

# Dr. Daniel K. Darko, Gospel of Luke, Session 2, Introduction, Part 2, The Literary Artistry of Luke

© 2024 Dan Darko and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Dan Darko in his teaching on the Gospel of Luke. This is session 2, Introduction, Part Two, The Literary Artistry of Luke.

Welcome back to the study of the Gospel of Luke.

In the first part, we look at a few things about the introduction of the Gospel. We look at the issue of authorship and recipients, we look at the world of Luke a little bit, and we begin to look at some of the religious traditions, such as Judaism, and how they inform how we are going to understand the Gospel of Luke. Here we move on quickly to begin to explore some key things about Luke and the way he writes his Gospel still as part of the introduction.

But here, we focus mainly on literary artistry and some of the common themes that we find between Luke and Acts. Luke writes in the introduction of the Gospel, from verses one to four, and I read Many have undertaken to draw up an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed down to us by those who from the first were eyewitnesses and servants of the word. With this in mind, since I myself have carefully investigated everything from the beginning, I too decided to write an orderly account for you most excellent Theophilus, so that you may know the certainty of the things you have been taught.

I put on a slide for you to take a look at how the second volume of Luke's writing was introduced, mentioning the same recipient, Theophilus. Coming back to the Gospel, though, and paying close attention to what Luke is doing here, let's make a quick observation about what he says he is doing. He is giving an account of things that have been fulfilled among us.

As if to say there were once told about, there were once promises to be fulfilled or prophecies to be fulfilled. They were handed down to us, Luke says, and he did not have direct contact with Jesus. The traditions he writes about were handed down to them and to him personally in this situation, but his sources were credible.

He says there were eyewitnesses, and there were servants of the word. Is it not interesting to observe how Luke describes the Gospel as the word? So, his sources are very familiar with the original source. He says with this in mind that he has also carefully investigated, done research, and decided to make sure that what he writes is meticulous and clear to provide an orderly account.

But in his reference as culture dictates, he may know tearful loss, but he needs to address him correctly. So, he refers to him as his excellency, if you like, sir. In America, we say, sir, if we are in the South, as a polite way to everybody.

Oh, but in England, when we say sir, it actually means sir, the most excellent. The tearful loss was the equivalent of the sir's concept. He was a very important person indeed, and Luke wrote this so that he could know the certainty of the things he had been taught.

Observations about how Luke describes his source. His source of data, his source of account that he is going to write about in these few verses, he described them as written accounts. He is not the first.

Many had gone before him, and he draws from them as well. Two, his source includes eyewitnesses. He makes no personal claim, but he makes reliable claims.

Third, as a well-educated person, he also put his skills to bear. He actually carefully investigated the material he gathered and presented an orderly account of the material he gathered. I relate with Luke on that part in terms of the third part.

That is the geeky part. That's my world. But what does an orderly account mean? Does Luke suggest to us that having an orderly account means he is actually following the chronological sequencing of events as they play out? Or is he talking about orderly accounts as providing logical, accurate, if you like, lucid accounts of the events that happen? Before one begins to imagine that this might be a chronological exactitude that he is referring to, why don't you pause in understanding that ancient writers would not typically have a need to say, need to present certain accounts in chronological fashion to tell the story of an individual?

Sometimes, they can decide to begin with the heroism of the person. They can decide to place certain events in the middle because of how they want to develop their plots and plot resolution. Luke does not mean to say he's providing a chronological account, per se.

He is actually referring to the logical and lucid presentation of events. In terms of Luke's other source that I mentioned, in terms of written source, we know in New Testament scholarship, if you take New Testament 101, one of the things we talk about is this whole mouthful thing called source criticism. Now, I like to tell students that my accent is so bad when I say sauce; maybe they hear pasta sauce or tomato sauce.

That's not what I'm saying. I am saying the origin of the text, okay? The sauce is S-O-U-R-C-E, not tomato sauce or pasta sauce. So, in the New Testament, we talk about source criticism.

What does that mean? Well, let's just talk about it in plain, ordinary person's language. Source criticism basically means this. One presents an account of something that happened in the past.

The person was not there when the events happened. The time between the actual occurrence of the event and the writing of the event is decades. So, the writer normally needs to gather some sources of information to be able to help them to put the material together.

