative, 101; emulation, 82; hybrid model, 82; instinctive, 100; literary, 19; of form, of content, 19; plot and life, 103; literary dependence, 122; mimesis, 73, 74; of biblical style, 76; of emotion, 116; of Hellenistic models, 81; of LXX, 74, 277; of master's way, 62; of OT, 30; of OT appearances, 16; of reality, 82; of reality, Markan, 90; of truth, 110; of vocabulary, structure, themes, 80; pleasure of understanding, 116; representation, 75; rhetorical, of famous authors, 82; serious, elevated, Plato, 96; similarity, 75 impairment: 221; physical, 254 impersonation. See enactment; dramatic, in Plato, 83; enactment, dialogue, 93; Jesus as traveller, 189; Luke's speeches, 96; vs. plain narrative, 93; vulgar, for Plato, 83 inclusio: discipleship inclusio, in Luke, 172; geographic, journey, 261; hodos; in Ethiopian's conversion, 261, 268; in Mark, 164; in Saul's conversion, 264; in Acts 8-9, 208; in Mark, 148; Spirit, in Philip's call, 260; Zacchaeus, in Luke, 185 indirect: style; direct speech, in Luke, 161; direct style, in Luke, 96; in Mark, 162; plus direct speech, Homer, 93; preferred by Plato, 83 innovation of the Church, 274; Christians, as innovators, 98; literary, 269; strangers, 97 inspector: cultural; corrupted ideas, 98; inspection journey, of Heliodorus, 127; of foreign cultures, in Plato, 97 instruction: at points of change, in Luke, 177; of the Spirit, in Acts 8, 10, 8; on discipleship, on the road, 163; on Scripture, on the road, 266; proclamation, on the road, 186; solemn, 16; Torah, 150 intellectual: arguments, 235; blindness; Cleopas, 176; Elymas, 176; Paul, 176; error, or ethical, 107; katharsis, 102 internal: chiasmus, 203; connotations of the way, 35, 37; OT quotations, 81; proof from prophecy, 248; symmetry, 193 irony: in Luke, 171; Ananias and Saul, 269; Emmaus misrecognition, 232; Saul is under threat, 211; Saul send to Tarsus, 270; in Plato, 92; on Caesar's tax, 157 J Jerusalem: Jerusalem and Troy, 201; Jerusalem-type, appearances, 12; Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, 59, 62; journey types; in and out from Jerusalem, 202 journey: continuity, Robinson, 64; different types of journeys, 29; discipleship, 66; divinely guided, 66; drama, 124; founding empires, 201; from Nazareth to Rome, 66; happy journey, persecution journey, 211; idealised; destination, 39; Exodus, 35; Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, 40; ideology, 137; in OT, 124; journey scheme, in Matthew, 157; journey within journey, 235; lexical variety, 256; mimesis of journeying, in Emmaus, 193; missionary, 198; mixed, heterogeneous material, 142; motif, 59; motif, in Luke, 158, 174; multiplicity, Flender, 71; notes, 29; of cultural, evangelistic, 99; of Heliodorus, 127; of the Prodigal Son, romantic, 183; of Tobit, 126; patterns, in Luke, 178; pilgrimage, 226; revelation, 226; reversal of destiny and of journey, 192; Samaritan's and the Grateful Dead Man, 182; scheme, in Matthew, 155; significance, in Luke, 177; slowed down, in Luke, 168; teaching, in Emmaus, 186; telescoped, Acts 9, 209; to Jerusalem, 65; transition character, in Luke, 164; transition role, in Luke 24 - Acts 1, 199; transitions in Luke-Acts, 225; two types, in Luke, 179 joy: from narrative, 24; joyful endings, 8; joyous restoration, 179; of resurrection, 271; of Rhoda, 10; of understanding Jesus, 253; of Zacchaeus, 185; road to joy and virtue, 134; the Ethiopian's, 103; the Ethiopian's, 268 judgement: of fig-tree, 157; of God, 38; of Jews, 171; solemn, 42; theology of judgement, 139 K katharsis: 23, 102, 103, 256 kerygma: Easter, 233; hodos kerygma, 271; kerygmatic appearances, 13; kerygmatic paradigms, 28; post-Easter, 9 L lexis: 103, 109, 189, 236; of transition, 210 literature: apocalyptic, 139; Hellenistic parallels, 16, 30; Hellenistic, and ethics, 249; history, 122; innovation, in Luke-Acts, 269; Jewish, and archaisms, 82; voyage motif, 120 liturgical: reading; Central Section, 154; Emmaus, 227 map: biblical, 137; Christian maps, 140; of the Holy Land, 140; world maps and ideology, 139 martyr: Jesus, 40 meal: at the centre of Emmaus encounter, 258; Emmaus, 187, 227; eucharist, 187, 227, 228, 267, 275; fellowship, 187; in Luke-Acts, 228; motif, next to sight motif, 229; of encouragement, 229; of fellowship, 184; of recognition, 231; restoration, covenant, 229; sacramental, 232; scene, 265; recognition, in Emmaus, 192; significance, 98; theatre, drama, 193; three visions of Peter, 215; vs. teaching, 253 melopoiia: 103 metaphor: of painting; Luke's style, 264; the way, 32; connotations, 143; geographical, 34; Hellenistic, 50; inner life, 33; redemption, 178; the Sower parable, 144 mimesis: Aristotle; different from reality, 101; literary creativity, 84; of action, 84; painting, 117; plot, action, 103; positive, 99; definition, 73, 74; Duris, 116; vivid representation, 116; Heracles; crossroads paradigm, 134, in NT, 90; literary, 19, 73; Lukan; close to Aristotle, 85; dynamic action, 212; editing Mark, 161; high mimetic mode, 235; hodos paradigm, 207, 208; LXX, 76; of plot, 82; OT models, 123; rhetorical, 81; style and vocabulary, 75; thematic, 81; Markan, sensationalist, 145; mimemata, 74; of hodos encounters, 25; Plato; ambiguous, 92; imitation, inferior, 91; impersonation, 93; positive, in creation, 94; unethical, 93; similarity and dissimilarity, 75 mission: 10, 28; Luke's emphases, 160; on discipleship, on the road, 186; on foreign cultures, in Plato, 97 motif: baptism, 242; blindness, 46; encounters, 5; ethical choice, 54, 133; fear motif, 103; geographical, 11; heavenly vision, 217; hodos, 225, 266, 271; journey, 66; journeying hero, 54; meal, 229; New Exodus, 242; of heavenly rapture, 191; proof from prophecy, 202; retreat, 167; sight and understanding, 47; sight motif, 124;
Index

suffering, 48, 248; the Way, 2, 149, 261; two witnesses, 176; wandering, 33; Way and salvation, 67

N
narrative: centrality, 13; models, 19, 73; parallels, 10, 169, 195; structures, 80, 122, 152, 235, 264; function: mimesis in Mark, 86

O
opposites: in Emmaus; types, 260; the Way in Hellenism, 52, 53
opsis: 103
overlap: of different journey schemes, 27; of frameworks, spatial and temporal, 276; of genres - history and poetry, 111; of suffering, in Acts 8, 254; of temporal frameworks, in Lk.24, 205; of triads, in Mark, 149

P
parable: dynamic, in Luke, 157; the Good Samaritan and mimesis, 85; Hellenistic parallels, the Prodigal Son, 183; Hellenistic parallels, the Good Samaritan, 181; Heracles legend, 133; imitation of reality, 84; of choice, Hellenistic, 55; of high status persons, in Luke, 162; recognition, in OT, 31; static, in Matthew, 157; the Sower and the way, 144; tragic-comic, in Luke, 277
paradigm: based on Emmaus story, 10; change, 70; discipleship, 64; divine visitation, 175; Elisha-Elijah, 191; ethical, 134, 135; hodos encounters, 208, 225, 231, 246; journey, 50, 124, 149, 179; kerygmatic, 28; mimesis, 84; on the road, 2; plot paradigm, 84; theos aner, 48; path: heroic, glorious paths, 52; middle path, via media, 55; of spiritual

Index

fruitfulness, 261; path of prosperity, 52; paths of God, 159; paths of virtue and vice, 133; the way, 35, 39; two paths to Acropolis, 56; ways of the Lord, 47
pathos, 104, 105, 248. See suffering. pattern: christological dialogue, 233; Easter appearance, 217; expansion, Dodd, 14; in Luke, Talbert, 196; instruction on the way, 180; of travel, 87, recommended, Aristotle, 84; scapegoat, Girard, 88; sea voyage, shipwreck, 29; travelling, 39; two paths to Acropolis, 56; travelling instruction on the way, 180; of travel, 39; two paths to Acropolis, 56; travelling
peripeteia: 104, 124. See adventure
perspective: context, for Luke, 4; destiny reversal, 265; ecclesia pressa, 59; Jesus, the Church, 256; of the Way, 264; Saul and David, 246
person: credible personages, 250; high status, 162; imitation changes person, 92, 93; personalisation, in Luke, 194; personalised; accounts, 169; meaning, 27; scene, 163; personified; vice, virtue, 128; providential, 183; suffering, 274; young, at crossroads, 55
pivot: Lk. 9, 24-Acts I, 6-9, 8-9, 225; Lk. 9, Acts 6-9, 44; Lk.6, 24-Acts 1, 8-9, 225
plot: coherent, 107; literary plot, 103, 104; plot coherence, 82; plot elements, 18; peripeteia, anagnorisis, pathos, ethos, 104; texture, relations, 107; plot lines; complex, 256; legends and Luke-Acts, 128; Luke-Acts, 197; novels and Acts, 123; turning point, in Luke-Acts, 183; two foci, 258; plot, soul of tragedy, 103; simple and complex, 105; well constructed, 84, 103
praxis: 83, 100
progression: linear with sacramental climax, 262; narrative, 164, 206, 258

Q
question: at the crossroads, 55; complication, 124; counter-question, 233, 234; Lukan dialectic pattern, 233, 234, 246, 274; more solemn, in Luke, 162; open question, 234; rhetorical, 8