Source criticism basically asks what the sources of the gospel writers are. Where did they get the information they bring to bear in their writing? Whom did they consult? Did they have access to written material? Were they oral? What are some traditions somewhere that they could tap into? What are some libraries they could have visited? So, basically, source criticism is doing just this. In the study of the gospels in particular, the similarities and differences between the gospels have posed a lot of questions to us. Therefore, source criticism becomes a convoluted exercise that we are always arguing about.

And sometimes, we are not sure what we are talking about. But basically, what we are saying is this. How do we explain the similarities and differences between Matthew, Mark, and Luke? And we have so many reasons we provide.

Some say, oh, it is because you can explain it this way. Matthew wrote first, and the two other gospels are very similar to Matthew because John is very different; they are dependent on Matthew. That view is actually held by very, very few.

Most scholars say, oh, Mark wrote first, and Matthew and Mark Matthew and Luke used Mark in the composition of their writings. But then, one goes on to ask the next question when it comes to source criticism. The next question is, what about the material that is in Matthew and Luke that is not in Mark? The argument that says Matthew and Luke used Mark in their composition also goes on to say that Matthew and Luke did not know each other.

So, if Matthew and Luke did not know each other, there are 220 to 235 verses that Matthew and Luke share in common. The question is, where did they get that from? And then they talk about the Q source. That is a basic introduction.

If you go to the other lecture in Biblical In-Learning that deals with hermeneutics, the scholar takes time to unpack more of that. So, having said this in the briefest way possible, let's come back to Luke. How do we look at Luke's source material? Now, the most common views that are held in terms of Luke's sources of composition is what we call the two-source hypothesis and the four-source hypothesis.

The two-source hypothesis, which is also referred to as the Haussmann hypothesis, says Luke used Mark. After using Mark, he also drew material from another source that Matthew also used that we don't know whether they are written or are a tradition. It is something that is an ongoing debate that is called Q. In that sense, Luke may have had information from elsewhere, but primarily, this argument goes as follows.

Luke gathered his material from Mark and from Q. What is Q? We don't know what Q looks like. It may be a traditional oral tradition that people shared, or it could be a written information. We don't know.

It is still an ongoing debate. One thing that is sure, though, is most of the Q source material is actually in the sayings of Jesus, so that we are sure about it.

So, the two-source hypothesis for Luke says Luke depended on Mark and Q. There is another hypothesis that looks like the two-source hypothesis called the four-source hypothesis developed by an Oxford don. Streeter's hypothesis says that Luke depended on Mark and Q, and then Luke also depended on the L-source. What is L-source? L-source, we don't know what that is, but it comprises any material that is in Luke that cannot be accounted for by Mark or Q. How do we explain this in a very layman language? It's very difficult, even if a villager like me is trying to explain this.

But basically, all that it means is this. In gathering Luke, in Luke gathering his sources to write the gospel, he depended on Mark and some material called Q. And there are other materials that are unique to Luke's own findings that he brings to bear in the composition of the gospel. If you understand it that way, then Luke's gospel is going to have a lot of things in common with Mark and Matthew.

But Luke is going to put his distinct and unique emphasis on how he composes his gospel. And so brace yourself for that because too many people like to read the New Testament from Matthew's point of view, and as I like to say, too many times when I test my students, I test them, and one of the common patterns I find is they try to use Matthew to answer questions for Luke, and they always miss those questions because they think Matthew, even whatever way I would say, and no matter how often I say, think Luke. This takes me further to look at if we know the sources of Luke, then we know that Luke is not doing anything particularly different.

But what Luke is doing in Lukan writings is also important to give us a sense. If Luke shares some things in common with Matthew and Mark, Luke also shares some things in common with Acts. Why? Acts is also written by Luke, and he wrote it for the same person he wrote the gospel to.

As we look at the relationship between Luke and Acts, first, we will look at the fact that they have shared author and recipient, the recipient being Theophilus. I would

explain further that this gospel is not so isolated from the second volume of Luke. In fact, the gospel is part one of two volumes of Luke's writings.

The way the gospel of Luke ends and the way the book of Acts begins actually show that Luke has the intention to produce these volumes. I was actually reading from one scholar who suggested that when he calculates the length of the papyrus, he would take the gospel of Luke. It is just about the size of the longest papyrus.