R
recognition: Aristotle, 104; Auerbach, 30; by memory, 105; by reasoning, 105; chiasmus, 47; contrived, by reasoning, 105; Heliodorus, 127; meal, bread breaking, 231; non-recognition, 32, 253; of Callirhoe, 124; of destiny; Saul, 250; of fortune; metabasis, 256, peripeteia, 104; point of return; Wendepunkt, 257; positive and negative, 182; recognition, 105; restoration, 262; reversal point; Heliodorus, 127
road: debates, dialogues, 189; encounters and Hellenistic models, 19; encounters and Luke's Way / Jesus, the Church, 256; of the way, 35, 169; paths of God, 159; paths of the road, 9; scenes and journey stories, 226; teaching, 165; through dialogue, 164
reversal: change (metabole), 105; complex; peripeteia and anagnorisis, 124; of destiny; Saul, 250; of fortune; metabasis, 256; peripeteia, 104; point of return; Wendepunkt, 257; positive and negative, 182; recognition, 105; restoration, 262; reversal point; Heliodorus, 127

S

Index
Emmaus, 69; temporal schema, in Lk. 24, 203

sight: 5; motif, 47, 229, 275; OT, 124; recognition, 232; by memory, 105; recovery; Tobit, 125; restoration, 47, 263; understanding, 267

spatial: divergence, 202; frameworks, 207, 276; imagery, 69; mediation, 151; opposites, 151; relation to Jesus, 68; relations in Acts 8-9, 208

structure: chiasmus, in Mark, 149; chiastic structures, 265; dialectic structure, 234; dialectic, in Luke, 70; dynamic structure of plots, 104; invading journey, in Luke, 139; outward and return structure, in novels, 123; plots and structure, 104; structures and standards, 25; superimposition of structures, 235


suffering: Aristotle, pathos, 104, 105; Lukan motif, 248, 255; necessity of, the dei motif, 167; of brothers, due to Saul, 255; of Ethiopian, 221, 254; of Jesus, at Passover, 107; of Jesus, Emmaus, 251; of Jesus, in Isaiah prophecy, 254; of Jesus, in wilderness, 166; of Jesus, path to glory, 178; of Lord's Servant, 48; of the Prodigal Son, 183; of Saul, 256; of Saul, of Ethiopian, etc., 248; of the traveller to Jericho, 182; of Tobit, 126

symbol: external symbols, the way, 35; historical symbol, Exodus, 39; hodos setting, Peter's confession, 145; Jerusalem as a symbol, 178; of progressing evangelism, 271; of the Dioscuri, 87; of the Way, 144; symbolic convert, the Ethiopian, 7; the Ethiopian, 221; the Way, as a positive symbol, 245

T

table: of nations, 160, 181; table fellowship, 207, 259

teaching: in Lk. 9-19, 41; in private, 167; journey, 61; journeying, 278; meal, 253, 257; movement, in Luke, 154; on the way, 260, 266; revelation, 165. See instruction

temporal: compression, in Lk. 24 - Acts 1, 209; condition for apostleship, 65; contraction, 202; contract, 204; development in Luke-Acts, 66; emphasis, vs. geographical, in the Journey motif, 65; frameworks, 209; limit to appearances, 217; notes in Acts 9, 263; overlap of schemes, in Lk. 24, 205; progression, 206; scheme, expanding and contraction, in Lk. 24, 205; spatial dynamics, of Luke's Way motif, 66; spatial frameworks, 276; unitary temporal schema, in Lk. 24, 203

thetaphany: anthropomorphic, 16; essential, to Saul, 269. See epiphany.

tragedy: characters, 101; components of tragedy (mythos, ethos, lexis, dianoia, opsis, melopoiia), 103; effect of tragedy (emotions), 105; epic, tragedy, and mimesis, 20; history, Polybius, 113; history, Quintilian, 113; in Saul's story, 255; Luke's style. See drama, imitation, comedy, plot; Luke's style, comedy, 249; reversal of destiny, 106; tragic and comic, in Luke, 277; unity, 109

transition: features, in Emmaus story, 186; function of hodos stories, 164; in Luke 24, 206; journey stories, 199; nature, Bartimaeus, 194; pivot role, 225
typology: 1 Enoch, 138; Raphael typology in Lk. 24, 31; typological interpretation of the Way, 33

U

unity: narrative, 205; narrative, of Acts 8-9, 207; of action, of character, 203; of composition, 66; unified plot, 107; unified story form, 18; unitary actions, 108; unitary temporal scheme, 203

V

vision: dialogue, 270; double heavenly vision, 217; double vision theme, 235; encounters, 18; Heliodorus, 127; of Cornelius, 214; of Paul, Acts 27, 214; of Stephen, 217; of the Macedonian, 214; revelation, 87; Saul's vision, 214; vision within vision, 235

W

word: as rhetorical entity, 123; avoidance of obscurity, 109; choice of words, diction, 109; literature, mimesis in words, 116; Luke and loan words, 78; painting with words, 117; the way of the word, 69

wordplay: hodos encounters, 109; in Acts 8.30, 235

Index