And then, when he takes the book of Acts and looks at the length of the book of Acts, and he looks at what kind of papyrus that could fit on, he also realizes that it could actually fit on the longest papyrus. So, it seems like Luke was working with the longest papyrus that he could find, papyri, that he could find. He used the first one to write the gospel of Luke and then later wrote Acts.

That makes sense. But I don't know whether we should go by that or not. It makes sense that Luke seemed to write a lot.

Luke seemed to be like one of my friends. He can only write big books. And he writes more than I can read.

Some of us may be like Ted John. We just write briefs and just go on with life. But you see, Luke writes these with shared themes to show that the same message continues in Acts.

In this particular study, though, we are only focusing on the gospel. So, let's look at the shared themes. The shared themes between Luke and Acts include promise and fulfillment.

Luke is clear in the narrative plot and plot resolution that things that God promised are being fulfilled. The messianic prophecies are being fulfilled. The age of the spirit is here.

And God is doing something remarkable that he had talked about, that when the Messiah comes, these things will unfold. Luke shows this pattern and continues in the book of Acts that the age of the Spirit is an era that is marked by the Spirit. In fact, Luke will see the spirit everywhere.

Now, you may notice after I make this comment, begin to read the gospel of Luke and underline the word spirit in the first two chapters, and you will be surprised. Luke, for him, the age of the spirit is here. And we are going to see the age of the spirit, the remarkable move of the Holy Spirit, beginning also in the book of Acts.

But guess where it began? Even in the infancy narrative that I'm going to be talking about here, the spirit will be moving. And then he goes on to baptism. The spirit descends.

And when the spirit descends on him, God gives this divine attestation. This is my beloved son. Oh, okay.

This is my chosen one. Well, great. Takes him, the spirit, whips him to go to be tempted.

And then he finds himself in the synagogue and says, hey, the spirit of the living God is upon me. And come on, the spirit is moving again. And as if to say, transpose that to the book of Acts, how is the church going to begin? It's going to begin just like Jesus began.

The spirit is going to come. Luke is going to see the spirit everywhere. And the age of the spirit is going to be manifesting remarkable things.

The gospel will be for all people. Luke would argue in his gospel, as in the book of Acts, that the gospel will come to a point where widows will be touched. The ordinary will be touched.

The outcasts will be brought in. The elite will be brought in. Tax collectors who are prominent in society, society may have a bad image of them, but they, too, will access the gospel.

In fact, key people in society will actually surrender. We will find even in the book of Acts, which we are covering, that people who are politicians are going to surrender. And even us, are you trying to convince us? Are you trying to persuade us? Because the gospel is powerful.

Luke is going to show in his gospel, as in Acts, that the gospel is for all people and all nations. It's also going to show that the outcaster includes the demon-possessed woman. In fact, one of the remarkable things I find in Luke is sometimes, when a woman who has spent all her money with doctors and will be ritually unclean, struggling and out of desperation, she thinks she could sneak in, touch Jesus, get some help.

Even that, that outcast, that marginalized woman, was able to get her share of what was going on in this new kingdom. Additional themes that we find in the gospel of Luke that goes on in the book of Acts are themes such as the inauguration marked by the spirit of God and the church. The beginning of the ministry begins with the power of the spirit.

And the spirit comes with gifts, with prophetic activity. We will see in the gospel in a very unusual way in Second Temple Judaism, people prophesying about the Messiah in the temple. Emphasis on outsiders is in, and people have all kinds of spiritual encounters.

In the gospel of Luke, Luke reminds us that we are in a new age where the spirit of God is moving as the Messiah does his work in God's world. Roger Strongstad, in his *Charismatic Theology of Luke*, writes, to the extent that Luke makes it explicit, the charismatic gift of the Holy Spirit in Luke's Acts is always an experiential phenomenon. It is so for Elizabeth, Zacharias, Jesus, the disciples on the day of Pentecost, the household of Cornelius, and the disciples at Ephesus; the Holy Spirit will be working everywhere and anywhere.

But lest I be misunderstood, if you are charismatic, if you are Pentecostal, I did not just endorse your theology. I am saying this is what Luke is developing. If you are going to follow that pattern, you want to follow what is going on in Luke carefully.

If you are non-charismatic, non-Pentecostal, and you are open to the studying of Luke, pay attention to the broader and holistic theology of Luke. Luke does not represent modern-day Charism, modern-day Presbyterians, modern-day Baptists, or even modern-day Bapti-Costals like me. Luke presents the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ to Theophilus, talking about the prophetic fulfillment of God's work in the world and how this work continues.

Luke is being Luke. If you follow his literary artistry, you begin to realize that Luke, the one we are talking about here, is very, very careful in the way he explains things. Yes, there are a lot of things that you find in terms of similarities with the book of Acts, but there are some slight differences if you look at the Greek text carefully between Acts and Luke.

It doesn't mean that it's a question of whether one person wrote that or not. We do that a lot when we are in Paul. But the truth be told, I can tell you, I don't write the same way all the time.

At any given time, on my computer screen, I have two writing projects going on; one is very different from the other, and the writing styles change. Similarities and differences in the Lucan couples do not raise questions about whether the same person wrote them or not, but it's an observation. Luke may be seen as the first part of a single volume in which the author makes some distinctions between the time and work of Jesus and Christian origins in Acts.

This is more telling as you see in Luke 24; when we get there, we'll see that from verses 44 to 53, Luke tells us about the need for the disciples to wait for the promise.

At the beginning of Acts, he mentions that the promise is being fulfilled. Let's look quickly at the Old Testament in the Lucan couples.

Some quick observations. When you look at how the Old Testament is used in Luke, both in his gospel and Acts, you'll find out that the birth and ministry of Jesus are the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies. Two, he presents Christian origin as rooted in Second Temple Judaism.

Here, I need to pause and explain because anytime I think Luke acts, whether I'm in America or I'm in Africa, I get the same questions. The student wants to ask the question, do you mean Christianity was part of Judaism? Well, yes. In Luke's account of early Christianity, Christianity was a Jewish movement.

The message of the Christians is a message the outworking of the fulfillment of Messianic prophecies in the Jewish tradition. Christianity did not come to replace Judaism. That is not Luke's theology.

Christianity did not come so that Judaism would die. No. Jesus came as a Jew.

And he came to fulfill these prophecies with God's power and His spirit. He ushers in the new kingdom. The beauty of the new kingdom is how expansive the scope is.

The people of all nations, all backgrounds, circumcision or no circumcision, can become the children of God through faith in Jesus Christ. Please, presuming the questions that I often get, let me try to clarify this one once more. I am not saying Christianity is Judaism.

And I am not saying Judaism is Christianity. I am saying, though, that the origins of Christianity are rooted in Second Temple Judaism. It is within Second Temple Judaism that a movement emerges.

So, even by the end of the first century, there was no such thing as a distinct religious movement called Christians and Jews. There were only people of the way who were part of Judaism. If you carry that thought, then in the next couple of lectures, a lot of things I will be highlighting will make sense.

For Luke, the Old Testament or the Jewish scriptures provide a context of the unfolding events. And it also gives us the prism through which we can interpret what God is doing in human history. When we get to the first two chapters, which are often referred to as the infancy narrative, we are going to see that there are so many Old Testament allusions Old Testament echoes to show that what people are expecting, not only the parents of Jesus, but even other people in the temple are expecting, is what is being fulfilled.



My fellow Christians and whoever is following this lecture, let me make this appeal. Please, let's try as much as possible to refrain from any theology that can make us hate Jews. The origin of Christianity is that God steps into human history by bringing his son into our world as a Jew.

Luke will remind us that this is a fulfillment of prophecy. What God is doing is not outside what God had always intended to do with his people. Hating Jews and claiming that we have come to succeed Jews misconstrues what Luke is espousing.

I hope that as we study the Gospel of Luke, we'll come to appreciate the Jewish foundation of Christianity and how God, working through his people, has given outsiders like us the opportunity to become members of his household. Is it not quite sad that when Gentiles became part of what God was doing in his fulfillment of Jewish prophecies, the Gentiles rather hijacked the movement and found a way to batch the Jews if they could? We need to be careful about that. Luke, in his writing, helps us understand and interweave these Jewish notions and these Jewish scriptures.

As I mentioned, this is a Gentile writing to a Gentile, showing how God's work through Judaism is showing up. And he brings up all these narrative devices. In fact, it is so evident that when you look at Luke, you'll find out that he is skillful in the way he constructs narratives.

He uses summaries, devices that were common in his day, in his narrative writing. He uses speeches. He tells a story, and then in the middle of the story, and he says, oh, pause, let me tell you.

In the middle of my story, there was actually a speech that was given at a time. So, let me give you that speech as part of my story. And as he does that, he changes the person.

He changes the tone. He changes the figure. He engages the audience, knowing that most ancient texts are not written to be read but to be heard.

So that people who listen to someone read this text can almost hear multiple voices within the discourse and be able to absorb the message that is being conveyed. Luke brings summaries and speeches as narrative devices. He brings journeys.

He plots and resolves his plots very well. The gospel of Luke, for example, you see him, he will situate some things up in Galilee. And then from Galilee, he will have the writing, the travel narratives.

And I see Jesus traveling and doing ministry from different places to different places. He goes to Samaritan territory sometimes. Sometimes, he crosses the Jordan to the east and tries to do some things among Gentiles.

And then he comes down all the way, and then he ends in Jerusalem. Wonderful plot. Then, in the book of Acts, he begins from Jerusalem.

And then he starts from Jerusalem outward and goes on. And then, towards the end, Paul is in prison in Rome. Journeys are part of the devices Luke uses.

He also uses parallels or parallelisms. As we will see in the next couple of lectures, in the infancy narratives, he breaks parallels between Jesus and John the Baptist. In the book of Acts, he uses Peter and Paul and make parallels.

Sometimes, he shows similarities and parallels with the miraculous events he chooses to record. Luke is skillful in helping the mind to recall similar things he had talked or written about so that his audience could be so engaged. Here, in terms of parallels, I will borrow some of the material I got from my good friend Craig Keener.

This is Kinner's material, copyrights. Now, Keener wouldn't say copyright, but it's Craig's work. Craig has made some observations with some of the parallels that one finds in Luke's Acts.

Where Jesus is anointed, you find the church anointed. You find Jesus' signs. You have Paul's signs.

You have three trials of Jesus, two before a governor, one before a herald. And then you find three trials of Paul, two before a governor, one before a herald. And then you see Jesus in his last word, in your hands I commit my spirit.

And then you have Lord receive my spirit. He makes all these parallels. You found, even when Stephen was being stoned; you find all these parallels that Luke uses to kind of get the brain to go; I heard something similar before.

And then you make the connection and go, yes. And if you're an African church, you said, yes, pastor, amen. In terms of the genre of the Gospel of Luke, it is important to establish that there was no genre called gospel, in which the word Evangelion, just Evangelion, means good news.

There was no such genre. In fact, if you look at the genre we have in the New Testament that we call gospel, they are a mixture of so many things from narratives to parables to all these things, sometimes poems, all kinds of things that speeches that are going on in the text. But it is important to note that the debate about how Luke writes has kept some scholars going.

And it is. It has been good for publication for some time. And the debate is on two things. The first is whether Luke is writing a biography or a narrative. If Luke is writing biography, then some emphasis comes up.

If he's writing history as narratives, then some things have to be considered. Well, I have news for you. You see, I grew up in a village.

And by the way, not a village in America, which is a whole different story. And I grew up in a village in Africa. From first to 10th grade, I had no electricity in my village.

So that should give you a sense. Some of those arguments are too complicated for my African brain-mind. Okay.

Is it not true that in my African storytelling and in your own traditional storytelling, when you are narrating events, you can still use the same narratives to talk about other people? Why is it such a complex thing to say it is narrative, even if it has some biographical component to it? Well, you see, it is. It becomes complex because the cultures from which a scholar develops shape our prism of reasoning and argumentation. In a traditional Western world, storytelling is not generally part of the culture. That is not to say completely off, but generally.

Unlike, say, the African culture or some Asian cultures, for example, I give you an example. My grandmother used to sit me down to tell me about history. My grandmother never went to school.

And she would tell me story after story. And she would give me precise dates for the events. I remember vividly when my grandmother told me about a bridge that had been built.

She linked that bridge to the time when the British were trying to take over some parts of the country as a former British colony. And then she came back to tell me that, in fact, it was around the same time a particular factory, a textiles factory, was built in that region. Oh, as my grandmother tells me all this story, later I come to discover, working on principles of interpretation, that my grandmother is actually giving me dates.

She is telling me about people. She is telling me about concrete events, and when I went back to compare the dates, they all were spot on. But it's a storytelling society.

Her mind works with stories. And so that is the way she taught us. When she wants to teach me some values, she could give me four or five key people known in our family history who will never do what I am trying to do.

And who would think what I'm trying to do is shameful? And as a young boy, I get it. It means in our family, we don't behave like that.

And I stop. It is just how the culture works. I appreciate the culture of the West, where so many things are written down that you can assess.

Date of birth and all those, I mean, date of birth for where I grew up, you are lucky if you know where you were born, not when you were born. Because it's not a midwife, it's not a hospital.

We don't keep them. What am I trying to say? In the world of Luke, we want to conceptualize a world that is different from the traditional Western world and begin to look at how Luke works with narrative devices. Whether he's writing history as a bio or as a narrative is a legitimate question.

But I press forward to say that maybe we should look at this text as a narrative that has some biographical component to tell the broader story in the way that my grandmother would have told me. If you take that for a minute, then Craig Kinner and his observations will help a little bit as I put it on the screen. Kinner observes that what we think about modern biography and ancient biographies are not the same.

So, when we try to stretch all these genres, you know, bio or narrative, we may be spending a lot of time on this subject. It may be helpful to look at what Luke is doing in my view as a narrative with some biographical component because a biography may focus on a single person.

And you can say the whole gospel of Luke focuses on Jesus. You can even come back to the book of Acts and say the first few chapters focus on Peter and the rest focus on Paul. And it can make your whole biographical argument there.

Is it worth stretching that too far? Well, if I follow what Craig Keener is suggesting, then I'll suggest that you think about it just broadly in terms of how biographies work. I personally don't see any problem of Luke constructing narratives and having figures within the narrative to tell the story more vividly because biographies fit within a certain range and a certain length and convey a certain way.

In the case of the texts we are dealing with, we are dealing with religious texts. The religious texts are not only supposed to tell about individuals. They talk about religious figures, and they talk about figures within the religious narrative that are encountered with the religious experience to help elaborate on what that particular experience has to convey to other believers of that particular religion.

If we understand it that way, then yeah, we can study biography and all that, but I would say focus on narrative. It is in that sense that I will push to look at historical narrative as a preferred way to read the Gospel of Luke. If you use historical narrative, then we will say Luke is writing as an author with a particular aim.

He has an objective in mind and is going to collect data. He is going to consult people and eyewitness accounts, and he is going to look at the material that helps him to tell his story. A narrator always has a goal.

The other thing about a narrator, ancient or present, is the issue of selectivity. A narrator does not feel obliged to follow certain particular rules that whatever they hear, they have to actually deliver. No, Luke says he is giving an orderly account.

He chooses the part of his data that works best for him to present his material in a more lucid way. For Luke and narrative, one should put on the hat of a Christ-follower who is writing with the understanding of the Kingdom of God and telling the story of the Kingdom of God, how the Kingdom of God was inaugurated in the history of mankind, and how the Kingdom of God is going to be carried out from here on. Luke's focus is on Jesus and the history of the early Christian movement, trying to tell us how it began, what God was doing, and what God continues to do.

If you understand this broadly as what Luke is doing, then it helps even if you know a little bit about how narratives work in modern ideas or modern reasoning with narratives. Then, you begin to see as you read the story how some of it fits in perfectly because every narrative may have these six features to complete the work. Every narrative has an aim, and I told you Luke's aim is the Kingdom of God, the advancement of the message of the Kingdom of God.

That drives how he tells his story. Narratives have scenes. You see, sometimes Luke will establish a scene in somebody's house.

Sometimes, the scene is in a synagogue. Sometimes it is in a field where Jesus is giving a sermon. Luke will bring in characters as every narrative would do, and when the characters feature, it doesn't have to be overemphasized as though it becomes some biographical material.

Every narrative has characters. The characters may be named, sometimes not named, but these characters move, and events are shaped around the characters to tell the story in a memorable fashion. Narratives include dialogue.

On occasion, you will see in Jesus's interaction with people somebody says something, and Jesus responds. As Luke brings that dialogue to bear in the narrative, the reader or the hearer is brought to vivid imagination of how these things were

playing out. Plot and plot resolution is a part of every narrative, and Luke does well in the way he employs this device in his gospel.

We can talk about features of structure, the timing of events, how he moves from here to here, and when things meet. I mean, I'll give you a quick example of some timing issue that we will talk about later on, in which somebody comes to Jesus, sends sermons to Jesus, and says, oh, please, can you come to my house and help with a situation? Somebody's sick in my house, and then just around that time, somebody runs to intercept Jesus and stops Jesus, and Jesus helps that person, and it's as if time is wasted. Somebody's supposed to get mad on that side, but it turns out, oh, Jesus, no, no, no problem.

It's all working. The timing is right. Luke puts the timing in place.

He works with all these features and structures to be able to, in some places, give you that tension. What is going to come? What is going to come? In some of the parables, you are not sure how it is going to roll out, and then suddenly, it rolls out a certain way. Luke is perfect in the way he works with these narratives.

In other words, when we are thinking about narratives and historicity in Luke, Achtmeyer and Green, and Thompson seem to capture this when they write. The primary question is not how the past can be accurately captured or what methods will allow the recovery of what really happened. Historiography imposes significance on the past, both by its choice of events to record and to order and to its inherent efforts to postulate for those events an end and or origin.

As you think about Luke, think about the introduction to Luke in these terms. The Gospel of Luke is written by a physician called Luke. He wrote this gospel to a nobleman or an elite person called Theophilus.

In writing the gospel, he tells the story of what Jesus came to do and how that story is being carried out. But he locates the event in Second Temple Judaism, and he tells the story within a particular worldview, a worldview in which spirits and demons, angels, all are working together. He tells the story with the skill sets that he has as a good composer, and he writes the story with narrative devices based on the sources that he uses to tell the story.

He claims or tells us that he draws from written accounts and eyewitness accounts, and he also does his own research to make sure he presents the material in an orderly account. The general introduction of Luke cannot be captured well and thoroughly in a series of lectures in this form. But I hope that the little I have given you so far sets you up as we begin to look at the text to begin to understand that we are looking at origin of Christianity rooted in Second Temple Judaism.

And the Messiah will come into our world. He will be born to a virgin and a virgin from a very humble home in Nazareth. He'll rise to be the savior of the world, and the story will unfold in that way.

And yet, the two key people who are in this communication, the two interlocutors, are two Gentiles. One Luke, Christ follower and quite educated. Another Theophilus, who is referred to as Sir.

But the message being talked about is the message that everyone, everybody, everywhere, will have a part in what God is doing in the world. The gospel of Luke is an exciting gospel. If you are a Catholic, maybe I should draw your attention to the fact that the gospel of Luke is the favorite gospel of the current Pope.

The Pope tells a story about how the gospel of Luke challenges individuals to care for the poor and the marginalized. So, if it's good for the Pope, it must be good for you. But maybe you are a Protestant.

Let me remind you as we go into the gospel of Luke that echoes of your Christmas hymns are all from this gospel. Your favorite parables in the Bible are all from this gospel. But maybe you say I am not very liturgical.

Why are you telling me all this Christmas in the manger kind of stories? I am a charismatic Pentecostal. I said yes. Luke is that gospel.

That tells about the spirit of God at work in our world. That places the work of the Holy Spirit at the very beginning of events. And that brings Jesus to a point where He would make a bold manifesto in a synagogue at Nazareth.

The spirit of the living God is upon me. There, an outline of His manifesto is given. If you are charismatic, that is the gospel for you.

Oh, but who is left out? Nobody is left out. Because Luke is for all of us, and if you are a Christian, let me remind you that Luke is the only one who gives us a consistent account and transition from the events of Jesus to how the early church begins in the book of Acts.

Studying the gospel of Luke with us in this series actually helps you and sets you up perfectly to follow on from the book of Acts. I hope that you are learning something with us in this Biblica e-learning series. I also hope that you are even encouraged to teach some of the things you learn from this Biblica e-learning series.

And from here on, we are going to open the text of the gospel of Luke and begin to walk through the gospel of Luke. I'm excited about that. That's where I want to be.

I want to pick up the text and begin to look at the text. But you see, I also had an obligation to give you the background so that we can look at it from the same framework, capture Luke's mindset, and understand his approach to the writings he's involved in so that we can appreciate what he has to share with us. Thank you so much for participating and following the second lecture on the series so far.

I hope in the rest of the lectures, you will find it edifying and a rich learning experience. Thank you and God bless you.

This is Dr. Dan Darko in his teaching on the Gospel of Luke. This is session 2, Introduction, Part Two, The Literary Artistry of Luke.